

Annex

# Official Journal

## of the

### European Communities

No 2-318

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

---

1984-1985 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 23 to 26 October 1984

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

<b>Tuesday, 23 October 1984</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Resumption, p. 2 — Agenda, p. 2 — Votes, p. 4 — Budget, p. 5 — Own resources, p. 18 — Votes, p. 36 — Question Time, p. 36	
<b>Wednesday, 24 October 1984</b> .....	<b>52</b>
Application of the Rules of Procedure, p. 53 — Commission statement, p. 54 — Unemployment — Action on behalf of women, p. 63 — Formal sitting, p. 76 — Topical and urgent debate: Objections, p. 81 — Unemployment — Action on behalf of women (contd), p. 82 — Economic recovery, p. 102 — Question Time (contd), p. 113 — Annex, p. 128	
<b>Thursday, 25 October 1984</b> .....	<b>147</b>
Agenda, p. 148 — Minutes, p. 149 — Credentials, p. 150 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 150 — Budget, p. 165 — Topical and urgent debate (contd), p. 170 — Votes, p. 173 — Topical and urgent debate (contd), p. 183 — Economic recovery (contd), p. 191	
<b>Friday, 26 October 1984</b> .....	<b>196</b>
Minutes, p. 196 — Economic recovery (contd), p. 198 — Scientific and technical interchange, p. 203 — Adjournment, p. 207	

## 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 TUESDAY, 23 OCTOBER 1984

## Contents

1. Resumption of the session . . . . .	2		
2. Agenda: Mr Cot; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Castle; Mr van der Vring; Mr Pitt; Mr Arndt; Mr Sutra . . . . .	2		
3. Votes: Mr Megahy; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Seefeld; Mr Tomlinson; Mrs Castle; Lady Elles . . . . .	4		
4. Supplementary budget No 1/84 — Report (Doc. 2-798/84) by Mrs Scrivener: Mrs Scrivener; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Dankert; Mr Christodoulou; Lord Douro; Mr Louwes; Mr Pasty; Mr West; Mr Kilby; Mr Bronlund Nielsen; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf; Mr Bronlund Nielson; Mr Møller; Mrs Hoff; Mr Christensen; Mr Debattisse; Mr Møller; Mrs S. Martin; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Cornelissen; Mrs Fuillet; Mr Brok; Mr Bardong; Mr Woltjer; Mr Cot; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf . . . . .	5		
5. System of own resources — Report (Doc. 2-799/84) by Mr Pfennig: Mr Pfennig; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr von der Vring; Mr Langes; Lord Douro; Mrs Barbarella; Mr De Vries; Mr Pasty; Mr Kuijpers; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Pitt; Mr Mallet; Mr Price; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Wolff; Mr Bonde; Mr J. Elles; Mr Alavanos; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Spinelli; Mrs Tove Nielson; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Pfennig; Mr Langes . . . . .	18		
6. Votes: Mr Arndt; Mr Pranchere; Lord Douro . . . . .	36		
7. Question Time (Doc. 2-790/84)			
• Questions to the Commission: . . . . .	36		
• Question No 1, by Miss Tongue: Food aid — Africa: Mr Burke (Commission); Miss Tongue; Mr Burke; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Burke; Mr van Miert; Mr Burke; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Burke; Mr Prag; Mr Burke; Mr Andrews; Mr Burke; Mr J. Elles . . . . .	36		
• Question No 2, by Mrs Dury: Selection of projects financed through the European Social Fund: Mr Richard (Commission); Mrs Dury; Mr Richard; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Richard; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Richard; Mr Newens; Mr Richard; Mr Elliott; Mr Richard; Mr Seligman; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Richard; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Rogalla . . . . .	39		
• Question No 3, by Mr Barrett: Regional Fund Payments: Mr Richard; Mr Barrett; Mr Richard; Mr Howell; Mr Richard . . . . .	41		
• Question No 4, by Mr Fitzsimons: Dublin/Belfast gas deal: Mr Burke; Mr Fitzsimons; Mr Burke; Mr Hume; Mr Burke; Mr Taylor; Mr Burke . . . . .	42		
• Question No 5, by Mr Andrews: Drug trial controls: Mr Richard; Mr Andrews; Mr Richard; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Richard; Mrs Banotti; Mr Richard . . . . .	43		
• Question No 6, by Mrs Lemass: New integrated development operation for Dublin: Mr Richard; Mrs Lemass; Mr Richard; Mr Andrews; Mr Richard; Mr Taylor; Mr Richard . . . . .	44		
• Question No 7, by Mr Debattisse: Offences and complaints: Mr Burke; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Burke; Mr Rogalla; Mr Burke . . . . .	45		
• Question No 8, by Mr Simmonds: Conference on trade in violent and pornographic video cassettes: Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Simmonds; Mr Narjes; Mr Seligman; Mr Narjes; Mr Habsburg; Mr Narjes; Mr Cassidy; Mr Narjes . . . . .	46		
• Question No 9, by Mr Lalor: Re-classification of disadvantaged areas: Mr Burke; Mr Lalor; Mr Burke; Mr Clinton; Mr Burke; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Burke . . . . .	47		
• Question No 10, by Mr Wolff: Dairy quotas in mountain areas:			

<i>Mr Burke; Mr Wolff; Mr Burke; Mrs Faith; Mr Burke; Mr Debatisse; Mr Burke; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Burke . . . . .</i>	48	<i>Mr Richard; Mrs Caroline Jackson; Mr Richard . . . . .</i>	50
• <i>Question No 11, by Mrs Lizin: Prayon and the zinc cartel:</i>		• <i>Question No 13, by Mr Marck: Publication of information by the Community:</i>	
<i>Mr Narjes; Mrs Lizin; Mr Narjes . . . . .</i>	49	<i>Mr Narjes; Mr Marck; Mr Narjes; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Narjes; Sir James Scott-Hopkins . . . . .</i>	50
• <i>Question No 12, by Mrs Caroline Jackson: Social Fund grants:</i>			

## IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

### *President*

*(The sitting was opened at 10.30 a.m.)*

#### 1. *Resumption of the session*

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 11 October 1984.<sup>1</sup>

#### 2. *Agenda*

**President.** — At its meetings of 9 and 11 October 1984 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed.

At the meeting yesterday afternoon the chairmen of the political groups instructed me to propose a certain number of amendments.

*Tuesday:* No changes

However, I would draw your attention to the problems concerning the examination of draft supplementary budget No 1 for 1984.

According to the agenda the vote on this draft supplementary budget and on the motion for a resolution in Mrs Scrivener's report will be taken tomorrow at about 5.30 p.m.

As soon as we have the result of the vote, Parliament's decision will be notified to the Council which could consider it on 24 October 1984, and communicate the

result of its deliberations to us the same evening. In that case the Council's decisions could not be distributed to the House until the morning of Thursday, 25 October 1984.

Consequently, in view of the short deadline for tabling amendments it would not be possible to hold the debate and vote on the second reading before 6 p.m. on Thursday, 25 October 1984.

This, of course, is simply a hypothesis on which no decision can be taken today.

I shall inform the House after the Council's deliberations on the possibilities available for organizing our work in such a way as to enable a second reading of the supplementary budget to be held during this part-session.

When the time arrives, it will be for the House to take a decision on this matter.

**Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (FR) Mr President, on this point I should like to draw your attention and that of the House to the constraints which affect the whole budgetary debate which, as you know, requires a large majority since an absolute majority of all the Members of Parliament is required for the adoption of amendments at both the first and the second readings. Consequently, I am worried that if the vote is taken at 6 p.m. on Thursday, the fact that many Members have to make arrangements to return to their constituencies, many of which are very far from here, will make it difficult for us to hold our debate and to arrive at our decision in an atmosphere of calm.

Therefore, Mr President, I would ask you, if the Council exercises — as they all hope it will — the necessary diligence, whether the agenda could be reconsidered, even though this will clearly require a very great effort from our services. However, I feel that, for the sake of the finances of the Community, it is worth making the effort to ensure that, for example, by the end of Thursday morning we will be in a posi-

<sup>1</sup> *Approval of minutes — Membership of committees — Petitions — Documents received — Treaties forwarded by the Council — Transfer of appropriations — Referral to committee: see Minutes.*

**Cot**

tion to discuss Mrs Scrivener's report, which will be presented at the second reading, so that the vote can be taken at the beginning and not the end of the afternoon. Otherwise, Mr President, I fear that there is a grave risk that the agenda that you are presenting today will seriously hamper our deliberations.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Cot. We shall consider very carefully the matter you have raised.

**Mr Klepsch (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I believe I have the support of Mr Arndt and Mr Plumb in simply asking that we keep the vote at 3 p.m. on Thursday. Any amendments which might be tabled will not pose a major problem since at the second reading — even if small changes have been made — only amendments from the first reading can be reintroduced. I therefore foresee no major technical problem. We all realized that we need a well-attended House for such an important decision. Therefore, we should not change the scheduled time of 3 p.m. This is what we are jointly requesting.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Mr President, doesn't this show the folly of trying to rush both the first and second readings through in one week? We have also got to consider the right of Members who may be dissatisfied with the Council's decisions, to table amendments. What, under this timetable, would be the proposed deadline for the tabling of amendments for the second reading?

**President.** — That is the whole problem. Mr Klepsch is in fact insisting that we should be sure to take the vote at 3 p.m., which, indeed, would be desirable. Of course, if there are amendments it will be very difficult to do so.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I think you should take very seriously what Mr Klepsch has said. Mr Klepsch was not referring to something desirable; he pointed to an actual state of affairs. We should not allow it to happen that — with a vague reference to technical difficulties — Parliament is unable to adopt properly tabled amendments because it is six o'clock and we do not have 218 Members present. If this happens, Mr President, the vote will be held over until November. I want to point this out quite clearly. We are in a position to vote again on the amendments which are already available — the deadline has expired — on Thursday, during the second reading. There are only a very small number of them and the only thing that can be changed in this text is the amount which can be communicated orally. There is no obstacle whatsoever to voting on Thursday at 3 p.m. I want to insist on this, Mr President.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — We cannot take a firm decision until we know the outcome of the Council's discussions. As soon as we know them I shall, as I promised, resubmit the matter to the House, which will then decide. Of course, it is desirable that we should vote at 3 p.m.

**Mr Pitt (S).** — Mr President, I cannot agree with your interpretation of Mr von der Vring's comments. He is making a very valid point. He is saying that we should not allow our timetable to be dictated by the Council. This Parliament is supposed to be one half of the budgetary authority. We cannot allow our timetable to be dictated externally, and especially crammed in such a way. Either we vote at 3 o'clock on Thursday, or we do not vote until November. It is as simple and as clear as that, Mr President.

**President.** — Mr Pitt, you have misinterpreted what I said. I did not say that our decision should be dictated by the Council; that is not the question. It is for the House to take a definitive decision on the way it conducts its business. Nonetheless, the Communications which we will receive from the Council and the amendments which may be tabled are part and parcel of our decision. This is a matter for the Members of this House.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, we shall probably have a conciliation meeting with the Council. At this meeting you must inform the Council that either the decisions will have to be ready in time for a vote on Thursday at 3 p.m. or else we shall not be able to vote this week at all, but only in two weeks' time. The important point is that it is not a matter of what the Council says to us but what we say to the Council and how we use the time provided for in the Treaties. We could even wait forty-five days.

**President.** — Mr Arndt, the House will take the final decision bearing in mind all of these elements.

**Mr Sutra (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, it is clear from what we have just heard that if we hold the vote at 6 p.m. Thursday we shall be at the mercy of a request for a quorum which would inevitably mean holding it over until November.

I propose that you put it to the vote. We should decide at once that the vote will be held at 3 p.m. We will then inform the Council of our decision.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — No, Mr Sutra, not now. I shall put the matter to the House which will then decide. We cannot take a decision now. Of course we shall retain the 3 p.m. deadline for the moment and it is infinitely

**President**

desirable that the vote should be taken at 3 p.m. That is what I wish too. I am quite prepared, as Mr Arndt suggested, to so inform the Council.

*(After reading the amendments to Wednesday's and Thursday's<sup>1</sup> agendas, Parliament adopted the agenda as amended)<sup>2</sup>*

**3. Votes**

**Report (Doc. 2-604/84) by Mrs Braun-Moser, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 348 final — Doc. 1-356/84) for a third directive on summer time arrangement.<sup>3</sup>**

**Mr Megahy (S).** — On a point of order, Mr President. Will there be any more opportunity for my colleagues to make explanations of vote pointing out the crucial effect that this proposal will have on people living in the United Kingdom? I am certain that they would welcome the opportunity to press home the point that this will have very damaging effects on people living in the United Kingdom, particularly elderly people. Will they get the opportunity to do so, as this vote was deferred from last time?

**President.** — Yes, Mr Megahy, there will be an opportunity to give explanations of vote under the normal conditions, i.e. with a time-limit.

**Mr Newton Dunn (ED).** — Mr President, I am sorry to take you back to the question raised by Mr Megahy about whether explanations of vote can now be taken. You were not in the Chair at the end of the last part-session when the request was made to establish whether a quorum was present. Vice-President Seefeld was in the Chair. We did have explanations of vote. They were completed. The President said the list was completed and we then moved to the vote. No further names were on that list for explanations of vote, and, as you know, they cannot be added subsequently. Therefore, I ask you to change your ruling. There cannot be explanations of vote now since the explanations of vote were completed.

**Mr Seefeld (S).** — *(DE)* Mr Newton Dunn is quite right. I was, at that time, in the Chair. We had concluded the debate, the proposal for a directive had been adopted, the explanations of vote had been presented and there were no further requests to speak. I was on the point of putting the motion for a resolution

to the vote when the request to establish a quorum was made. Therefore the only thing that remains to be done is to vote on the motion for a resolution in Mrs Braun-Moser's report.

**President.** — Mr Seefeld, far be it from me to contradict you. I was not aware that you had closed the list of speakers and I must of course do as you suggest.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — On a point of order Mr President, I have been concerned, as a new Member of this Parliament, about the frequency with which I am unable to attend plenary sittings of Parliament because of meetings of committees of this House taking place simultaneously with the plenary sittings. I understand quite clearly that it is your responsibility as a matter of urgency to give a ruling and to give permission for those committee meetings to take place. I have not always been convinced of the necessity for such urgency. Can I ask your guidance as to whether it is not possible, when you have given permission for committee meetings to take place, that you report to us at the beginning of the plenary sitting, explaining the circumstances in which you have given such permission? During the last part-session we found ourselves in the absurd situation of being called to a meeting of the Committee on Budgetary Control where part of the business of that committee was to go wandering off through the streets of Strasbourg to start looking, with an architect, at the site of a proposed Parliament club which many Members of this House were not committed to. We are not satisfied that that constitutes urgency and would therefore ask that when you give permission for a committee to meet, you explain to the House your reasons for giving this permission so that such meetings become an exception rather than the rule; that they become something very special and we can in fact do what we are supposed to be doing, which is attending to the business of this House rather than being elsewhere during plenary sittings.

**President.** — Mr Tomlinson, I share your point of view. Committee chairmen have frequently been reminded that they should not in principle call committee meetings during plenary sittings.

I should like, however, to make an exception for the Committee on Budgets. Particularly when financial and budgetary matters are on the agenda, it cannot avoid carrying out its business during the session.

Apart from this exception committee chairmen are advised not to call meetings during part-sessions, and I shall certainly remind the next meeting of committee chairmen of this directive.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Mr President, I am glad Mr Tomlinson has raised a point which was raised several times

<sup>1</sup> See Minutes.

<sup>2</sup> *Deadline for tabling amendments — Speaking time — Topical and urgent debate (announcement): see Minutes.*

<sup>3</sup> See Debates of 11 October 1984.

## Castle

in the last Parliament. However, I do not think you quite replied to his point. His point, as I understand it, is not one of requesting people not to hold meetings: you have the power to forbid them, to refuse the permission. What we are asking is that you exercise that power to refuse permission unless it is a very exceptional case, and that when you do give permission, to have an item on the agenda in which you explain at the beginning of the part-session which meetings you have authorized, and why.

**President.** — Mrs Castle, contrary to what you may believe, I cannot give orders to committees. As committees enjoy a certain degree of autonomy in the organization of their work, all I can do is make recommendations.

**Lady Elles (ED).** — Mr President, I think it was the first decision of the Bureau of this Parliament, which is to some extent responsible to Parliament for the running and administration of this House, that no committee meetings should take place during plenary sittings except in very exceptional circumstances and that it would be up to the President of Parliament to give the authorization. Mr Tomlinson has raised something from which all of us in this House have suffered for some time — that when committee meetings are held during plenary sittings, Members cannot attend the plenary sitting. It is essential that Members come to this Parliament to attend the plenary sittings. I would remind you, Mr President, of the decision of the Bureau of this Parliament, of which I am a Member, and I strongly support this particular recommendation.

**President.** — Forgive me, Lady Elles, but the Rules of Procedure do not contain any provision which would enable the Bureau to forbid committees to meet. I repeat that all I can do is make recommendations. Nonetheless, I am quite prepared to resubmit the matter to the Bureau — of which, happily, you are a member — where we can discuss it. For the present I shall abide by the Rules.

None the less, I fully share Mr Tomlinson's view, namely that it is highly desirable that apart from exceptional cases — and I referred in particular to the Committee on Budgets — there should be no committee meetings during this session.

I feel that we should all agree on this point, and I can only repeat the recommendations made to the committee chairmen.

### 4. Supplementary budget No 1/84

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-798/84) by Mrs Scrivener, on behalf of the Committee

on Budgets on the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1/84 (Doc. 2-701/84) of the European Communities for the 1984 financial year, drawn up by the Council on 2 October 1984.

**Mrs Scrivener (L), rapporteur.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, during the first October part-session, Parliament expressed its satisfaction at the fact that a draft budget had at last been prepared, but at the same time entered the most serious reservations concerning its content. In particular, we drew attention to the various artifices employed by the Council on the revenue side; we also indicated that the cuts made in operating appropriations were unrealistic and contrary to the decisions taken by the budgetary authority in December 1983. Finally, particularly in our resolution on financing of the 1984 and 1985 deficits, we expressed our disapproval of the solution adopted by the Council for covering expenditure above 1% of VAT.

The Committee on Budgets has made a detailed examination of the draft budget submitted by the Council. In its deliberations, it has been concerned on the one hand to ensure that the revenue side reflects the true situation and on the other hand to safeguard Community policies. On the subject of revenues, the Committee on Budgets voted for a series of amendments which to a large extent revert to the estimates contained in the Commission's preliminary draft budget. The details are as follows. The Council had not accepted the Commission's forecasts for agricultural levies and sugar levies. Nevertheless, it now seems in the light of the results recorded for the months already elapsed that these revenues will undoubtedly be less than the estimates featuring in the initial budget for 1984. In view of the additional consideration that the Council had not given any justification for its own revenue estimates, we decided to reinstate the Commission's forecasts, which we found consistent with the true situation. In doing this, we reduced the agricultural levies and the sugar levy by about 526m ECU. We also examined the forecasts supplied by the Commission and the Council for customs duties. In its preliminary draft budget, the Commission had considered it necessary to reduce the figure for revenues from this source by 37m ECU, a reduction which the Council for its part considered unnecessary. On examination, it was found that neither the figures supplied by the Commission in its preliminary draft budget nor the figures shown by the Council in its draft budget tallied with a reasonable estimate of customs duties.

Taking the revenues collected to date and annualizing them, one finds that the figure for customs duty revenues should be between 100m ECU and 425m ECU higher than that shown in the original budget. The explanations given by the Commission's representatives to our Committee on Budgets confirm this forecast, which should be very close to the final outcome.

### Scrivener

Acting on the Commission's proposal, the Council had incorporated the surplus for the current year in the draft supplementary and amending budget for 1984. In doing so, it had found a circuitous way of effecting a *de facto* reduction in the appropriations for structural policy expenditure. Parliament's Committee on Budgets, while expressing reservations about the approach adopted, has halved the estimate of the surplus foreseeable for the 1984 financial year. The level at which this reduction in revenues has been pitched is such that it will be fully offset by the increase in customs duties. In this way, as will be noted, the foreseeable surplus for the year is consistent with the historical amounts recorded for the previous years.

The overall effect of these various operations is to reduce revenues for the year by 473m ECU. This amount should be offset by the increase in advance payments to be made by Member States towards the budget of the Communities, this being the only way to balance the accounts in the very special situation now prevailing, in view of the exhaustion of own resources.

It will be remembered that, at the time when the 1984 budget was being drafted, the Council challenged Parliament's right to amend revenue. The principle on which this attitude is based runs counter to the traditional rules of budgetary law in our democratic countries, according to which the volume of fiscal charges on the economy is a matter to be decided by elected parliamentary representatives.

In this instance, in which the Council has sought to reduce expenditure by manipulating the rules on the keeping of accounting records of revenues, it is absolutely clear that Parliament must concern itself with this essential aspect of the budget.

Finally, it will be noted that the amendments voted on the revenue side have the effect of maintaining the balance of the budget for 1985, which will thus not have to bear the burden of the 1984 deficit, which it would of course inevitably have to do if Parliament settled for the revenue figures advanced by the Council. What we are talking about here, therefore, is truth in the budgets for these two financial years.

On the expenditure side, the Committee on Budgets adopted a dual approach. First, having carried out an examination of the appropriations for the agricultural guarantee section proposed by the Commission and the Council, we considered it inappropriate to make any changes to these appropriations under the present circumstances, even though implementation of a special destocking programme can be regarded as a sensible measure which will secure the future. On the other hand, the Committee on Budgets adopted the proposed modifications presented by the Committee on Agriculture aimed at bolstering the appropriations for the wine market and the beef and veal market by reducing those for cereals, and at setting up a 'Christmas butter' operation.

Secondly, the Committee on Budgets adopted three amendments concerned with the reserve chapters, since failure to use these operational lines before the end of the year would have caused these appropriations to lapse and be transferred to the balance for the financial year. The Committee on Budgets accordingly proposes that these appropriations be transferred to the lines provided in the commentaries to the budget, thereby ensuring that they do not lapse. This operation is the corollary of the modifications made to the balance for the current financial year on the revenue side. These various amendments and modifications proposed to you by the Committee on Budgets make for a 26.5m ECU reduction in revenues, since the revenues in respect of which Member States are entitled to reimbursement of collection expenses are lower than in the Council's draft budget.

In conclusion, we are inviting you to vote for a realistic budget. It is also in a spirit of realism and a concern to take account of the difficulties of the current situation that the Committee on Budgets has not categorically rejected the intergovernmental agreement providing the basis for the advance payments mechanism. However, let no-one be deceived by this! There can be no question of this Parliament shifting its position, even implicitly. The intergovernmental agreement is a bad solution, contrary to both the spirit and the letter of the Treaties. It calls in question the principles on which the Community is founded and in time can only weaken it. The essential requirement at this stage is a budget which enables us to cope with the immediate needs, since the credibility of the Community institutions is on the line. The deliberations of the Committee on Budgets provide a basis for attaining this objective; it now remains for the Council to discharge its responsibility by demonstrating its will to see this process through to its conclusion and ensure that the budget can be finalized during this part-session.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

*Vice-President*

**President.** — Thank you, Mrs Scrivener, for keeping well inside your time. I hope the other speakers will do the same.

**Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Mr President, I shall certainly try to emulate Mrs Scrivener's commendable example. This is helped by the fact that I have already stated several times the Commission's own views on the content and financing of the supplementary budget for 1984. I do not think, therefore, have to make any further general statements today. Nor, in the light of the previous

### Tugendhat

speeches which I have made, do I need to respond in detail to each of the points contained in the resolution which is before this House in the name of Mrs Scrivener and of the Committee on Budgets. I would however like to take up the final point she made when she expressed the hope that the House would vote through the budget during this week's part-session.

Whatever may have been the behaviour of others in other fora it certainly is very important for the maintenance and continuity of Community policies that this budget should be voted through. The Commission expresses its fullest support for the statement in paragraph 3 of the Scrivener resolution that the Community cannot postpone honouring its commitments without risking the loss of its financial credibility.

Mr President, I would also like, on the Commission's behalf, to thank the Parliament — in particular Mr Cot and Mrs Scrivener — for the efforts which they have made to put the Parliament into a position in which it can, if it wishes, take this decision. Parliament can only take rapid decisions when the preparatory work has been undertaken, and on this occasion it has, I think, been undertaken with considerable celerity.

The amendments and modifications to the Council's draft which have been proposed by the Committee on Budgets concern both the expenditure and the revenue side. On the expenditure side a transfer of amounts between specific lines in EAGGF (Guarantee) within the overall envelope retained by the Council is proposed. I would just like to indicate here that the distribution of the additional 1 833m ECU of EAGGF (Guarantee) envisaged in the Council's draft reflect in general what was proposed by the Commission in July. The developments in the various agricultural markets have somewhat changed since then, and the amendments proposed by the Committee on Budgets are indeed a more accurate reflection of our current requirements. The Commission will need, in any event, to propose, before the closure of the EAGGF accounts, transfers similar in character to those which we have proposed in previous years.

The reduction of 150m ECU for EAGGF (Guarantee) made by the Council may mean that part of the cost for the destocking measures which the Commission has recently decided in the milk sector will have to be charged to the 1985 budget. The Committee on Budgets has also proposed to transfer all appropriations for commitments and payments in Chapter 100 to the specific lending lines for which they were earmarked. The Commission has no objection to this and will use its best endeavours to execute these credits.

If, however, some payment appropriations cannot be used, despite the Commission's efforts, before the end of the year, they will be available for use in 1985 and will not form part of the 1984 end-of-year *solde*.

As regards the revenue side of the budget and the amendments which the Committee on Budgets has

proposed to the Council's draft in this respect, the Commission has consistently advocated, both in its preliminary draft and in the subsequent statement which we made both in the Council and in this Parliament, that the forecasts of revenue inscribed in the supplementary budget should correspond as closely as possible to the likely reality. We have deprecated any disposition to use false figures whose effect would simply be to exacerbate the budgetary problems of 1985.

According to the latest information available to the Commission — information which corresponds to that conveyed to both Council and Parliament in our last three-monthly report on the execution of the budget up to 31 August — the net shortfall of traditional own resources will be very much of the order of magnitude predicted in our preliminary draft budget. Customs duties are likely to be some 250 to 275m ECU higher than the original budget figure. By contrast, the agricultural and other levies are likely to be some 150m ECU lower.

As regards the forecast of the budgetary *solde* I can only repeat that the Commission sticks to the figure of 350m ECU which it has previously endorsed. We regard this figure as a reasonable estimate, bearing in mind both the experience of past years and the anticipated results of the tight budgetary management which we are undertaking in order to achieve certain limited economies which do not call into question the Commission's responsibility for executing the budget or the continuity of Community policies.

In conclusion, Mr President, let me emphasize again the importance which the Commission, like the Parliament's Committee on Budgets, attaches to the adoption this week of a supplementary budget permitting the proper discharge of all the Community's financial obligations in 1984.

**Mr Dankert (S).** — (NL) Mr President, Mrs Scrivener said she would respect her speaking time and she did; Mr Tugendhat said the same, and I rather feel that if no one exceeds the allotted speaking time in a budget debate, then that budget is not worth very much, for even with supplementary budgets we have always had great difficulty in keeping to the allotted speaking time.

Mr President, agricultural expenditure and non-compulsory expenditure have always been hotly disputed issues in past debates on both the budget and supplementary budgets. Now Commissioner Tugendhat says he can accept Parliament's amendments on agricultural expenditure; I am tempted to say that we have never met with such a reasonable reaction to a supplementary budget before. But I would remark with a touch of criticism to the Commission that it could also have informed the Parliament in a letter of amendment that these changes could have been incorporated into the supplementary budgets.

### Dankert

On the Christmas butter — on which Mr Woltjer will speak shortly — I believe that on such a politically sensitive issue the budgetary authority as such should take responsibility. I think that Parliament has always made this point and that an amendment to this effect should make that clear now.

But this budget — and I think this explains why the speaking time is being respected — hardly deals with expenditure, it deals mainly with the financing of expenditure. The most important point here is the revenue side, as is shown by the amendments which have been tabled so far. The revenue side is most important because of the financial crisis of the Community, because its own resources have been exhausted and because, as Mrs Scrivener has already indicated, of the need for a supplementary budget which has been found in an inelegant but to my mind inevitable intergovernmental agreement between the governments of the Member States. And the shameful thing about this intergovernmental agreement is that the governments of the Member States are not prepared, under that intergovernmental agreement, to cover the expenditure passed by these same Member States in the budget. Revenue must stand alongside expenditure voted by the Member States and the tricks which have now been employed to create the impression of expenditure being covered by income — and Commissioner Tugendhat referred to this — are an extremely dangerous ploy in my opinion.

The danger for 1984 of this supplementary budget, of this supplementary financing, is perhaps not too clear. That is why my group is prepared to accept this supplementary budget, albeit with a number of amendments. For 1985, however, the situation becomes much more dangerous as much larger amounts are involved and it will probably be much more difficult for national governments to agree on these amounts than was the case for 1984.

That is why it is all the more irresponsible of the Council to have left some of the expenditure for 1984 uncovered for it has thereby taken upon itself the responsibility of shifting some of the burden on to 1985. And so as we take each decision on this 1984 supplementary budget it is essential to know — and I urge Commissioner Tugendhat to supply this information — how much of the expenditure we are voting on just now can actually be financed by the Commission in 1984. This involves not just the income which is lacking, especially agricultural levies which he mentioned, but it also involves how much the Commission expects the Member States to fulfil the commitments they have undertaken. So far that one thousand million ECUs is not there.

I think it is important in this budget debate to know how much the Commission must borrow from the Member States in 1984 in order to fulfil commitments. In other words — to use Commissioner Andriessen's expression — how much the Commission must go into

the red this year with the Member States in order to guarantee that the farmers are paid; and the question then is, if the Commission is in the red, can all the Member States pay their farmers? I think that is the crucial question of this supplementary budget and a clear answer has yet to be given. The one Commissioner talks about being 'in the red', the other says nothing and Parliament must at least know what the situation is before we decide on this budget in the second reading. For as I have already said, what remains undone now will have its effects in 1985.

On the general amendments, Mr President, the Socialist Group endorses the amendments tabled by the Committee on Budgets and introduced just now by Mrs Scrivener. We consider that the most reasonable way of reaching agreement with the Council this week in two readings. That means that basically we want the approximately 200 million ECU back from the Council which the Council cut, wrongly in our opinion, from the 1984 expenditure. About 200 million, which means that we are still leaving the Council some 250 million which will in fact become available. I think that is a reasonable compromise. To sum up in general terms, we support the amendments tabled by the Committee on Budgets and hope that agreement will be reached in the debate on Thursday.

**Mr Christodoulou (PPE).** — (GR) Mr President, the Group of the European People's Party will support in principle the draft supplementary budget for 1984, because its adoption will bring relief not only to the farming population, but more generally to commerce and working people in the Community, following a long period of uncertainty about how the 1984 budget deficit was to be covered.

This uncertainty would surely have been avoided if the Council had shown less inertia and indecision in approving the Commission's proposal to increase own resources, a proposal submitted as long ago as 1982 when there were already clear warning signals of the Community's present financial problems.

However, in accepting the draft supplementary budget we would like to make the following comments:

First, the draft supplementary budget as amended by the Council on 3 October 1984, is as it were the product of a peculiar alchemy, because both the planned revenues and the planned expenditure have undergone considerable changes. This situation forces the Commission to effect savings in inappropriate directions, in particular to restrict the rate of payments from the structural funds and from the sums set aside for development of new policies; in other words to cut down on just those appropriations that constitute the essence of the Community and give it some prospect of development.

Secondly, the draft supplementary budget overestimates the revenues forthcoming from agricultural con-

**Christodoulou**

tributions, ignoring the practical realities, and above all requires the Commission to effect savings of the order of 500 million ECU instead of the 350 million ECU proposed by the Commission itself. Part of these 500 million ECU is to come from appropriations that will be cancelled at the end of 1984 unless they are tied up in the meantime by the Commission, and the remainder is to result from strict management by the Commission, which reduced the rate of release of both commitment and payment appropriations some months ago. In reality, however, these are not true savings but merely a carry-over of commitment and payment appropriations from 1984 to 1985.

Thirdly, because of the overestimation of the revenues for 1984 and the transfer of appropriations from 1984 to 1985, the draft budget is not in fact balanced, and it is inevitable that the budget for 1985 will bear the burden of the deficits and overestimates of the 1984 budget.

Mr President, considering that in 1985 there will be a budget deficit of the order of 3 billion ECU, the scenario we lived through in 1984 is in danger of being repeated, though with even more dramatic consequences, unless Council decides upon an increase in own resources from 1 October 1985. Since the experience of borrowing from the Member States is unlikely to be repeated in 1985, we call upon Council to come to a decision as soon as possible to increase own resources as from that date, because the European Parliament is not disposed to allow a radical reduction in expenditure from the structural funds, nor will it let the development of new policies go to the wall.

Furthermore, the European Parliament will not accept one-sided actions such as the proposed resolution on financial discipline worked out by Council. That proposal completely disregards Parliament's role in the budgetary procedure, especially where non-compulsory expenditure is concerned, and the Commission's duty to take initiatives as well, and amounts to a quantitative restriction of expenditure by the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF and a reduction in the rate of increase of non-compulsory expenditure, whereas the guidelines of the Brussels European Council clearly referred to a qualitative orientation.

Finally Mr President, I would like to join previous colleagues in stressing that the compromise amendments by the Committee on Budgets reflect the present situation better where planned revenues and expenditure up to the end of 1984 are concerned, and we shall support them because we consider that their adoption will result in a considerable reduction of the expenditure carried over to the 1985 budget. This will facilitate its finalization by the competent budgetary authority. As I have already said, we shall therefore support these amendments and we hope that the Budget Council too will adopt them at a second reading, so that the matter can be put right.

**Lord Douro (ED).** — Mr President, my group supports the need to complete consideration of the supplementary budget this week. The Commission has stated on a number of occasions that this budget must be in place by about this date, and I hope nothing will happen later this week to prevent that.

My group also supports the need to provoke a second reading of the supplementary budget. The Council has indulged in a number of manoeuvres on this supplementary budget that we believe they should be called to account for in a conciliation meeting tomorrow between representatives of Parliament and the budget Council. The Council, amazingly, has chosen to ignore the Commission estimates for reduced revenue in the current financial year. I would be interested to know how the Council can justify ignoring the advice of the Executive and I will look forward to hearing their reasoning tomorrow. In the meantime my group will support the amendments to reduce the revenue estimates.

The Council is also seeking to reduce non-compulsory expenditure in 1984 by an amount approximately equivalent to the amount proposed in all the amendments adopted by Parliament last December for increasing non-compulsory expenditure. The Council is seeking therefore to nullify all the work which Parliament did on the second reading of the 1984 budget. That, also, is something which the Council should be made to justify.

Thirdly, the Council is, as far as I can see, ignoring the financial regulations. They make it quite clear that any savings or overspend in any one budget should be incorporated in a supplementary budget for the succeeding year. That is the reason why this supplementary budget includes 307 million ECU which was not spent at the end of last year. Indeed, in the remarks column the Council justified the inclusion of that 307 million quite clearly by referring to the relevant financial regulation. However, amazingly, they then go on on the very next line to incorporate into this supplementary budget estimates of savings for this year. I cannot understand how those two lines are compatible one with another.

So, for these reasons, my group hopes that the amendments tabled by the Committee on Budgets will be adopted, that the Council will meet tomorrow morning to consider the amendments and that tomorrow afternoon there will be a conciliation meeting at which the Council will seek to justify in terms of creative accounting, what they have done, which is to balance the books for the rest of this financial year in a way that offends against all normal doctrines of good financial management.

**Mr Louwes (L).** — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of my group I should like to make a few comments on the supplementary budget and the difficult passage it

**Louwes**

has had. My group has also suffered, especially from the strange and irresponsible behaviour of the Council which has resulted in the Community losing a lot of its credibility. A sad state of affairs, Mr President.

Although I am very critical of the Council as a whole, I would, however, make one specific exception, that of the Irish Presidency, which has at least managed to submit two draft budgets so that we can, in theory at least, continue to finance the Community in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Treaty.

My group's anger is directed only at the few Member States which like spoiled children have tried to have their own way by ignoring completely the Community interests. Once more, Mr President, a sorry state of affairs.

My group is of the opinion that the Committee on Budgets, on a proposal from its rapporteur Mrs Scrivener, has discharged its obligations. It has reinstated the Commission's estimates and rectified the incredible bungling of the Council. While on the subject I should just like to comment that Vice-President Tugendhat has just said that the Commission has consistently refused to use false figures. I think these words from the Vice-President's mouth are a strong condemnation of those who might have tried to do otherwise.

My group will follow the Committee on Budgets with regard to the legal basis for the extra contributions from the Member States and the amendments before us. We fervently hope that this supplementary budget will be adopted this week. It will not be our group's fault, Mr President, if we fail to do so.

**Mr Pasty (RDE).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, once again we find ourselves discussing the draft supplementary budget for 1984. On this occasion, however, what we have to do is not so much hold a debate as get a job done. Just about everything that could be said has been said, and I shall accordingly confine myself to a few comments.

Our colleague Piet Dankert has just made the rather humorous remark, that if most of the speakers this morning, including the rapporteur, have not used their full speaking time it is because Parliament no longer entertains the slightest illusion about the draft budget presented to it.

In outlining our main criticisms, I should begin by deploring the deception of the Fontainebleau agreement and its consequences, the failures of successive Councils on agricultural policy and the budget, and the further failures of the General Affairs Council, all of which led our Councils of Ministers to cobble together a last-minute compromise to save face so that they could propose a supplementary budget to the Community, thereby meeting their commitments under the Treaties.

All things considered, the only merit of this draft supplementary budget is the fact that it has been produced at all. However, the truth is that there is profound disagreement about this budget, both on the manner in which it has been drafted and on its content.

I can begin by referring to the actual procedure adopted in the preparation of this draft supplementary budget, which is hemmed in by the complexities and interdependence of the enormous financial problems which remain outstanding. The solution proposed does not in fact constitute a response to the real substantive problem that we have been discussing for several weeks but a partial, thoroughly incomplete response which is regrettably no more than the superficial outcome of horse-trading in the Council.

No indeed, we can but repeat with all due emphasis that all this is thoroughly unsatisfactory. This draft budget is contrary to Community procedure, since it is founded on the basis of an intergovernmental agreement rather than a Community procedure; in this, it in fact conflicts with both the letter and the spirit of the Treaties under which the Community was established.

At this stage, however, we have to recognize that this debate has been overtaken by events, since we are confronted with facts. As I was saying, this draft budget has now been produced, and we are faced with the practical problem of ensuring that the Community functions normally between now and the end of the year; our Assembly is faced with a difficult task in proceeding with the reading of this budget, since we are caught between our requirements for smooth running of the Community and the situation with which the Council has presented us, in which we find that the very spirit in which our Community was created is being flouted.

Having been placed in this dilemma, we should, in my view, set ourselves three priorities. First, we should eliminate the effects of the Council's deliberate manipulation of the figures so that they reflect the true situation. All the earlier speakers have made this point.

Our second course of action should be to restore the transparency of budgetary requirements, presenting the true picture of the necessary expenditure which the Council has deliberately ignored with its 500 m ECU cuts in appropriations, mainly for structural policies, which, if we do not take a firm stand, can only accentuate the imbalances in the financing of the Community. We are also referring here to the agricultural destocking programmes. The Council has been unwilling to allocate the appropriations requested by the Commission, but we all know that this problem needs to be settled urgently and that expenditure not committed for 1984 will necessarily have to be committed for the 1985 financial year.

Our third priority must be to make both the volume and the structure of this budget true to the factual

**Pasty**

situation, since otherwise we would be adopting the same approach as the Council, endorsing an artificial budget which would really be an unbalanced budget providing no more than thoroughly makeshift solutions to the present difficulties and laying up substantial additional problems for 1985, when we know in advance that the draft budget for 1985, which we shall be examining during the November part-session, is going to have to resolve some extremely difficult problems.

We also feel that, in order to achieve our aim, it is necessary to adopt the course proposed by our rapporteur for the Committee on Budgets, Mrs Scrivener, and the Group of the European Democratic Alliance will be voting for the amendments, which, in our view, restore the true situation on the revenue side and accordingly call for the necessary increased advance payments from Member States.

It is our hope, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that the majority of the House will adopt the same line; judging from what has been said by earlier speakers, there would appear to be a very large measure of agreement on this point.

The Council must be confronted by Parliament with its political responsibilities, to which end we must leave it in no doubt that we cannot condone its simultaneous violation of Community orthodoxy and budgetary orthodoxy. In fact, in this debate, as in the earlier debates held during previous part-sessions, the very future of the Community is at stake.

**Mr West (S).** — On a point of order Mr President. It is established practice in this Chamber to welcome important visitors. There have been no more important visitors in this Chamber than the four ladies who have just taken their seats in the gallery. They represent the thousands of women who are supporting the miners on strike in Great Britain, and include Betty Heathfield, the wife of the General Secretary of the National Union of Mineworkers. I would request, Mr President, that you welcome these ladies to this Assembly on behalf of Parliament.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — Mr West, in fact it is only the President himself who can do this sort of thing, but I am quite sure that the House will understand your desire to see that the women's support group from the United Kingdom in the current dispute in the mining industry are welcomed here because, whatever our views about the strike on either side, I think we have to pay tribute to the tremendous work that they have done. As I say, it is the President himself who must extend the welcome. But you have had your say and I am sure that we can now move on to the next item of business.

**Mr Kilby (ED).** — Might I suggest, Mr President, that if you welcome the ladies who represent the striking miners of Britain, you also welcome the wives of those miners who are, in fact, working in Britain, some of whom are also here today.

*(Applause from the European Democratic benches)*

**President.** — I take note of what you have said, Mr Kilby. I had not realized that anyone else was here today.

**Mr Brøndlund Nielsen (L).** — *(DA)* On a point of order, Mr President, I should like to propose that in future when a welcome is pronounced by the President, it should be considered in advance and be discussed in the Bureau, before it is given the go-ahead. Mr President, I have every respect for your handling of the sitting but, when a Member can get up every so often and say on a point of order that such and such a delegation is present in the strangers' gallery and ask the President to bid them welcome, things are in a mess. Then a new element is introduced which can lead to looseness in the conduct of business, if I might put it that way. I suggest therefore that we decide in advance how these matters are to be handled. Don't forget that you are welcoming people on behalf of Parliament as a whole.

**President.** — Mr Nielsen, I did point out that only the President could officially welcome visitors. I made it clear that that was the normal procedure. If you like, I will refer the matter to the Bureau. However, if a Member gets up to speak on a point of order, who is to know what that Member is actually going to say?

**Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC).** — *(DE)* First of all I should like on behalf of the Rainbow Group to welcome the wives of the striking miners and express our solidarity with them.

*(Applause)*

I rise to speak on the supplementary budget to which we have tabled an amendment and wish to illustrate by the example of the skimmed milk powder who are the beneficiaries of this EEC agricultural policy and who are the losers. It is made out to be a support for farming, but in reality it supports the interests of industrial profits and destroys farming. What has happened? The supplementary budget contains 1 700 million DM for the production and storage of additional skimmed milk powder and this at a time when because of milk quotas the farmers are delivering less milk, a drop of 3% in general, and 8% in the Federal Republic of Germany alone.

How can milk which is not delivered to dairies be turned into milk powder? It happens like this: up to

### Graefe zu Baringdorf

now skimmed milk was returned in liquid form to the pig farmers. They poured the skimmed milk into their liquid feed and used this CAP subsidised milk as a cheap protein for their pigfeed. This skimmed milk, which was delivered in liquid form, is now no longer returned, as it is in short supply, but is put through the spraying towers so that these are used, as otherwise the dairies would be faced with too high fixed costs. So this skimmed milk is turned into powder. It is mixed with copper, a denaturant, which means that although it can still be fed to pigs it is not suitable as a high protein for calves and humans. The farms that used to receive liquid milk now receive this powder which they add to their liquid feed. Again water is added which has just been extracted from milk — it consists of 85% water. That is fed to the pigs and extra money is now earmarked for that purpose. It is a process which serves only to finance the agricultural industry.

But there is another point to which I wish to draw particular attention, and I think that when the miners' wives hear this then tears will come to their eyes: a further 570 million DM are earmarked for subsidising milk replacers. And the special thing about this is as follows: because of the milk quotas the farmers are only paid 17 pfennigs today for their 'surplus' milk, i.e. the milk they produce over and above the fixed quotas. Now it would be in the farmers' interests to feed this milk to the calves who used to get calves' full milk. In the meantime, however, the agricultural industry has produced a so-called milk replacer with 10% fat which is cheaper than the full milk and therefore fed to the calves. Milk was delivered against that and so has increased the stocks. And now, when surplus milk has become cheap it is more advantageous to the farmers to use the surplus milk. But so that the agricultural industry can continue to sell its milk replacers, 570 million DM are now being spent on subsidies to enable it to compete with the surplus milk. This Common agricultural policy benefits agricultural industry but it is destroying farming. With the end of farming comes the end to the countryside and we are thereby destroying the basis for healthy food supplies and a healthy environment. None of us can afford to forget that, not even those of us who are only consumers and are not directly involved in agriculture.

**Mr Brøndlund Nielsen (L).** — (DA) Mr President, forgive me for speaking again on a point of order. I should like it to be stressed in the Minutes that Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf spoke *on behalf of the Rainbow Group* in extending his full support and sympathy to the British miners in their strike. When I ask that, it is because the Danish members of that group take every opportunity to state that they are non-political.

**President.** — I think that is something you should sort out with the other members of the Rainbow Group.

**Mr Møller (ED).** — (DA) Mr President, the chairman of the Rainbow Group made some remarks, which I shall not comment upon, concerning the visitors who want to attend the debate and who, as I understand it, support the British miners or may even be married to striking British miners. But the chairman of the Rainbow Group said that he was speaking on behalf of the group. I would therefore ask him whether the Danish members of his group also support him for, as Mr Nielsen said, they told their voters at the elections that they were politically neutral, that they stood outside any general political groupings. If they support Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf, they are reneging on their election platform.

**President.** — Mr Møller, we are now getting involved in national political positions. I suggest you sort this out outside the Chamber. Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf, if you wish to make a personal statement you can make it at the end of the debate, under Rule 67.

**Mrs Hoff (S).** — (DE) Mr President, may I begin a preliminary comment that in December 1983 the Socialist Group rejected the 1984 budget because it felt that the appropriations in the EAGGF Guarantee Fund were not properly estimated. Our reservations then have since been confirmed, which admittedly does not help us much at the moment, but this should nonetheless serve as a lesson for future budget debates — I am thinking of the preparation of the 1985 budget. In its budget policy the EEC is moving from one perilous situation to another like a badly laden ship in danger of capsizing. The extraordinary imbalance is due to the costs for the Common Agricultural Policy, and the 1984 supplementary budget is another example of that.

An imbalance has been created because the Community's own resources have been completely used up and because the agricultural policy takes the lion's share of the budget. This is the cause of many unsolved problems in the Community. The agricultural demands on the budget over the years mean there is never enough money available to follow through a well balanced policy. So we cannot have an effective policy on employment, a sensible social and regional policy, nor a proper development policy.

That means specifically, in terms of amounts in the 1984 supplementary budget, that the Commission wants an additional 2000 million ECUs for agricultural expenditure, which is to be financed partly from savings in structural policy in the 1984 budget in the region of some 500 million ECUs. That is not a solid and lasting solution. We must therefore support the amendments to reduce these planned budget 'surpluses', if we may call them that, and to reduce greater manipulations, which Mrs Scrivener earlier described as artificial interventions.

As regards the budget surplus for 1983 as seems to

**Hoff**

emerge from the revenue side of the draft, I have doubts as to whether they actually exist. The largest item on the income side is the some 2000 million to be derived from so-called advances from the Member States. These special payments are needed because neither the Council nor the Commission managed to assure the necessary increase in own resources in time. This type of financing is short-sighted and illustrates the whole problem of the Member States' policy on Europe. Furthermore, it contradicts the spirit and letter of the Treaties. Earlier speakers have already dwelt on this.

The Committee on Budgets has insisted that the normal procedures with a first and second reading should also be used for the 1984 supplementary budget. We hope that this way overhasty and wrong estimates can be avoided. In any event we must prevent the 1985 budget containing costs which occur in this year but are carried over into 1985 because of insufficient funds. That contradicts the provisions of Article 199.

In the present state of affairs we cannot yet talk of budgetary transparency and budgetary clarity for the 1984 supplementary budget. I hope that we shall throw some light on this issue in our present debate and be in a position to adopt the supplementary budget this week.

**Mr Christensen (ARC).** — *(DA)* On a point of order, Mr President. It has been brought to my notice that the chairman of the Rainbow Group, Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf, welcomed some British miners' wives on the group's behalf. I should like to state that Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf has no authority to speak on this matter on behalf of the Rainbow Group.

**President.** — I take note of that. Obviously you will have to sort it out for yourself.

**Mr Debatisse (PPE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to add a few comments to those made by my colleague, Mr Christodoulou, on behalf of the European People's Party.

First of all, we hope that the vote on the supplementary budget will incorporate the proposals made by the Committee on Budgets, including those from the Committee on Agriculture, so that the undertakings given to the farming world by the governments of Europe will at last be honoured, since this is the only way that they and the Council can retain their credibility. I am well aware that there has been much talk recently of refunds to certain States. Parliament has decided to give its assent, but the undertakings given to the farming world are too often forgotten, even in the debates held in this House. For instance, when we are told of the Commission's objective of tight management of the 1984 budget, we are bound to agree, but at the same time pointing out that it is unaccepta-

ble for the cost to be borne by our farmers, whose incomes are under serious threat. The word is that farm income has fallen by 20% in the Federal Republic of Germany, by 5% in France, and that the story is similar in various other countries. I believe that such a situation must be taken into account in our proposals and in our debates in this House. For instance, when the cost of the agricultural policy is under discussion, some Honourable Members would perhaps do well to remember that the United States, which is said to have the most efficient and competitive farming industry, spends more on supporting its agriculture than Europe spends on its agricultural policy.

It is necessary to put these figures into perspective so that they can be seen in their proper proportions. I should think that France's budget deficit alone is more than the total amount of Community expenditure on agriculture. I should like to stress this point and emphasize the need for us to sort out our priorities and honour undertakings given, especially in view of the impression that has emerged during our debates that the proposals for the supplementary budget or for the 1985 budget do not evince any real political will to pursue an ambitious agricultural policy such as would enable Europe to perform its role and discharge its responsibilities in the world. Here again, one need only cast an eye towards the United States to appreciate the difference in attitudes. We too should be showing the same kind of concern if we really mean to build Europe.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, having completed these brief comments, I should like to state my approval of the proposals that have been made to increase the reimbursable advance payments to be made by Member States so that the deficit on the 1985 budget will not be so large and, once again, so as to restore truth to the figures, as explained by various earlier speakers.

These were the very brief additional comments that I wished to make, and I cannot overemphasize the importance to the farming community of this part-session's vote on a budget which is not entirely consistent with farmers' aspirations and needs.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS

*Vice-President*

**Mr Møller (ED).** — *(DA)* Mr President, it is of course with a certain uneasiness that we vote on a budget which lacks consistency. If revenue and expenditure do not balance, it should not really be said that the work on the budget is finished. But now the Council has taken some decisions which mean that we simply cannot get round this lack of balance. There

**Møller**

has been so much discussion in Parliament these past two or three years on budget problems that hardly any of us feel inclined to debate them any more. In spite of this deficiency in the budget, therefore, I warmly welcome the fact that the Committee on Budgets has reached agreement on the Scrivener report, that Parliament can now at least agree on a budget, and I hope that consistency will be brought into the budget in the course of the negotiations with the Council of Ministers in the days ahead. It is the duty of the Council of Ministers now to endeavour to steer a course more in the direction Parliament wants and, instead of dictating, listen to the other arm of the budgetary authority, namely Parliament. I will therefore vote in favour of the Scrivener report and the supplementary budget, because I think that it is nevertheless progress if we can move forward, even to the point of being able to discuss other things with the same seriousness that we have always brought to the debate on budgetary problems.

**Mrs S. Martin (L).** — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be very brief. In fact, I do not think that there is any call for us to spend very much time on this supplementary budget for 1984. We discussed it at length during our last part-session, during which there was extensive criticism of its lack of realism.

How can we knowingly fail to cover expenditure stemming from the Council's previous decisions and commitments and also from Community legislation which we have refused to change?

At the same time, how can we contemplate penalizing the farming industry, which stands in urgent need not only of a supplementary budget but of one which is coherent?

The Council must clearly understand that it is absolutely essential for this budget to be voted this week and that we for our part are determined to ensure that it can be voted. But it must also understand that we are equally determined to ensure that the Council also takes account of the amendments proposed by the Committee on Budgets, incorporating the main recommendations from the Committee on Agriculture. I for my part would add two further amendments: one for fruit and vegetables, an extremely sensitive sector, and the other for 150 m ECU to finance destocking measures.

At the present time, especially in the beef and veal sector, the Community has stocks which will one day have to be reduced, and that under satisfactory conditions. The Commission must therefore have the resources necessary for this purpose at its disposal.

I am hopeful that the Council will be able to agree with us on this.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Mr President, things have moved much more rapidly than I had expected, and

you have caught me somewhat unawares. I just want to confine a few brief remarks to the supplementary and amending budget which, to quote Mr Christodoulou, 'will bring relief to farmers in the Community'. We were recently told that it is imperative for the farmers of the Community. This may be so, but the supplementary and amending budget brings precious little relief to anyone else, and great anger and annoyance to many of our Community citizens. The draft supplementary and amending budget is, I believe, bad in principle, and even worse in practice, and coming from a Council with pretensions concerning budget discipline, almost borders on the absurd.

The supplementary and amending budget is to produce an additional 1 833m ECU for agricultural spending on the expenditure side, making use of fictional figures on the revenue side. The real price that we are being invited to pay is to set back further the interests of many of our European citizens concerning a decent employment policy in Europe, a decent social policy in Europe, a decent regional policy in Europe, and with Europe showing its care and compassion for the rest of the world by a decent development programme.

Mr President, as everybody seems to be using less than their time, let me just link these remarks by returning to budget discipline, about which the Council are loquacious in principle — if not very clear as to what they mean — and, simultaneously, as bad as it is imaginable to be in practice. What kind of budget discipline is it that produces a supplementary and amending budget which ignores the Commission's estimation of reduced revenue? What kind of budget discipline is it that is going to finance further agricultural expenditure by reductions in non-compulsory expenditure in direct conflict with the wishes of this House and the amendments passed by this House in discussion of the 1983 budget? This is the kind of budget discipline which makes a nonsense of many of the pronouncements of the Council.

I believe there will be many Members in this House who are less concerned with the immediate imperative of passing a budget — supplementary, amending or otherwise — to a deadline than with the content of the budget. I, and the Members from the United Kingdom who were elected to this Parliament during the elections this year, come here asserting quite clearly that the Treaty of Rome, drafted thirty years ago, is no longer directly relevant to the needs of the citizens of Europe. The needs of our citizens are not met by worshipping agricultural expenditure as if somehow it were holy writ passed down like tablets from the mountain. The need of our citizens is to restructure our budget and if this means restructuring our Treaties to do so, then that restructuring of the Treaties must take place. It is not the concern of our citizens now whether or not we disappoint some of the agricultural interests in the Community, important as those agricultural interests may be. What they need is a restructuring of the industrial infrastructure of Europe, the

### Tomlinson

building of social policies that remedy the privation of the majority of the citizens of Europe, and this supplementary budget does precious little for any of those things, and the direction in which it takes us is the opposite one to that which is necessary.

I hope that we will reflect long and hard about the path we are treading if we let the Council believe that by putting us under this pressure on this occasion they can get away with the same capricious attitude towards the Parliament on future occasions.

**Mr Cornelissen (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, last month the most important question in this House was whether the Council of Ministers would take a decision to ensure the financing of Community expenditure until the end of this year. Today's question is whether we as a Parliament agree with the financing proposed by the Council in the supplementary budget.

In view of my limited speaking time I shall restrict myself to one element in the supplementary budget — the drastic cuts in the non-compulsory expenditure, a corner-stone of the Council's decision. This corner-stone, Mr President, has become a scandal in the eyes of Parliament. This will come as no surprise to the Council. This is finance for which Parliament has fought hard for many years. And furthermore, this is finance which enables us in Europe to make a much needed start on the various problems, for example unemployment, environment, poverty in the third world. In some fields the amounts involved are so modest that they permit nothing more than a start of a European policy. I take expenditure on transport as an example. Transport and communication are a key sector in the process of European unification, but total expenditure on transport amounts only to a shameful 34 million ECUs.

And another point, Mr President. Parliament has far reaching authority on non-compulsory expenditure, and rightly so. So the Council could expect strong resistance from Parliament, especially so soon after the European elections to its proposal to cut 500 million from this expenditure. The least one could expect in such a delicate situation is a detailed explanation from the Council of how this 500 million is broken down and the reasons why this money cannot yet be spent. It goes without saying that without such a convincing explanation Parliament cannot approve of these cuts.

Mr President, at the beginning of this new term of office I should like to make the following point. Would it not be wise to examine systematically why year in year out there is a serious delay in spending non-compulsory expenditure? It is simply not acceptable that debates in Parliament and budgetary items which have been agreed on after long discussions should come to nothing. I realise that the reasons are complex and that no one single authority, let us be frank with each other, can be blamed as being the guilty responsible

party. That is why I would urge a Community approach from the Council, Commission and Parliament to put an end to this politically unacceptable situation.

I could imagine, Mr President, that the Commission's report to Parliament under the *Notenboom* procedure could be followed by specific proposals for improving this politically important issue. In other words, a kind of *Notenboom* procedure part II. I would appreciate Council, Commission and Parliament considering these ideas and would welcome a discussion on them in the Committee on Budgets.

**Mrs Fullet (S).** — (FR) Mr President, I am disturbed about the disintegration of Community finances. You may tell me that I am not alone in this, to which I would reply that that is no consolation.

This disintegration reflects the Council's inability to reach agreement on a proper budget, on coherent financing of the Community. It reveals the lack of any shared vision of the future of Europe. This has become like a bad long-running serial, and today we are seeing two episodes. For the moment, we are concerned with the first of these, the supplementary and amending budget for 1984. If I may, Mr President, I shall jump the gun a little and discuss the next episode, own resources.

On the supplementary and amending budget for 1984, I would say that we are bound to vote for it, in order to keep the Community's commitments to the farmers. Otherwise, we shall end up with renationalization of the CAP, and paralysis of the Community's structural funds as well.

The proposals made by the Committee on Budgets are reasonable. They reinstate the figure of 260 million ECU for revenues from customs duties, which the Commission considers to be a good thing. The Committee refuses to carry over to 1985 agricultural expenditure of some 500 million ECU, which admittedly entails additional financing from the Member States. But this constant pressure of blackmail on Community financing will have to be ended one day. I hope that the Council will take account of the proposals for modifications and amendments made by the Committee on Budgets. On the Pfennig report concerning own resources, I have only one comment to make: the Community must be provided, as of 1985, with the own resources that it needs to meet its commitments, since otherwise we shall continue to stumble along for several more years, haggling over advance payments and still without a budget worthy of the name. The provision of additional own resources is therefore necessary immediately, irrespective of any considerations of prospective enlargement. It needs to be said clearly that linking enlargement and additional resources does nothing to facilitate enlargement, but actually complicates it by holding back finance for the

### Fuillet

necessary accompanying measures, notably the integrated programmes for the Mediterranean. It is because I am so keen to see the Community enlarged that I refuse to link enlargement and own resources.

I hope that what we are proposing will be correctly understood beyond this Chamber, by our friends in Spain and Portugal. At the start of my speech, Mr President, I referred to a bad serial. Looking ahead to the 1985 budget, it takes no clairvoyancy to predict that there will be a sequel but certainly no end. In the circumstances, I am really putting both the Commission and the Council on their mettle, in the hope that reasonable measures will be adopted and that we shall at last show the ambition to put our policies into practice. At all events, honouring the undertakings that we gave during the European elections is, to my mind, a necessity, but it is my belief that we do not have the means to do this as matters stand. It is with this objective in view that I call upon everyone to display great wisdom.

**Mr Brok (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is an absolute disgrace, to put it mildly, that with the supplementary budget of 500 million ECUs there is talk of surpluses, for these are no surpluses, only the result of inactivity on the part of the Commission and Council in the non-compulsory field. I think that there is quite obviously a conspiracy between the Commission and Council of Ministers to attempt to remove budget policy decisions from one part of the budgetary authority, namely the European Parliament.

How else are we to understand how the Commission could speak as early as April of possible savings of 65 million ECUs in the Guidance Section of the EAGGF? An attempt has obviously been made from the beginning by ignoring the budget policy decisions of Parliament, i.e. by the Commission writing itself a blank cheque through inactivity, to create reserves to finance the agricultural policy in this way, a policy which was not mapped out sufficiently swiftly.

For these reasons we should make it clear that this European Parliament is not prepared calmly, to accept such a change in the budget structure at the cost of the non-compulsory expenditure. We believe it must be made clearer that it is precisely through a sensible structural policy, namely expanding the Social and Regional Funds, that we can and must create alternative and promising jobs in structurally weak areas where because of the problem of unemployment one must think more in terms of agricultural policy, so that we can thereby reduce the pressure on the CAP. I believe a forward looking structural policy could enable us to make many improvements in the EEC. Quite obviously, however, neither the Council of Ministers nor the Commission is prepared to act in areas of the Community which are effective in budget terms which would improve the economic situation in the Community.

In view of the over 12 million unemployed in the EEC I think it wrong to try to cut non-compulsory expenditure. And it certainly does not help us give the Community the necessary incentives in our competition with the Americans and the Japanese to ensure sensible living conditions for the future. There must be a breakthrough here, and that is why we object to these cuts being made solely in the non-compulsory sector, as proposed by the Council. That is why we shall engage in hard discussions in the conciliation procedure to strengthen Parliament's position and thereby the future development of the Community more than has happened so far in the supplementary budget.

**Mr Bardong (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Figures have been discussed at sufficient length in this debate. The purpose of a supplementary budget is to adapt the finance to a new situation. That has not happened with the presentation of the 1985 budget and only to a very limited extent with the 1984 supplementary budget. It goes without saying that Parliament cannot be satisfied with such a presentation.

The changes made by Council, the Council's behaviour including the time pressure they have been and still are putting on us up to and including today's sitting, which makes great demands of Parliament, are a source of general mistrust. Mistrust, as I see today, of the Commission's implementation of the budget — even though apparently it was relatively satisfactory this time under the *Notenboom* procedure — because some budget headings can apparently disappear in the course of the year, sometimes without Parliament noticing it and without there being an open discussion on it. Mistrust of the Council now because, as has already been said, Parliament's margin of manoeuvre in the decision-making process has yet once more been infringed and Parliament's laborious work on the budget passed over once again.

Every Parliament needs a healthy mistrust of the executive and mistrust in itself is not a bad thing. But as a newcomer to this Parliament and the Committee on Budgets I do have the impression that this mistrust is being fomented from various sides — in this case by the manipulations and manoeuvrings on the 1984 income side in particular — and can only be tolerated as it were with mistrust. Justified mistrust too, because an attempt is being made here directly or indirectly to restrict the budget rights of Parliament. Our electors believe we have too few rights and if I as a newcomer had any illusions they have been dissipated in recent weeks. Nevertheless as a newcomer to this House I believe that it is especially our budget rights that are important, but now apparently more than ever before the danger exists that these rights are being undermined. Parliament must not allow that to happen and it must be on its guard.

It is in Parliament's greatest interests to have the supplementary budget adopted this week because that will

### Bardong

make the Community more effective and able to act. That is why we must urge the Council — and I do so on behalf of my group — to consider Parliament's proposals in the concertation procedure. Parliament has been very long-suffering of the delays, confusions and camouflage which I think we have seen in this procedure. The Community's ability to act has top priority for us as we have just gone through a long period of uncertainty in the budget area in particular. But one should be wary of this priority of Parliament which can be a danger to other institutions of the Community.

But perhaps the supplementary budget can still be saved. If we save it and tolerate some things for 1984 which perhaps we should not do, we must say resolutely today that such uncertainties must be eliminated from the 1985 budget. If Council does not accept sufficient of our amendments and unnecessarily increases the 1985 deficit at this stage, then it will be contributing now towards making the 1985 discussions more acrimonious. I hope that the 1984 supplementary budget can still be saved, but in 1985 we shall refuse to board a ship which is taking water when it sets sail and is doomed to sink.

**Mr Woltjer (S), draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food.** — (NL) Mr President, when the Council finally produced its preliminary draft budget for 1984 and 1985 and then its draft budget, a Commissioner exclaimed in Dutch, 'Both budgets are monsters'. I think that Parliament has little to add to that and that comment can also be made of the 1984 budget.

My group has already commented on the expenditure side at sufficient length and I shall not dwell on that further. But one aspect I do wish to take up, that of agriculture, which is covered by a number of additional budgetary headings.

The situation we are now in could have been foreseen long ago, which is one of the reasons why I repeat the words of that Commissioner — it was Commissioner Andriessen — that this whole budget is indeed a monster and that we hardly know where to begin because there has been no agricultural policy in recent times. I well remember that at one point in Fontainebleau or later in Brussels agreement was reached on the whole of agriculture and that was welcomed by the Commission because it did constitute a great step forward. Critics who said at that time that the agreement could not be financed under the 1984 budget were really dismissed with the comment that time would bring counsel. Well time has passed, but no counsel has come, and we now face major problems. And I hold the Commission directly responsible for these problems, not just the Council but also the Commission which has really shown itself incapable of acting.

So it was foreseeable. But more than that. The present problems can have catastrophic consequences because

as our colleague Mr Dankert explained we are faced with the question, 'Can the Commission pay the farmers in 1984 under the existing regulations?' That is a big problem and everyone knows, at least rumours are rife, that major problems of liquidity are to be expected.

And if these problems of liquidity materialise, Mr President, then that brings up another issue, namely how can we prevent a return to nationalization? For that is the outcome of a problem of liquidity and that is the outcome of the Commission's rickety policy. If the Commission is unable to implement the regulations, and the farmers are entitled to these payments, then national Member States will take over and that will also mean they give their own interpretations and that is the next step on the way back to nationalization, and it is only round the corner. After the problems with Germany we now have the budget problems which can equally well result in re-nationalization.

There is a third point I wish to make. The 1984 supplementary budget before us is totally unrealistic. Admittedly amendments have been made since the Commission drafted the budget. I know full well that agricultural expenditure always involves changing external factors, estimates which are difficult to foresee — the development of the world market and market prices, etc. I can admit that elements can emerge as mistaken three months later, but I cannot accept such enormous mistakes as we have here. There is the threat of an enormous surplus in the cereals sector while at the same time a clear shortfall in the meat and wine sectors. These two factors were foreseeable at the time the Commission drafted this supplementary budget. That is why I think that Parliament ought to make this budget and the expenditure side more realistic. Parliament ought to take the bull by the horns, which the Commission refuses to do, and take 100 million away from the cereals sector, which are not needed there anyway, and transfer 60 million to the meat sector and 40 million extra to the wine sector.

A final point I wish to make, Mr President, is on the Christmas butter action. It is clear, and it also came as a surprise to me, that not only must we have a Christmas butter action but also that it can be carried out under this budget. It seems indeed that there are 150 million ECUs for this in 1984. The Commission could have decided on the Christmas butter much earlier on. I welcome the fact that at last we now have a decision. I am still very worried about the methods and timing of this action but at least, we have made some progress and the amendment stressing what the Commission has done in this field should be seen in that light.

**Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (FR) Mr President, the speakers for the groups have been brief in their comments on this bad budget, and so shall I, because there is not very much to say. I should like to express my gratitude to Mrs Scrivener

**Cot**

for the very thankless task that she has had to accomplish, since it fell to her to mitigate the shortcomings, to put it no higher, of the other branch of the budgetary authority, so as to arrive at a more or less realistic supplementary and amending budget. The Committee on Budgets set its sights no higher than this, Mr President. All that we tried to do was to eliminate the most glaring mistakes or errors from the text, to knock it into some sort of shape.

That said, I should like to emphasize that the European Parliament is most anxious to see the adoption of a supplementary and amending budget, to judge from what we have heard this morning, and this was certainly the feeling in the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Commissioner Tugendhat said that the Committee on Budgets had done the work necessary to ensure that Parliament would be in a position to take a decision during this part-session, and I acknowledge that statement with thanks. What this means in practice is that if, for various reasons, we are unable to adopt the budget on Thursday, this will not be Parliament's fault. For the remainder, Mr President, the Committee's amendments do not require any explanation, since they are really self-explanatory. It is now for the Council to carry out its task with all due diligence so that our Parliament can adopt the supplementary and amending budget for 1984 in good time, on Thursday.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

**Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC).** — (DE) Mr President, a short time ago I expressed our solidarity with the wives of the striking miners and I should like to be more specific now. As one of the speakers of the Rainbow Group I spoke on behalf of the Federation of the Green-Alternative European Link in this group. I was not empowered to speak on behalf of the Danish group but am pretty sure that they are politically with us as regards the object of this solidarity, but they must speak for themselves.

**President.** — Your comments have been noted, Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf.

##### 5. System of own resources

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-799/84), by Mr Pfennig, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the amended proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-368/84 — COM(84) 384 final) for a Council decision on the Community's system of own resources.

**Mr Pfennig (PPE), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. The new financial regulation of the European Community has been discussed on several occasions in the European Parliament. Our proposals are contained in various reports which can briefly be summarized as follows.

In view of the accession of Spain and Portugal the Community first of all needs a solid long-term new financial regulation. For this we need the political determination of the Member States to regulate anew the distribution of tasks between the Community and the Member States. Secondly European problems should be solved by the Community and not by the Member States; and for this the Community, instead of the Member States, should have the necessary finance. Hence the need to increase the Community's own resources.

Thirdly, the Community, like the Member States, must exercise budgetary discipline in financing the Community tasks before us. This is of particular relevance to agricultural expenditure. Fourthly the imbalance in the Community budget caused by the disproportionate amount of agricultural expenditure must be redressed not only by reducing such expenditure but also and especially by transferring new tasks with financial implications to the Community. Only this way can we — fifthly — solve the problem of overtaxation through value added tax of the citizens of individual Member States. A special system of financial adjustment should also be established. Sixthly a short-term solution to the problem of overtaxation of citizens in individual Member States can be found by a special payment by the Community for Community purposes. This refers at the moment to the United Kingdom.

The Council has produced a short version of its proposals for a new financial regulation under the terms of reference of 30 May 1980. The Council's discussions were concluded for the time being with the Fontainebleau decisions. The Council opted for a short-term solution of raising the Community's own resources to 1.4% by 1 January 1986, with special compensation for the United Kingdom. Everything is to be re-examined and decided on again one year before the own resources are used up when the Commission is to submit a report on the results of the budget discipline, the financial needs of the Community and the distribution of the budget charges among the Member States. The Council considers the foreseeable date for that will be 1987, as the value added tax share of the Community may be raised to 1.6% on 1 January 1988 under Article 201 of the EEC Treaty.

As negotiations on the entry of Spain and Portugal to the Community should be completed by 30 September 1984 the Council obviously feels that the increase in own resources to 1.4% should cover the accession costs for Spain and Portugal. Furthermore the Council

**Pfennig**

has brought itself to accept the principles of budget discipline to be achieved partly through the Council alone, contrary to Article 203 of the EEC Treaty, fixing a general reference framework for the financing of Community policies at the beginning of the budget procedure, all without the European Parliament.

I shall not attempt at this stage to re-evaluate the Fontainebleau decisions, but the Council seems to have lost the political perspective for the Community and wants to try to find it again in three years. Where is there room in this kind of Community financing for European tasks such as research and development in space travel, microelectronics, biotechnology or environmental protection? Where is there any room for a social action programme in the Community? Are not these Council decisions which could also contribute towards redressing the balance in the budget only worthless paper if there is no political determination in the Member States to transfer the tasks and the necessary finance to the Community? The British Lord Chancellor, Lord Hailsham, said in the Winston Churchill Memorial lecture on 11 October 1984 in Luxembourg that ideals could not be reached without good budgeting, but good budgeting is no substitute for ideals. I think that the European Parliament must ensure that in the future there is at least good budgeting as the Council has put aside ideals for the time being.

The Commission's present proposals for a new system of own resources in the Community are of little help. They reflect incompletely the Fontainebleau decisions and run counter to the spirit of the Community treaties. Firstly the Commission has sued the Council decisions to abolish irrevocably the whole of the Community's financial regulation of 21 April 1970. In its place should come, as the new financial regulation of the Community, a provisional solution for one Member State and that should be ratified by the Member States. And so the exception becomes the rule, under the Commission's proposal.

Secondly the principle of a uniform rate of value added tax has been abandoned. In future a Member State will be able to transfer only part of the income from the value added tax paid by its citizens to the Community and to put the other part into the state coffers. The shortfall in the Community budget which would thereby arise is to be made up by the other Member States. This almost brings us back to the *à la carte* financing of the Community of ten years ago from national contributions.

Thirdly the new financial regulation is to be valid until all ten or even twelve Member States ratify a new regulation. Fourthly the new value added tax rate of 1.4% only seems to be a definitive amount. In future the Commission, instead of the budget authority — in other words instead of the Council and Parliament — intends autonomously to fix the actual amount of the part of VAT to be paid by the Member States to the

Community. It intends to decide on the basis of its calculations how big the shortfall created by a Member State will be and how much extra the others will have to pay to make up this shortfall. And so the Council and European Parliament will lose their authority over the revenue side and Council, Parliament and national parliaments their control over the actual amount of money accruing from value added tax to the Community.

Fifthly there is no trace in the Commission's proposal of any long-term concept to redress the balance in the Community budget. Sixthly the Commission's proposal means in political terms that in future the United Kingdom, in addition to receiving an amount based on the principle of the 'fair return' will only have to pay to the Community budget up to a maximum of one third of the share of value added tax. On the basis of the per capita share in Community VAT the United Kingdom would be treated as the second poorest country in the Community after Greece.

I consider these proposals from the Commission totally unsuitable as a basis for a new financial regulation for the Community. I wonder if the Commission as watchdog of the Treaties deliberately intends to destroy the present federal financial regulation of the Community in the hope that the Council or some of the Member States will take better decisions. I do not think the European Parliament should go along with that kind of thinking. We should heed the warning issued last week by President Mitterand that the European Community would disintegrate if the finance problems are not solved. We should stick to our earlier decisions so that in the future we can have at least a semi-satisfactory budget policy based on the improved 1970 financial regulation to which improvements can be made. And so I advise all honourable Members to endorse the proposals from the Committee on Budgets.

The specific decisions from the Committee on Budgets are as follows: the decision of 21 April 1970 on the Community's own resources should be upheld. Secondly this should be complemented by decisions to take a positive step in the further development of the Community towards a financial union. Thirdly a change in the 1970 decision involves not only a planned increase of the VAT rate to 1.4% but also an increase to 1.6% by 1 January 1988. Fourthly 50% of the revenue exceeding 1.4%, i.e. after 1988, is to be placed in a fund from which new Community policies are to be financed. Fifthly corrective measures have to be taken via a Council regulation, as in the past, for the United Kingdom on the expenditure side of the Community budget on the amount of the relief decided on in Fontainebleau. These corrective measures should be a lump sum of 1 000 million ECUs for last year, a transitional measure for three years and then be stopped.

These briefly are the decisions of the Committee on Budgets. It also discussed whether the new financial

### Pfennig

regulation should incorporate a system of financial adjustment and whether the changes to the 1970 financial regulation should come into force at the same time as the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community. Both amendments were narrowly defeated in the Committee. I see they have been tabled again in the House and I shall give my opinion on them tomorrow when we vote.

May I just make a few technical points? I very much regret that due to lack of time some errors have crept into the translations. Amendment No 7 is incorrect in the English version, although it originates from the European Democrats. The Italian version of amendment No 12 is incorrect and the French version of that same amendment is incomplete. We shall try to correct these amendments before they are put to the vote.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Mr President, on 3 May 1983, three months after the presentation of its Green Paper, the Commission submitted a draft proposal for a Council decision on the Community's system of own resource. Parliament gave its opinion on this proposal in the Arndt resolution of 16 November 1983. At the level of the Council, intensive discussions took place in which the Commission played a full part during the months which followed the submission of our proposal. The question of the future of the Community's own-resource system was a principal subject of discussion at the European Council meetings of June 1983 in Stuttgart, December 1983 in Athens and March 1984 in Brussels. Finally, at the European Council meeting of June 1984 in Fontainebleau, agreement was reached at the level of the Heads of State and Government on a package of measures concerning the future financing arrangements of the Community involving, notably, a raising in the ceiling of VAT from 1 % to 1.4 % and on a method of correcting budgetary imbalances.

The draft decision on 'own-resources' which Parliament is debating today was presented by the Commission on 9 July 1984 as an amendment to its original proposal pursuant to Article 149(2) of the EEC Treaty. This amended proposal integrates, where appropriate, the conclusions of the European Council at Fontainebleau into the Commission's earlier text.

The Commission was represented at the Fontainebleau European Council by President Thorn and by Vice-President Ortoli. Its results were not, of course, identical to the proposals which the Commission itself had previously submitted. None of us in the Commission would argue that the outcome was ideal or perfect. Nonetheless, it represented a successful conclusion to a long and difficult negotiation enabling in particular the Community's own resources to be extended in scope and providing a durable resolution of the problems of budgetary imbalance which had plagued the

Community for so long. The Commission thought it right therefore to reproduce faithfully in its amended draft proposals all the elements which the Heads of State and Government had specifically agreed upon.

I might add, Mr President, that none — not one — of the government representatives at Fontainebleau has contested the consistency of the Commission's amended draft with the conclusions of the European Council. I stress this point at the outset because Mr Pfennig's report on the Commission's amended proposal advocates a number of important changes to it. Some of them conflict clearly with the Fontainebleau agreement. Others would seem to depart from positions which Parliament has taken on previous occasions in this matter. For example, Mr Pfennig, supported by the Committee on Budgets, envisages that a further raising of the VAT ceiling to 1.6% on 1 January 1988 could be authorized by the budgetary authority. That is to say, it would not need the ratification of national parliaments based on the Article 201 procedure. This is clearly incompatible with the relevant extract from the Fontainebleau text which states:

'The maximum rate may be increased after agreement has been given in accordance with national procedures'.

On the question of the correction of budgetary imbalances, the proposal of Mr Pfennig also conflicts with the Fontainebleau agreement. It is proposed that the correction in favour of the United Kingdom should be implemented by expenditure, not on the revenue side, and that it should be limited in time to 4 years and separate in its legal status from the own resources decision. On these two points the Fontainebleau agreement is unmistakably clear. It states that — and I quote — 'The correction will be deducted from the United Kingdom's normal VAT share in the budget year following the one in respect of which the correction is granted' and that 'the correction formula will be part of the decision to increase the VAT ceiling to 1.4%, their durations being linked'.

All of these issues were key elements in the Fontainebleau agreement. Whatever the Commission's own views on the substance — and in some respects we sympathize with the aim of what Mr Pfennig's resolution proposes — we do not believe it would be in the Community interest to reopen the discussion on them again now and thus risk an almost certain further delay in the timetable for the provision of urgently needed additional own-resources for the Community.

Mr President, I now turn to changes on which the Commission has the impression that they break with views held by the Parliament in the past. Amendment No 9, last paragraph, states

'At least 50% of all new own resources above 1.4% shall be put into a separate fund for the sole purpose of financing the structural policies of the Community'.

**Tugendhat**

Now, Mr President, while the Commission agrees with the objective of a significant increase of expenditure for structural purposes, the budgetary technique proposed seems hardly consistent with the principle of non-hypothecation. As stated earlier in the very same Amendment No 9,

'The revenue shall be used without distinction to finance all expenditure entered into the budget of the Communities'.

It is very hard, Mr President, to reconcile those two statements.

The Pfennig report also puts a lot of emphasis on maintaining a uniform rate of VAT. In the two previous resolutions of Parliament on own-resources — the Spinelli resolution of 1981 and the Arndt resolution of 1983 — Parliament advocated and agreed to modulated rates of VAT. While it is true that the modulation proposed there and in the Commission's original proposal was a general one, whereas the modulation proposed by the Commission now is more specific, the principle of different rates of VAT for different Member States is still the same.

In Amendment No 7, Mr Pfennig proposes that grants shall constitute own resources. This would seem to be opening the door for intergovernmental agreements of the type which is being proposed for financing the 1984 supplementary budget. Both Parliament and the Commission have raised serious objections to this. In addition, grants can be interpreted as similar to national contributions, a concept which has been refuted by Parliament on several occasions.

the autonomy of the Community's financial system could be undermined if grants became an important feature of the system. In any case, a grant cannot by definition be an own resource. Own resources belong to the Community by right. A grant, by definition, has to be given by somebody else.

Mr President, I turn finally to the date of entry into force of the new own-resources decision. In the Commission's view, it is essential for the Community that the decision shall enter into force on 1 October 1985 and shall enter into effect on 1 January 1985 so that the expenditure requirements for 1985 can be fully covered by own-resources. Indeed, this would be the only Community way of solving the 1985 budget problems on the revenue side.

There are some points in Mr Pfennig's resolution to which I think it right to draw the honourable Members' attention. That I have sought to do. I have not sought to cover in detail every point raised by Mr Pfennig since the Commission's position on most of the issues involved is well known and has been set out on numerous occasions in this House.

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

## IN THE CHAIR: Mr DIDÒ

*Vice-President*

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Mr President, first of all I wish to express our unrestricted appreciation of the rapporteur Mr Pfennig. To a very large extent we agree with his report; we may perhaps have yet to agree definitively on one or two of the amendments. He had a difficult job reaching a consensus in the Committee. In particular my group had difficulty in agreeing to the Commission's proposal on increasing the Community's own resources and the British refund payments — even although in November 1983 after very long discussions our opinion was expressed clearly in the Arndt report.

What are we expected to do with these proposals? The reason for our dilemma is quite clear. We have to enforce the decisions of Fontainebleau. From Parliament's point of view, and in view of all our decisions, the results of the series of summits including Fontainebleau were pitiful. This last-minute agreement on the lowest common denominator in no way meets the demands of a *relance européenne*.

And yet we all welcomed Fontainebleau. We thereby welcomed no more and no less than the avoidance of a political and financial bankruptcy in the EEC. So today we are really ratifying Fontainebleau. We tolerate Fontainebleau without identifying ourselves with the contents. We are interpreting Fontainebleau where the decisions were open to many interpretations and we have made some minimal clarifications in order to guarantee Parliament's rights in the future and to leave open the way for us to return to our principles in the future.

The decisions before us are greeted with muted enthusiasm as a transitional solution. But our ideas of Europe are different. 1.4%, 1.6% or even 2% value added tax, 1% of the national product of the Member States are not sufficient to finance the Europe we all need, to help effectively to solve unemployment, to implement Community measures for clean air, clean rivers, clean Community waters — the North Sea and the Mediterranean. Nor are they sufficient to start modernizing the economy in Europe and there is no way they could begin to bridge the gap between the rich and poor regions in Europe. But think of the reform of the agricultural policy, of reducing the miserable surpluses, which we believe for financial and moral reasons are a precondition for reforming European policies to win back people's respect for Europe. Fontainebleau has done a little in the milk sector, but in no way has it reformed the European agricultural policy. No, we must accept Fontainebleau but by no means approve of it.

Commissioner Tugendhat warns us not to overlook our extension plans for the top floors, but a fire is

**von der Vring**

burning on the ground floor and we must lend the fire brigade a hand so that it does not trample on too much.

I should just like to make a few comments on the controversial points in the report; firstly, on the link between enlargement and the increase in own resources. Parliament took this decision in order to force unwilling governments to agree to enlargement. Nothing is changed by that, especially as this link is guaranteed by several governments. But many Members claim that a large portion of the 1.4% has already been used to pay for irresponsible agricultural surpluses of the past, and many others fear that the farmers will not get the money they are entitled to. Both positions are controversial and unnecessary differences of opinion have arisen on them.

The Committee does not consider there is any reason to re-open the discussion on this subject. That means first of all no change in the decision-making situation of the House, and it also means that we recognise that the additional revenue should be available soon and that we continue to insist on enlargement by 1 January 1986.

I am a staunch supporter of enlargement in the south; I have defended my position many times in this House and refuse to accept that at this critical stage where enlargement hangs by a thread the whole issue be re-opened in an unnecessary and damaging manner. I cannot go along with that.

Our British friends are upset at our having limited the so-called British refund payments to the end of 1988, and I can understand that. But in Fontainebleau there was only one special arrangement for the United Kingdom, not for any relevant Member State, and that runs counter to our ideas, as do refund payments without an explicit purpose, irrespective of whatever interpretation may be given in future to the term refund payments. What we have here, when all is said and done, is a 'fair return', and that totally contradicts our ideas. If therefore we are to tolerate Fontainebleau, then only for a short time, only as a transitional solution. That is why we have tabled these amendments to the Commission's proposals.

I cannot resist a final question. What does it mean in practical terms that the legal limit of 1% value added tax is to be raised by the national parliaments to 1.4%? Part of that money was spent and committed long ago. And what happens if a national parliament — as has been threatened on various occasions — refuses? What would that change? Would we have anything other than the revelation that the national parliaments in Europe no longer matter? It would change much less than may appear and not very much will be changed by the decision taken here today. That may explain our muted enthusiasm in this issue.

**Mr Langes (PPE).** — (DE) Mr President, we are discussing a document which will be with us in the com-

ing months and which will be very important in its final version. All of Parliament's rights are restricted here, as you know. We can table amendments to the Commission's proposal but the Council can choose to ignore them. But may I say at the outset that Parliament takes the question of revenue and changes to the financial regulation very seriously, and the Council representatives here today should tell their ministers that even in future budget debates we shall evaluate the final version of this document in political terms. As the document is very important to the Commission, Mr Vice-President Tugendhat, and you are in the stronger position, I must tell you we are dissatisfied with your proposal. I think it is a bit much to hear you state today on behalf of the Commission that the Fontainebleau decisions are not ideal but then in the same breath that we have to implement these decisions unaltered.

May I make a political point here? If this is really your opinion, and I do not mean only you, Mr Tugendhat, but the whole of the Commission, then you have proved today that the Commission has absolutely no political determination and no more political substance of its own, that it is not prepared, when it recognises errors, omissions or weaknesses in a document from the Fontainebleau Council, to correct them but only to put them into practice.

I wonder whether this morning we have not heard the farewell speech of a political Commission which in future only intends to execute — 1 January is soon here. This is the only explanation of this proposal. Parliament — and I am grateful to Mr von der Vring for having put it so clearly — also sees the realities of Fontainebleau but we are not blind to what must be done here. Where, Mr Commissioner, is there any clause in a legal contract which stipulates that the beneficiary in a special contract can decide himself how long this special contract should be valid? Where does it say that the payers should be at the mercy of the beneficiaries? That is a problem we should all discuss sensibly. Mr Commissioner, why did you not put a time limit on this special arrangement for the United Kingdom and make it clear it is a transitional measure? Why are you not in favour of a general financial adjustment system which can benefit the Greeks, the Portuguese, when they are here, the British or anyone else?

As for your criticisms of the Pfennig report, I must ask you to read parts of it again. Look at the specific points! This 10% — and Mr Pfennig said up to 10% — which the countries should receive by way of administrative costs, only affect customs and levies of course. No one talked about value added tax. These are errors in your response to this report.

My group supports this proposal from the Committee on Budgets. We have asked that after the special arrangement for the united Kingdom a general one should be made. Personally, Mr von der Vring, I think

## Langes

it unfortunate that we speak of Spain and Portugal in this context but Parliament took a decision to this effect in May and we ought to display a certain consistency here.

*(Applause from the Centre)*

**Lord Douro (ED).** — Mr President, Mr Pfennig is proposing today, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, some very major changes to the Commission proposal for the increase in own resources. The Commission proposal, in fairness to the Commission, is only an interpretation of what was agreed at Fontainebleau. I should say to begin with that I believe that the Council has brought upon itself part of the opposition and some of the amendments which are being proposed today by failing to consult sufficiently, both as to frequency and as to substance, with the European Parliament. The European Parliament is one half of the budgetary authority, and any matter concerning revenue or expenditure in the budget should be part of some sort of agreement with Parliament. I must say that I think the Council has been foolish in not taking more account of Parliament's views in this matter. Nevertheless, my group does object to three of the major changes proposed by Mr Pfennig.

Firstly, Mr Pfennig proposes that the balancing mechanism where the United Kingdom is concerned should be on the expenditure side of the budget. Of course, we would support that in the long-term; but in the short-term there appears to be no other mechanism other than some abatement on the revenue side of the budget. So, we are forced, I believe, to accept a change in the revenue. But of course all those Members, like Mr Langes and many others, who feel strongly on this point should realise that the problem will in fact go away if there is a change in the balance of expenditure which he and other Members from all groups in this House favour. To the extent that there is greater expenditure on the sort of policies from which all countries will benefit, the gap will disappear and the abatement on the revenue side to the United Kingdom will disappear.

The second major principle that my group cannot accept is that the arrangement should have a duration of only four years. The Fontainebleau agreement made it quite clear that the whole matter would be reconsidered *ex novo* as and when the 1.4% limit was exhausted, and we find unacceptable any other attempt to disengage the duration of the 1.4% limit and the special mechanism for the United Kingdom.

The third point of principle that we cannot accept is that the further increase to 1.6% from 1.4% should be made without the approval of national parliaments. We believe that that is not only unrealistic but that it might put in jeopardy the whole ratification procedure for this new limit of 1.4%.

So, Mr President, my group is anxious to support the budgetary powers of the European Parliament. We will certainly this afternoon support the amendments to the supplementary budget. But, regrettably, we are unable to support the three most fundamental proposals being made today by Mr Pfennig and we do urge other Members of this House to reconsider their attitude because, as I say, we think that the route being proposed by the Committee on Budgets puts at risk the whole procedure to increase the Community's own resources. We are all united in believing that the Community's own resources should be increased, but what the Committee on Budgets is proposing might jeopardize that very important step forward in the evolution of the European Community.

**Mrs Barbarella (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, we all know that we are at this moment discussing the legal implementation, as it were, of certain parts of the Fontainebleau Agreement. I think it of value, therefore, to remind this Assembly of certain aspects of this Fontainebleau Agreement that we consider very worrying.

First of all, we should like to emphasize in this context our very serious concern indeed at an increase in the VAT resources of the Community that is very limited, very small, and that will at most allow the Community to survive in the future, but only very precariously and in conditions of extreme difficulty.

I should like to recall that, last July, President Thorn reminded us in this very Chamber that the 1.4% increase was, in his opinion also, too small, and that a fresh call for an increase in funds would become necessary in the very near future. Our basic concern is that this very limited quantity of financial resources may freeze — indeed, I would go further it might bring to an end — the business of the Community, whereas we consider that, in the circumstances such as they are, the Community ought to be taking on a new lease of life, and should be tackling the question of structural policies with new vigour.

The second great concern that we have to express in regard to the Fontainebleau Agreement is the fact that this slender, very small increase in own resources has been linked with the mechanism of the compensatory payments to Great Britain. The connection that has been established seems very worrying to us because, basically, it links the possibility of a further increase in own resources — and hence an increase in the Community's activities — to a unilateral, restrictive position that is identified with the particular views of one Member State.

The third worrying aspect of the Fontainebleau Agreement is the mechanism that has been contrived for the British compensatory payments, which concerns differential levels of VAT. We consider that the principles governing the life of the Community, the Treaties and all the resultant legislation, have been very ser-

### Barbarella

iously strained: strained, that is, by the decision that the proportion of own resources to be contributed to the Community is no longer the same for everyone, but can vary from one Member State to another. This principle seems to us an extremely dangerous one that penalizes unfairly and is unjust — unjust both from the point of view of fiscal equity. I shall not dwell any further on these points, because we have already discussed them very fully.

Mr President, I have returned to these three points — which provide as many grounds for concern — in order to say that we have in fact played an active part in the Committee on Budgets to have these items in the Fontainebleau Agreement couched in more correct, more balanced terms — I say this again — in the legislative tradition of the Agreement itself, and in accordance with what the Parliament has emphasized and repeated on a number of occasions in this Chamber.

We are therefore absolutely in agreement with the rapporteur on the fact that the mechanism for increasing the Community's own resources should constitute an extension of the 1970 decision and not a new decision that goes beyond this very legislation. We agree — not least because we have ourselves taken part in this operation — that the legislative act by which the national parliaments will ratify the increase in own resources should be kept separate from the settlement of compensation to the British, which does not need to be ratified and therefore cannot be of either the same political or legal nature — I emphasize the word 'nature' — as the other act. This does not mean that it is less important, nor does it mean that the two things should not proceed in parallel, alongside one another.

In conclusion, Mr President, I will say once again that we are in agreement with the approach and proposals contained in Mr Pfennig's report, and at the same time I have to inform the Assembly that my group has put down an amendment regarding the extension of the increase in own resources to 2% without the need for ratification. This seemed to us an obvious step, and one that has always had the support of this Parliament.

I should therefore like to invite members also to consider the possibility of going up to 2%, as a minimum increase, so as to enable the Community to survive — indeed, to live — for a longer period of time than just two or three years.

**Mr De Vries (L).** — (NL) Mr President, we are debating today two of the three sections of the Gordian knot, the 1984 supplementary budget and the decision on own resources.

In today's debate the third part, the 1985 draft budget, is of course far from being out of our minds. On the contrary. Our Parliament is today firing a shot across the bows of the Council and Commission which can-

not be open to misinterpretation. The 1984 supplementary budget has already been dealt with by speakers from my group. I shall restrict myself to my group's opinion of the Pfennig report. I can be brief. With one important exception my group basically agrees with it.

Mr President, it is absolutely essential to increase the Community's own resources, and the Council has rightly proposed increasing the amount of value added tax. But unfortunately the procedure proposed by the Council is short-sighted, both literally and figuratively. A VAT rate of 1.4% by 1 January 1986 is only an emergency measure, scarcely adequate to continue to finance the present policy. There is no room for a new policy and that is what the citizens of Europe and this Parliament are asking for. Everyone knows that a further increase to 1.6% by 1 January 1988 is inevitable, especially in view of the accession of Spain and Portugal.

But what is the Council doing? By linking the necessary increase to national ratification the Council is ensuring that one single Member State can financially paralyse the Community for an indefinite period. That means a permanent budget crisis from now until 1988. That is why we as Parliament propose that the second increase of the VAT rate to 1.6% be decided on jointly by Council and Parliament on a proposal from the Commission. That too is why we refuse to link a new decision on own resources to the accession of Spain and Portugal, as some Member States advocate. Not because we want to delay the accession. My group has always fought for that accession, as this House well knows. But the longer it takes to make new own resources available the greater will be the crisis we shall find ourselves in. It is up to us in Parliament to guard against that.

Secondly, Mr President, we insist that our budgetary authority as Parliament is not diminished. That means we want the British problem to be financed through the expenditure side of the budget, i.e. through the development of a new European policy and not through a reduction on the VAT payment. That payment is not a national contribution but an integral part of the Community's own resources. It is scandalous that the Commission dared agree to the VAT solution for Britain. The Commission should safeguard the European treaties and not undermine them. That is also true of the 1970 decision on own resources. In that decision and in the amendment under discussion today there is no place for an exception for any single Member State. The British problem should not be solved in a decision on own resources but in a Council regulation. My group has tabled an amendment to cover that point.

Finally we fully support the proposal in the Pfennig report to extend the own resources to customs duties on products under the ECSC Treaty and some other levies and taxes. The Commission could improve its

## De Vries

image in this House if it were to agree to accept these proposals under Article 149, para. 2 of the EEC Treaty.

Finally, Mr President, this House is not seeking confrontation with the Council or Commission. There is nothing we wish more than a normal functioning of the Community. But there are clear limits to our compliance. The Council has been warned!

**Mr Pasty (RDE).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what is our subject, what are we debating?

Officially, we are seized of a draft Council Decision prepared by the Commission to formalize the decisions taken at the recent Fontainebleau summit. The serious technical nature of our discussions should not be allowed to obscure the fact that the difficulties and contradictions besetting us stem from the disastrous Fontainebleau compromise, which I take this further opportunity to denounce on behalf of my Group.

Contrary to what we were led to believe, Fontainebleau settled nothing, as we are constantly reminded by the budgetary difficulties in which we become increasingly embroiled with each passing day. Contrary to what we have been led to believe, Fontainebleau gave no fresh impetus to new common policies. When we are not even sure of being able to finance common policies already decided upon by the Community, the common agricultural policy first and foremost, how are we going to be able to find finance for new European ambitions? Contrary to what we have been led to believe, Fontainebleau does not mark a leap forward for Europe but a step back for the Community spirit; in particular, by making provision for one Member State to be able to withdraw from the financing of present or future common policies, Fontainebleau has created a big crack in the Community edifice while seeking to disguise the beginnings of the disintegration of the Community of Ten just when plans are being made — prematurely — for enlarging it to include two new partners.

The only positive feature of the Fontainebleau agreement is the authority that it gives for raising the VAT ceiling from 1% and an increase in own resources. But it has to be said immediately that this again is an illusion, since the increase is wholly inadequate. Since we find that the 1.4% is in reality reduced to 1.3% when the effect of the mechanism for financing the United Kingdom's budget rebate is taken into account. Moreover, we already know that these new resources up to this limit of 1.3% will be totally absorbed as soon as they become available if enlargement goes ahead at the same time.

To make matters worse, the Fontainebleau agreement tied the increase in own resources to the adoption of a mechanism for budgetary relief to the United Kingdom which is totally unacceptable in its inspiration and

in its practical consequences. It is unacceptable in its inspiration in that it endorses the *juste retour* theory and abandonment of the principle of financial solidarity enshrined in the Treaties. To be convinced of this, one need only peruse the draft sent to us by the Commission, which calls for three different rates of VAT contributions: one rate applicable to the United Kingdom, one rate applicable to Germany, and one rate applicable to the other Member States. But this mechanism is also unacceptable in its practical consequences, in as much as it leads to the effective exemption of one partner — the United Kingdom — from having to meet its share of the financial consequences of enlargement, of additional agricultural spending under the common agricultural policy which might be necessitated by short-term eventualities, and even of any new policies adopted by the Community in as much as they do not benefit the United Kingdom disproportionately. This point is in fact made very cogently in Mr Pfennig's motion for a resolution, approved by the Committee on Budgets.

The only *communautaire* solution to the problem of the United Kingdom's budgetary imbalance, whose existence we do not deny, would have been either to couple the VAT contribution with contributions based on other criteria taking account of Member States' real wealth or to do what Parliament has always wanted and make provision for correction via expenditure or by a system combining both these methods.

Unfortunately, however, the worst available system has been adopted.

I come now to Mr Pfennig's amendment. To attempt to reconcile the Fontainebleau agreement with the position constantly reaffirmed by the Parliament on budgetary relief to the United Kingdom — i.e. compensation via expenditure, not revenues — was like trying to square the circle. If what Mr Pfennig has come up with is not, in our view, wholly satisfactory, this, I grant, is because he was trying to reconcile the irreconcilable. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr Pfennig for the efforts that he has made to take this draft from the Commission, which we for our part consider to have been thoroughly unacceptable in the form in which it was originally presented, and make improvements on a number of fundamental, essential points. In particular we approve what he has done to mark a very clear distinction — on the legal plane — between the increase in own resources achieved by raising the VAT ceiling on the one hand and the problem of correction in favour of the United Kingdom on the other. Only the former should be the subject of a draft amendment to the Decision of 21 April 1970 on own resources. The latter should be dealt with by a Council Regulation.

We also agree to the use of a simpler procedure for raising the ceiling above 1.4%, requiring unanimity in the Council and a qualified majority in Parliament, but no ratification by the national Parliaments.

**Pasty**

By contrast, we totally disagree with the mechanism adopted for the correction of budgetary imbalances and note an inconsistency between the motion for a resolution presented by Mr Pfennig — which we approve: correction via expenditure — and the wording of Amendment No 12 which, while admittedly improving Parliament's powers of control over calculation of compensation, remains extremely ambiguous as to whether the method of correction should be via revenues or expenditure.

In conclusion, we shall support all draft amendments which are strictly in line with Community orthodoxy, especially as regards the need, as stipulated in the Treaties, to adjust revenues to decisions taken under common policies. From the moment that a common policy is adopted unanimously it must be financed without restriction and without discrimination between the various Member States. Conversely, it is unacceptable for one Member State to take it upon itself to withdraw from the financing of certain expenditure which is of common interest. Consequently, no solution which is contrary to the Community principles of financial solidarity will get our approval.

*(Applause from the Right)*

**Mr Kuijpers (ARC).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the European Free Alliance I should also like to make a few comments on the Pfennig report. The first concerns the unwillingness of the Member States, in other words state nationalism, to make the necessary finance available. The United Kingdom has feathered its nest and it is really rather ironical that we must listen here to Mr Tugendhat answer this House. It would be difficult to find a more ironical situation than this one.

Ladies and gentlemen, what is the price to be paid for this budget? For me it is quite simple. A clear departure is being made from the European spirit which ought to reign. Democracy is also being eroded. The first rule of democracy is that agreements which have been concluded should be respected and properly financed. Well, first of all, the regulation on own resources, as agreed on 21 April 1970 is being destroyed by this settlement, this compromise.

Secondly, this settlement does not solve any of our problems. I forecast that in 1985 we shall be faced with the same problems again.

Thirdly, the Member States are denying us, their common European organ, the power to develop further in a European way. Everyone here talks in grandiose terms about a European profile, a European identity, but as soon as money is requested for it one or the other Member State blocks the affair and this expression of intent cannot be put into practice.

May I, as a folk nationalist and federalist, say that the Member States are blocking things in two directions. Firstly at the European level, and secondly they fail to give their own regions, parts of their own nations, the finance necessary to develop their regional policy. It is nineteenth century state nationalism.

Fourthly, why ladies and gentlemen — Mrs Barbarella has already made this point before me — could we not transfer 2% of VAT to the Community immediately? Then at least the budget would be covered. There would even be a surplus and then a real chance of doing some scientific research, of promoting employment and helping the disadvantaged areas.

1986 will see the accession of Spain and Portugal. If we seriously intend to keep this appointment we must now answer for the consequences. We cannot do that with this 1%. You all know that this 1.4% must yet be ratified by the Member States and Community law. That will take at least a year and in the meantime the 1.4% will have disappeared.

Finally, Mr President, if we have a real European Community, and want a real European budget, then we must have the courage to say what is amiss in the present budget. I would first like to point to our own budget in this House. Three thousand million Belgian francs are wasted each year in the nonsense over the three seats of this institution. Secondly, we are giving rights and money to producers of butter, for example, which we ought to sell directly rather than putting into cold storage at an annual cost of thousands of millions of francs. What is the point of it all?

**Mr d'Ormesson (DR).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the Group of the European Right believes that the Community will not survive unless it adheres to its fundamental objectives. What are these? The creation of a common market, that is to say a single market in which the free movement of persons, goods and capital is guaranteed.

The Joint Declaration of 5 April 1977 strengthened the spirit and letter of the Treaty by stipulating that all the Member States are party to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms signed in Rome on 4 November 1950.

Now these freedoms have been challenged, within the Community, by the excessive nationalization that has been seen in some parts of its territory. They are under threat from outside the Community from the accentuation of Soviet pressure, characterized by the dissolution of the trade union Solidarity in Poland, which had kindled so much hope, by the extension of Soviet hegemony — with Cuba as the cat's paw — in Ethiopia and Angola, and by the invasion of Afghanistan and the deployment in East Europe of 405 SS 20 missiles, each of which has three warheads, a range of 5 000 kilometres and targeting accuracy of within 100 metres.

**d'Ormesson**

The other central feature of the Community is the common agricultural policy based on three principles: unity of prices, Community preference, and financial solidarity. This policy was adopted in response to two needs: first, to secure food supplies to the peoples of the Community; secondly, to create conditions under which it was possible for the farming community to continue populating our rural areas and make their livings there.

But now, with the exhaustion of our own resources and the ensuing political crisis, the indications are that it will not be possible to sustain what has been achieved to date unless we carry out a fundamental revision of the rules according to which funds are made available to finance it.

The prospect of a manifestly inadequate budget for 1985 creates a very disturbing situation, since it reflects the collapse of our government's European will.

In this context, and for as long as we do not have the resources needed to afford proper price guarantees to a larger number of farmers and thereby to absorb surplus production, it is more than a mistake, an error, to proclaim that the Community is to be enlarged on 1 January 1986. Enlargement, the case for which is supported by the Group of the European Right, could well have the opposite effect from that intended: dislocation of the Community. It will be retorted that these difficulties can be resolved by regulations and a transitional period, but in the present state of our legislation, that is pure fantasy. Our regulations are flouted too often or, as with quotas, they are based on rules which are unjustifiable, in the case of milk, or on rules which it is intended to render unjustifiable, in the case of wine.

For as long as we remain in this situation, we should be thinking in terms of getting back on course. New regulations are required but first of all it is necessary to have means of sanctioning abuses and other incorrect application of the rules, which are giving rise to sometimes very heated confrontations between our peoples.

To the members of the European Council I would say that, before talking about enlargement, it is necessary to establish the rules and to acquire the means of ensuring that they are applied. Granted, we have the Court of Justice. But how many months does it take to settle a dispute? Law without justice is the negation of law. In order to have justice now we must have a better balance in the financial contributions made by the various Member States.

The figures speak for themselves. In declining order, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, the Kingdom of Belgium, France and Luxembourg were the only net contributors to the common agricultural policy in 1983. Since then, the United

Kingdom and, on a lesser scale, the Federal Republic of Germany have received compensation. Some people here maintain that the reason why the British contribution is so large is that it buys a high proportion of its products from outside the Community. However, if you turn to Title 1 of the draft budget for 1985, which is of course the chapter for levies, you will find that the sum entered for the Kingdom of Belgium is 278 400 000 ECU and that for the United Kingdom 280 000 000 ECU! The focus of the crisis that we are experiencing is in fact in our institutions, in the rules for financing the Community.

I believe that this situation can be rectified only if a better balance is established in the efforts that the various Member States are called upon to make. Let us take an example. In 1982 the profits earned by the Federal Republic of Germany on industrial sales to the Community amounted to some 10 billion ECU. Five times its net contribution to the common agricultural policy. As this demonstrates, returns from industry vary extremely widely from one State to another.

It is this that has made me feel that the States' contributions should be geared to their real ability to pay. It is not enough to increase the rate of VAT contributions. Other resources must be generated for the Community, and these should be geared, for instance, to indicators of real wealth, whether agricultural or industrial. Only on this basis can new common policies be developed.

I maintain that common policies are needed for major industrial developments, especially in the fields of energy, research, transport, and defence, which is inseparable from armaments and civil defence. Our children's survival is directly dependent on this. The facts are there for all to see, and they are indisputable.

It is high time that each of our institutions appreciated the full implications of this.

*(Applause from the Right)*

**Mr Pitt (S).** — Mr President, I speak today as a member of the Committee on Budgets. In committee last Thursday I voted against the Pfennig report. I intend to do the same this afternoon and to use the few minutes at my disposal to explain to a wider audience why I shall do that.

The first reason is that I believe the report is illconceived and the second is that it is certainly ill-timed. It is very badly timed for two reasons. First, if we vote for the Pfennig report today, we shall be voting in favour of a higher level of national contributions from Member States to the common market before the national parliaments have considered that question. I think that is quite the wrong order of priorities. The second reason it is badly timed is that if we approve the Pfennig report, we shall be actually deciding that

**Pitt**

higher and higher contributions — indeed endless increases in contributions from Member States shall occur with no reference whatsoever to national parliaments after the proposed increase that is due to be put before them in the course of 1985. For those two reasons I believe that the Pfennig report is extremely ill-timed.

I believe, incidentally, that the national parliaments will take into account things which all too few speakers in this debate so far have even thought to mention. Being closer to the electors of Europe, the national parliaments will want to know, when they consider increased contributions, whether the corrective measures which need to be applied to the pattern and the shape of the European Community budget are in place and on course. I do not believe that the national parliaments will approve increased resources until they can see some improvement in the shape of the Community's budget. Secondly, I do not believe that greater contributions will be approved by the national parliaments unless they can see budgetary imbalances between the Member States being properly addressed and properly redressed.

I think that the Pfennig report is misconceived for a number of reasons. From a different political perspective Commissioner Tugendhat spoke this morning with great eloquence and with great force against the Pfennig report. I would echo his conclusions but not all of his reasoning for those conclusions. Primarily, I would agree with him that it would be absurd of this Parliament to approve a report which runs flatly counter to the agreement made at Fontainebleau. What we ought to be doing instead is holding the Council to this agreement and saying to the Member States and to their representatives in the Council: You carry out what you agreed at Fontainebleau and we, as a Parliament, will build upon the conclusions that you came to.

I believe that on the detail of the Pfennig report there are a number of serious problems for us. First, there is the cut-off point, as Lord Douro mentioned. If there is an imbalance in a budget and a corrective mechanism is agreed by the Council to put that imbalance right, then it is absolutely absurd for the Pfennig report to be proposing that there should be a time-scale for the corrective mechanism irrespective of when the imbalance is removed. Either the imbalance is an imbalance and the corrective mechanism should operate until it is no longer necessary, or the imbalance is not recognized. Many speakers in this Chamber seem not to recognize it, but the Council did, I do and I know that the electorate in Britain do. So, if for no other reason at all, I hope that people will object to the Pfennig report simply because of the three year cut-off point for Britain's 66% reduction in VAT net contributions. There are other objections too. Incidentally, the British question may be a problem for one Member State today, but in principle it could be a problem for any Member State tomorrow. So I hope that we will not

exclude something simply for that reason. My fundamental objection, however, is that we are asking here for new resources and more money without new programmes. I believe passionately that if we are to take the people of Europe with us, then we have to have good reasons, good programmes, new programmes to vote more resources.

Commissioner Tugendhat is against the Pfennig report, the Council at Fontainebleau is against the Pfennig report and I am against the Pfennig report. I do hope therefore that this Parliament won't be so foolhardy as to put itself behind the Pfennig report and once again go against the tide of public and institutional opinion in the EEC.

**Mr Mallet (PPE).** — (FR) Mr President, I should like to make three comments on the excellent, important report presented by Mr Pfennig, rapporteur for the Committee on Budgets, the main points of which meet with our approval.

The principles of financial solidarity defined in the Decision of 21 April 1970 constitute one of the keystones of the European Community. Any departure from these principles, to meet particular difficulties being experienced by certain Member States, must be of a purely transitional nature. As the report proposes, efforts should be made to resolve such difficulties within the framework of a lasting genuinely *communautaire* system of financial compensation.

My second comment is that it is clear — indeed obvious from the various declarations made by the European Commission — that an increase in own resources, specifically by the raising of the 1% VAT ceiling, is essential come what may to the normal functioning and development of the Community, and that it is needed before the end of 1985.

This decision to increase own resources should not be subject to any preconditions. In particular, I do not feel that it would be wise to create a linkage — a 'junctim' as they say in German — between the increase in own resources and enlargement of the Community. It goes without saying that when the time comes the financial implications of enlargement will have to be fully taken into account and this, I am convinced, will necessitate an increase in the uniform percentage of VAT earmarked for the Community budget to a level above the anticipated ceiling of 1.6%.

Thirdly and finally, all our governments are experiencing budgetary difficulties, as we are aware. We fully appreciate this, but we urge the Council of Ministers not to lose sight of two facts: first, that the budget of the Community corresponds to roughly 2.5% of the aggregate total of our national budgets; second and most important, that the transfer of national expenditure to the Community does not make for an increase in costs but on the contrary, as long as it is accompa-

## Mallet

nied by sound management, provides scope for economies through the elimination of duplication as a result of the improved efficiency brought by the pooling of effort.

Ladies and gentlemen, one cannot achieve one's ends without acquiring the means. That is one of the great tenets of politics. If we want the Community to be able to honour its commitments, discharge its responsibilities and meet the challenges of the future, it must be provided with the means, not merely to survive, but to live and therefore grow.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

*Vice-President*

**Mr Price (ED).** — Mr President, if Parliament adopts the amendments that have been proposed by the Committee on Budgets, does it really intend the Council to take it seriously? The amendments change most of the essential ingredients of the Fontainebleau Agreement. If Parliament's amendments are to be adopted by the Council, they might as well tear up the Fontainebleau Agreement and start again.

The Parliament has stressed in resolution after resolution before the Fontainebleau Agreement the urgency of raising the VAT ceiling. Even now there is doubt whether all the national ratification procedures will be completed in time. Does anyone seriously believe that a completely fresh agreement could be negotiated and the ratification completed by the end of 1985?

Mr President, I do not believe it is in keeping with this Parliament's aspirations for itself, which I share, for it to adopt such an unrealistic position on the basis of the Pfennig resolution.

I share some of the concerns of Mr von der Vring and Mr Langes, I regret that there are *special* provisions relating to the United Kingdom and Germany. I would much prefer that there be a general mechanism for any country facing an unacceptable situation. But we should not claim, as Mr von der Vring did, that this represents a move to *juste retour*. The United Kingdom will remain one of only two major net contributors to the Community budget. It will continue to bear a burden far greater than its proportion of the Community's wealth. The fact is that our Community budget does the opposite of what we expect of our national budgets. It is a regressive budget rather than a progressive budget, and all that the special provisions for the United Kingdom do is to mitigate the worst effects of that unfairness.

Over the last three years this Parliament has had few weapons in its many disputes with the Council of Min-

isters. The special provision for the United Kingdom has provided such a weapon. It has had the advantage that the adverse effect of using it was felt by only one Member State. That weapon has been used several times. Each time that one Member State has felt a great sense of unfairness about the Parliament's actions.

In my view, it is time for this Parliament to attempt to re-establish confidence, and that is what the link between the duration of 1.4% VAT and the UK measures provides.

I ask this Parliament to recognize that it is in the interests of the Community as a whole to re-establish this confidence. It is an essential prerequisite to making faster progress in what I see as our common purpose to build a united Europe.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — (FR) Mr President, it is now well known that the budgetary procedure is regularly exploited by the majority in this House as a means of strengthening its political powers and extending its areas of competence, more often than not beyond the scope of those conferred by the Treaties.

We for our part are not prepared to countenance this headlong rush into budgetary expansion any more than the parallel rush into institutional expansion, both of which are being used to circumvent the real problems.

However, we are fully aware how important the financing of the Community is and therefore appreciate the need for an increase in resources, since the availability of additional resources to a large extent conditions continuation of the process of European integration, but at the same time we are not prepared to see this done at the expense of the farmers.

With the exhaustion of resources as from 1984 confronting it with the need to replenish Community finances, the European Council at Fontainebleau decided to lift the 1% VAT ceiling, while at the same time perpetuating the handouts to the United Kingdom, whose pressure has once again paid off.

What the Commission is proposing to us is basically a translation of the Fontainebleau decisions into legal and regulatory terms.

We agree with some of the criticisms made by the Committee on Budgets of the proposals brought forward by the European Commission, which has failed to comply with the guidelines laid down by the European Parliament in the Arndt report of 1983, particularly as regards the *juste retour* principle and the development of common policies which, to quote the report, 'is the only means of rectifying the budgetary imbalances'. But there are other proposals in the Pfennig

### Chambeiron

nig report about which we have our reservations, where we are not actually hostile. For instance, we do not accept the inclusion of ECSC customs duties in the Community budget. We demand that they be raised, so as to afford better protection to the Community market, but insist that they must remain within the national budgets, or conceivably be incorporated into the ECSC budget.

We have no objection in principle to an increase in the VAT contributions, on condition that it is moderate, that it is modulated according to Member States' wealth by reference to GDP per capita, and above all that, contrary to what is proposed in the Pfennig report, anything above 1.4% is ratified by the national parliaments. This we consider to be an essential safeguard against the risk of budgetary expenditure being allowed to creep up, since the majority in this House is too often tempted in this direction.

We do not consider an increase in VAT contributions as the only way to find new resources. In the throes of the present budgetary crisis, we must look at every possibility. There are far too many derogations from Community preference, costing between 20 and 25 billion francs each year, and their gradual elimination would make new financial resources available while at the same time promoting the development of Community production. A first step in this direction was taken by the Commission when it proposed taxation of vegetable oils. The Council should go back to this proposal and bring it into effect.

With the twofold aim of providing finance for the Community budget and resisting pressure from the dollar, we have tabled amendments taking up a suggestion which was made by the Greek Prime Minister, Mr Papandreou, when he was President-in-Office of the Council, a suggestion to tax exports of capital above a certain maximum. We do recognize that transitional corrective measures can be made in favour of any Member State finding itself in an unacceptable situation, but we reject the notion that the existence or otherwise of an unacceptable situation should be assessed exclusively in terms of accounting data, disregarding the financial and economic advantages and the costs associated with membership of the Community.

In the light of this analysis, we maintain that it is time to put a stop to what we have called the 'blackmail by the United Kingdom' by calling a halt to the succession of unwarranted presents that it has been receiving, when it has not even refunded the 1 billion ECU overpayments for the financial years 1980 and 1981.

The House should once again make a firm stand, since otherwise we shall see still more insistent demands from the United Kingdom, and these will continue to poison the Community atmosphere, with the CAP in particular coming under fire, this on the grounds of budgetary discipline.

By way of conclusion, Mr President, I should like to offer an answer to the question that the public are justifiably asking. Additional resources for the Community budget? Very well, but for what purpose? It is not simply a matter of replenishing resources depleted by the current economic circumstances. Nor can there be any question, as far as we are concerned, of going along with the majority in this House, which each year creates new lines in the budget, the appropriations for which are often underutilized or serve merely as artificial means of effecting transfers between States; this waste, which has in fact been recognized as such by the European Court of Auditors, can be avoided by reforms in the financing machinery based on new criteria for the allocation and use of appropriations. It is therefore not simply a problem of resources but one which also depends on the degree of political will brought to bear.

One last sentence, Mr President. It is therefore possible as of now to set the Community budget on a course aimed at the objectives of economic expansion and employment, strengthening of the common commercial policy to counter the pressure from the United States, real incentives to encourage industrial cooperation, and solidarity with the poorer countries.

**Mr Wolff (L).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have only a few observations to make, since I have the impression that much if not everything has now been said.

In reality the Community budget takes account of expenditure which is designed to provide incentives and to support a number of industries, agriculture, commerce, the Regional Fund and the Social Fund. However, given this compulsory expenditure, we must find the necessary resources to cover it. For the time being it is the Member States which are advancing these resources by drawing on their own resources.

If we wish to increase the proportion met by the various Member States, they will be obliged, if they intend to balance their budgets, to increase taxation, which everyone already finds very heavy. And if we wish to attribute responsibility for a given policy to Europe, we must also transfer the necessary resources to Europe. It is quite out of the question to think that we can call upon Europe to undertake expenditure in excess of the resources that we are able to give it by way of transfer.

From what I have heard, and this opinion is shared by many of us in this Chamber, Fontainebleau was a flop, a monumental flop. Things were promised, but people expected others to pay for them. In common with an earlier speaker, I believe that it has to be appreciated that the Fontainebleau agreement needs to be reviewed.

To say that Europe is doing everything to ease the domestic policies of each of the Member States is illu-

## Wolff

sory. It is necessary to put up the money and — to repeat myself — transfer the necessary resources. Someone said earlier that it is necessary to obtain the means with which to pursue the policies proposed; it is absolutely essential. But, as we are all agreed, Europe must be built; it is worth the effort. Parliament is concerned to see harmonious progress, not disputes. But I believe that we must realize that we cannot transfer expenditure without transferring resources.

**Mr Bonde (ARC).** — (DA) Mr President, I should like to use my speaking time to address the members of the Venstre Party in this Assembly. It is in fact the party for which the majority of my compatriots vote and whose Foreign Minister and party chairman has tonight given his backing to a scheme under which my compatriots in future may expect less in returns than they have been able to get under Community arrangements in force up to now. How can Venstre go along with the fixing of ceilings to agricultural expenditure in the Community? How can they go along with the so-called budgetary discipline which, after all does not in any way mean that the intention is now to save the Community's resources? On the contrary, the intention is to save on agriculture in order that so much more can be devoted to all the other new objectives which were not in the Treaty of Rome we voted on in the 1972 Referendum. If only we had obtained some concessions in return, for example if only we had had assurances that the cutbacks in Community expenditure on agriculture would not lead to a new explosion in national support measures which the farmers would have to compete against, or merely that a number of the existing illegal support measures would be removed! Can the Venstre representatives explain what we have got from the deal concluded tonight and give the farmers a proper explanation of what they can now expect? What will be the effect of the budget ceiling on agricultural expenditure? A huge brawl between southern European and northern European agriculture. If additional Community resources cannot now be released to finance surpluses, the fight will be about whether Community money is to be used for wine lakes or butter mountains, for olive oil stores or skimmed-milk powder factories, for northern European or southern European farm products.

When Spain and Portugal come into the fold on 1 January 1986, which is still the plan, the northern European majority in the Council of Ministers will tilt in favour of those who want more support for southern European farm products. That will be the end of any increase in support for our farmers. The Community money will in future go to the even poorer farmers in southern Europe. Indeed that is not unreasonable, but it does mean the end of the Danish idea of the Community as a means of solving farmers' income problems. In 1983 Danish farm incomes were 42% of what they had been in 1972 in real terms. The Community arrangements have not provided a solution to the problems of Danish agriculture. I therefore call on the

representatives of Venstre to tell us what they intend to offer as a replacement for the Community funds which cannot be increased any further. How are the Danish farmers to adjust to the new agricultural ceiling? What are your proposals for the independent agricultural policy which must now supplement the Community arrangements or, even better as far as I am concerned, replace them?

**Mr James Elles (ED).** — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a large number of speakers in this debate have condemned the conclusions of Fontainebleau, which were the culmination of months of prolonged debate in the Council of Ministers. Despite their imperfect nature, I wish to record my support this afternoon, in general terms, for these conclusions, for two essential reasons.

First, I believe they provide a step in the right direction to enable Member States' contributions to the Community budget to be based on their ability to pay. Second, and more important, they permit the Council over the next couple of years to avoid continual discussion of the United Kingdom budgetary imbalance. Nothing over the next few years could be more debilitating for politicians and top civil servants than to continue to discuss small sums of this kind. Linking the United Kingdom abatement with the duration of the 1.4% ceiling provides a vital element of automaticity. It has, in effect, the value of a permanent solution as it becomes part, in the future, of the *acquis communautaire*.

These decisions taken at Fontainebleau reflect the reality of European politics today. I believe the Commission proposal accurately represents them. I cannot, therefore, associate myself with the Pfennig report in its criticism of the Commission's interpretation of Fontainebleau, and will thus vote against the resolution in this respect.

Nevertheless, looking to the future, Fontainebleau did provide the indicator of how to proceed in the longer term by stating that ultimately the only solution to budgetary imbalances is through expenditure policies. The idea of Fontainebleau, surely, is to encourage the development of the Community's structural policies so that, in the longer term, the British abatement will steadily be reduced. In essence, I believe that this process will be helped if the European Parliament can gradually develop its powers on the revenue-raising side of the budget and gain control over both compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure.

As the formidable Professor Hallstein commented some time ago,

'Integration is like a bicycle. You either move on or you fall off.'

As a committed European, I believe we must, therefore, support means by which the Community can

**Elles**

develop new policies. For this to happen, we must ensure that the Community has sufficient financing to undertake those initiatives, which are worthwhile for all Europeans and provide a clear value for money. In this context, budgetary discipline, I believe, must be a means to an end and not become the end in itself.

As a result, I will support the idea proposed in the Pfennig report that at least 50% of all new revenue from VAT exceeding the rate of 1.4% shall be placed in a separate fund for the sole purpose of financing Community structural policies. If, as Mr Tugendhat says, this is in conflict with other parts of the text, then the other parts of the text should be changed in conformity with this concept. Because in the final analysis, with the spectre of enlargement looming closer, and with the unknown consequences of this enlargement, particularly in terms of agricultural expenditure, the only way we can assure that we have a Community to which all Europeans will aspire is by keeping funds separately on one side to finance the policies they wish to see.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) Mr President, compared with the stance adopted by the Commission of the European Communities, the attitude of the Committee on Budgets to the matter of increasing own resources is perhaps less negative, since they do not perpetuate the rebates to the United Kingdom, but merely extend them provisionally for a further four years. Nevertheless, we representatives of the Greek Communist Party cannot be content with a 'lesser evil' logic and vote for the Pfennig report, thereby legitimising this subversion of due shares in the Community's budget, to the benefit of powers such as the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, and to the cost, among others, of our own country. We think it is entirely unacceptable to have compensatory mechanisms, rebates, contravention of the Community's established rules concerning the budget in the United Kingdom's case, while at the same time Greece, the least well developed country in the Community, is required to abide by the letter of the Community's established rules in matters such as trade, in which Greece has a continually expanding deficit.

Why, on the one hand, should there be exceptions for the United Kingdom and on the other hand continual recourse to the European Courts, enforcements and threats against Greece? Another point I would like to mention regarding the increase in own resources is the view, expressed even by the Greek Government, that an increase in own resources will result in an increase in the Community's grants to Greece. Indications are that precisely the opposite will happen. Mr Genscher categorically links the increase in own resources with the accession of Spain and Portugal. Alongside the increase in own resources we are required to implement financial discipline, a kind of severe common policy of frugality for the farming population. Besides,

the miraculous integrated Mediterranean programmes have been omitted from the Community's 1985 budget and are now postponed indefinitely.

Finally Mr President, I would like to stress that the Greek Government will have to take serious account of the fact that following the substantial rejection of its requests for exemption from certain Community regulations, and the rejection of the second stage of the Greek memorandum, it will be very problematic to increase grants to Greece.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — (GR) Mr President, the solution to the budget problem is not of course financial discipline, which ultimately makes the rich richer. At times like the present our footsteps should be guided by the principle of common solidarity, which is not a matter of ethics but possesses deep political and economic importance. This calls for the redistribution of resources on a European scale, with its main emphasis on increasing own resources to the level of 2%.

Fellow Members, we ask you what is to be done about our obligations towards the poor farmers in the South? What of our obligations regarding the financing of the major works in the Greek five-year plan, and what of the integrated Mediterranean programmes which have become linked to enlargement towards Spain and Portugal? Is the Community, in essentially abandoning them, to show such clamorous proof of untrustworthiness? And what is to become of the new policies with which the Community's future is unequivocally interwoven? We adopt Amendment No 2 by the Committee on Budgets as a sign of good faith that we are not just concerned with the problems of Greece and the other less well developed regions. We are not apathetic about unemployment in the United Kingdom, nor about the fate of the British miners, and we will vote in favour of increasing the grants made to the UK, but within a framework of implementation of common programmes and of a fair distribution of resources, and without recognizing this increase as a right that establishes any principle of fair returns.

We repeat that we support the Commission's view that own resources should be increased from 1 October 1985, effectively back-dated to 1 January 1985, and in particular we agree with the Pfennig proposed resolution to provide for the possibility of increasing VAT to 1.6% by 1 January 1988.

**Mr Spinelli (COM).** — (FR) Mr President, I shall confine myself to speaking in favour of Amendment No 16, which is concerned with only one point, but an important one, the problem of the level of VAT. It is an amendment which departs from the proposals made by the rapporteur, Mr Pfennig, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets.

**Spinelli**

The Pfennig report proposes that the maximum share of VAT reserved for the Community be raised to 1.4% and that it should remain at that level until 1988, when it would be increased to 1.6%. This request has been put forward although President Thorn has made known to the Council that the 1.4% ceiling would be reached as early as next year. Consequently, if it were adopted as it stands, Mr Pfennig's proposal would mean that the new Commission would have to operate within the straitjacket of 1.4% for three years and then 1.6% in the fourth year. The Commission would accordingly be obliged either to forswear all development of new common policies or to propose that they be financed from sources outside the budget and therefore outside the control of this Parliament. That would be quite out of keeping with the arrangements called for by Parliament in its 1981 resolution on new own resources. Parliament then proposed that the aggregate volume of resources to be transferred by the States to the Community be fixed periodically on the basis of multiannual programmes to be proposed by the Commission and approved by the Parliament and the Council. We have now come to the eve of the vote on the budget for the 1985 financial year and the vote of confidence in the Delors Commission, to which we look for more vigour, more independence, more imagination and more initiative than has been displayed by the outgoing Commission.

If Parliament intends to pursue a significant political strategy, it must begin by demanding that the Commission should, as from the beginning of its term, have the right and duty to present a four-year programme, accompanied by costings, for the policies to be implemented by the Community. It is on this basis that the budget for 1985 should be prepared. This is the purpose of my amendment.

Secondly, we should make ready to reject the budget for the 1985 financial year on the first reading, because it has not been built around any programme. The new Commission must be given the opportunity to prepare a budget geared to the requirements of its four-year programme.

Thirdly, we should be making ready to pass a vote of confidence in the new Commission, but only as long as it meets these demands from Parliament.

I hope that Parliament will take account of these considerations and vote for my amendment. Above all, I hope that the two groups which have traditionally led the field in their commitment to the construction of Europe — I refer to the Group of the European People's Party and the Italian Communist Group — will set the right example. At all events, should my amendment be rejected, I shall vote against the Pfennig motion for a resolution because it calls for a resolution of dissimulated capitulation. *'Dixi: et salva vi animam meam.'*

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — (DA) On a point of order, Mr President, I don't know whether I should laugh or

cry at the questions Mr Bonde has put to me. I will opt to take them absolutely seriously because in fact it is deeply disquieting and highly regrettable that a Member of Parliament should seek to mislead Members, just as Mr Bonde and his associates seek to mislead the Danish people. If Mr Bonde did not suffer from the frustrations by which one must inevitably be afflicted when one is not even represented in the Folketing, he would know that it is the Folketing which gives a Danish minister authority for his conduct at meetings of the Council of Ministers. I entirely agree with Mr Bonde that Venstre is a very important party in Denmark, but Venstre will be most important the day it has a majority in the Folketing, for then it will be able to apply its decent policies one hundred per cent. But truly and honestly it is paying too high a tribute to the Venstre Party to say that it is Venstre alone which has the honour — or perhaps the opposite in Mr Bonde's view — of giving a Danish minister the brief on which he is to negotiate.

In actual fact we are dealing here with an educational matter. Mr Bonde's ignorance raises a problem of education which we ought to do something about in the European Parliament.

**President.** — Mrs Nielsen, I cannot deal with pedagogical questions but I regard Mr Bonde's question as a rhetorical question which by its very nature does not call for an answer.

**Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Mr President, I particularly wanted to intervene at the end of this debate in order to answer some of the questions raised during the course of it, but also in order to reply on behalf of the Commission to some points made by Mr Langes. I hope, Mr President, you will forgive me if I say that I do very much regret the fact that Mr Langes should have seen fit to launch a somewhat personal attack on the Commission when he self-evidently was not listening to my speech. He was talking to Mr Pfennig at the time and is not here when I stand up to reply. In his absence I do none the less feel obliged to make one or two points. Perhaps Mr Pfennig would be kind enough to convey them to Mr Langes!

Mr Langes attacked the Commission for abandoning its political role and for making proposals which simply execute the agreement reached by the European Council at Fontainebleau. He suggested that this somehow represented the end of the political Commission. I really must reject this criticism most strongly. In reality the Commission has played as fully as possible its political role by making proposals and defending them during the long discussions in the Council and in the European Council, proposals which I must say are of a more audacious nature than the changes now put forward by Mr Pfennig.

### Tugendhat

Firstly, for instance, the Commission proposed a general Community procedure for increasing the VAT rate beyond 1.4% thus enhancing the role of the European Parliament in this matter. Our proposal, however, turned out not — I emphasize *not* — to receive support in this Parliament. The Arndt report quite specifically did not support our proposal to accord more authority to the Community institutions. I regret that. Nor, of course, did it receive support in the Council. It is less surprising that it did not receive support in the Council, but it is very unfortunate that it did not receive support in Parliament.

Secondly, when it became clear that a Community procedure for increasing own resources was *not* feasible, the Commission fought for an increase in the VAT ceiling from 1% to 2%. The Commission's communication and memorandum of 5 March and 15 March respectively of this year provide evidence of that. At Fontainebleau itself President Thorn, on behalf of the Commission as a whole, made a great personal effort to try to convince the Heads of State and Government, of the necessity to go beyond the 1.4% ceiling. Unfortunately, he did not succeed.

Thirdly, the Commission, in its original proposal, wanted to make a significant contribution to the problem of budgetary imbalances by the introduction of modulated VAT. That would have been a *communautaire* way forward. Again, the Heads of State and Government did not agree.

I have sought to explain the various efforts which the Commission made in order to bring about a more satisfactory outcome than was, in fact, achieved. I think that it is not unreasonable for me to expect some consideration to be paid to those efforts. However, when the agreement *was* finally reached at Fontainebleau, what was the Commission to do? We had made our own position quite clear. Contrary to what Mr Langes has said, we had fought a good fight for Community solutions put forward since. However, faced with a situation in which the 10 Heads of State and Government had reached an agreement which did provide an increase in own resources, though less than we had suggested, which did provide the opportunity for resolving other problems that — it is not too much to say — had been dominating Community life for some very considerable time and which did provide a means of resolving those problems, was the Commission to turn its back on those solutions? Was the Commission to say: No, if we cannot have everything we want, we will have nothing of what we want?

Were we to take decisions which would have meant that there could be no new 'own resources' for the foreseeable future? Were we to take decisions which would have meant that the problems which had been besetting the Community for so long were to continue? Well, there may be some people who feel that it would be better to have no new own resources; there may be some people who feel that it would be better to

continue with all the problems which have beset the Community for the last few years; but certainly the Commission does not put itself in that number. The Commission believes that, in the circumstances which arose at Fontainebleau and after Fontainebleau, the best thing for us to do was to seek to implement the Fontainebleau agreement. We had put forward our case. We had argued our case. We had sought unsuccessfully to convince Parliament and the Heads of State and Government, unsuccessfully, of the need for other means. However, when it finally came to that agreement, I think we were right to take the view we did that it ought to be implemented. I challenge anyone who thinks it ought not to be implemented to tell us where the new own resources are going to come from, how we shall receive them, and how the Community will continue.

Before I leave Mr Langes' intervention, I must make one other point. Rather to my surprise, he referred to the 10% reimbursement for the cost of collecting the Community's own resources. In my speech this morning, I did not mention that at all. It is true that an earlier draft of my intervention which was circulating did contain a reference to that, and perhaps Mr Langes was fortunate enough to read the earlier draft of my intervention that was circulating. What I actually said, however, contained no reference to that at all, and I do feel, in the light of what was said by Mr Langes, I must point out that I did not say anything on the subject to which he referred. It is always better to listen to speeches than to read preliminary texts.

I will try to take what the other speakers said in the order in which they spoke. First of all, Lord Douro said that he did not think there had been enough consultation with Parliament. I cannot agree with him either. The Commission produced a Green Paper in the spring of 1983 before any proposal on new 'own resources' was made at all. Parliament was invited to comment upon it and, indeed, subsequently gave an opinion. We then produced our proposal in May 1983. So Parliament had ample opportunity to comment on our proposals and, indeed, we adopted the rather unusual procedure — justifiable, I think, but unusual — of providing two bites at the cherry.

Mrs Barbarella asked why we had embodied some parts of Fontainebleau, if I understood her correctly, but not others. I must ask her which bits she thinks have been left out. As I said in my speech earlier. . .

*(Interruption by Mrs Barbarella: 'I did not say that')*

There are also, of course, dangers sometimes in listening to the interpretation. Unfortunately, as Mrs Barbarella knows, I do not speak Italian. In that case I will pass over that.

Mr Pasty — and I think also Mrs Barbarella though I hesitate to say so now — pointed out that 1.4% was not enough. As I said to Mr Pfennig a moment ago, in

**Tugendhat**

the Commission's original proposal we suggested a step to 1.4% and then a Community procedure for going above it, and I regret that Parliament did not support us. When we were not supported by Parliament or the Council, we then said 2%. I can, of course, agree with Mrs Barbarella and Mr Pasty that 1.4% was not by any means an ideal way to resolve these matters.

I do not know whether there were any other specific points which I ought to reply to at this stage. If any Members who feel that I have not answered points which they made — and I think, looking through this, that I have — would care to remind me of them, I will seek to provide responses in writing.

I would, in conclusion, ask Parliament to reread — always, I know, a tedious thing to do — some of the original proposals which we made, because if those proposals were re-read it would be seen that the Commission really had undertaken a massive political effort covering a very wide range of the subjects under discussion, that we had made our position quite clear on the way new 'own resources' ought to be introduced, on the extent of these resources, and the President of the Commission at the European Council made our views quite clear at the highest level. Faced then with the decision that was reached, were we right to say that that decision should be implemented, or were we wrong? I think that if we had not taken the view we did it would have been impossible to get new own resources, it would have been impossible to resolve some of the problems which have beset the life of the Community, and therefore I feel sure that the Commission took the right decision. But it must be seen against the background of everything that we did before, and I hope it will be considered against that background.

**Mr Pfennig (PPE).** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Commissioner Tugendhat's statement calls for a reply from me. I shall not go into the statement made this morning in which I feel he misrepresented some points. When he now regales us with the proposals the Commission made to Council on the increase in value added tax — either an unlimited increase or from 1 to 2%, etc. — then that is a typical example of the kind of Commission behaviour which the Parliament has always deprecated. An essential element was missing, namely that apart from the increase in VAT the Commission should also think of what policy should be realized in Europe.

Where then are the Commission's proposals for new Community tasks with the necessary finance? Has the Commission ever thought of the Community financing space travel for instance, or apart from this small Esprit programme microelectronics, genetics, etc.? Where are the Commission's proposals? Where is a simple arithmetical sum for a new European policy from the Commission which shows how much money

would be needed at European level, how much could thereby be saved at national level, to illustrate why it is advantageous to have European policies?

It is precisely this that has been missing since 1980 when the Commission took office; the European Parliament has always reproached the Commission for this, hence the unease in Parliament and Council about making unlimited finance available to the Community, as you have asked for, Mr Tugendhat.

The blame for lack of progress lies with you because you have not submitted relevant political proposals but simply kept on playing with arithmetical sums. National parliaments are simply not prepared to risk increasing own resources without transferring some tasks from the national to the European sphere because they want to know what the money is being used for, which is apparently only for financing old policies which have sometimes been deemed to have been misguided. And so here we are back where we started in 1980 when the Commission took office. It has not moved forward in this sphere. The only thing it has achieved in this period is to have brought the old policies into disrepute by mismanaging the market. That is why we shall probably refuse a discharge of the budget. I just wanted to add that so that the Commission does not get carried away with self-satisfaction.

**Mr Langes (PPE).** — (DE) Mr President, I should like to make a personal statement. I listened to Mr Tugendhat's speech this morning, and to fill myself in I reread the text distributed by the Commission at lunch time. If the Commissioner departs so abruptly from the text that he has had distributed only a few minutes earlier than I admit I made a mistake. But remember that I did not have the speech he delivered here in writing in front of me but only in my head. I apologize for that. But then the Commission should not distribute documents either which contain mistakes. The other points are political in nature. I listened to them with pleasure and serenity.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken on Thursday afternoon.<sup>1</sup>

(The sitting was suspended at 4.50 p.m. and resumed at 5.30 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

<sup>1</sup> Deadline for tabling amendments: see Minutes.

## 6. Votes

*Draft supplementary budget No 1 for 1984*

and

*Report (Doc. 2-798/84) by Mrs Scrivener, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the draft supplementary and amending budget No 1/84 of the European Communities for the 1984 financial year, drawn up by the Council on 2 October 1984 (Doc. 2-701/84)*

**Mr Arndt (S).** — (DE) Mr President, could you please advise Members to have their voting cards ready, so that we will not have problems again later on?

(Laughter)

**President.** — Mr Arndt, I am sure that all Members have heard that sensible piece of advice.

*Explanations of vote*

**Mr Pranchère (COM).** — (FR) In this debate on the 1984 supplementary budget there is one thing in particular that is of vital concern to us, and that is that we should act in such a way that the Community will honour its commitments to its farmers. The entire credibility of the EEC is at stake, as is also the income of the farmers who have already been harshly penalized this year by the imposition of quotas and by the virtual freezing of farm prices. We have already held this matter up for too long, and this supplementary budget must be adopted without delay during this session.

It is true that this is a rather scrappy sort of budget which bends the Financial Regulation at many points. However, that is not the main thing. In the course of the budgetary procedure we will be keeping a sharp weather eye open so as to counter the clever moves of those who would try to use procedural defects or conflict with the Council as pretexts to delay the adoption of the supplementary budget. It is because the Scrivener motion for a resolution leaves the door wide open to manoeuvres of this kind in the second reading that we cannot vote in favour of it. We shall abstain.

**Lord Douro (ED).** — My group was in favour of the second reading of this supplementary budget, and that is why we supported the amendments. Now, of course, a second reading will have to take place.

I felt that I ought to explain why we voted against Amendment No 6 which is the amendment which created expenditure on the line for Christmas butter.

There were two reasons why we voted against it. One was that we were informed in the Committee on Budgets that the Commission has the money available for this disposal programme and therefore did not require this amendment to spend the money. Secondly, a substantial part of that expenditure will fall in next year's budget and for that reason this amendment was imprecise. But we broadly support the amendments and we look forward to the conciliation meeting tomorrow with the Council.

(Parliament adopted the resolution contained in Mrs Scrivener's report)<sup>1</sup>

**President.** — As Question Time is scheduled to begin at 8.30 p.m. we shall now suspend the sitting.

(The sitting was suspended at 5.50 p.m. and resumed at 6.30 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR SEEFELD

*Vice-President*

## 7. Question Time

**President.** — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. 2-790/84).

We begin with the questions to the Commission.

Question No 1 by Miss Tongue (H-186/84):

Subject: Food aid — Africa

What scope or mechanism does the Commission have for adjusting the 1984 budget allocations so that any uncommitted funds for non-emergency food aid may be made available for emergency responses to the current drought and famine in Africa? If it can be done and has not been done why not?

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — The 1984 budget allocations for food aid are used for both normal and emergency actions throughout the year, depending on the urgency of the situation and the needs. There is no distinction in the budget between these two types of allocation. To date in 1984 the Community has allocated 87 000 tonnes of cereal as

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur spoke:

— in favour of Draft Amendments Nos 14 to 20 and for Proposed Modifications Nos 5 and 6/rev.;  
— against Proposed Modifications Nos 8, 9/rev. and 13/rev.

**Burke**

emergency food aid to 11 of the most affected countries of sub-Saharan Africa, in addition to the 360 000 tonnes allocated overall to Africa in the Community's normal direct-aid programme in 1984. This is an increase of 50 000 tonnes since 1983 and 100 000 tonnes since 1982. A further 60 m ECU in Community food aid is being delivered to these countries indirectly via the international and non-governmental organizations. It is possible that further emergency aid decisions will be taken before the end of the year in view of the evolution of the situation, particularly in the Sahel and the Horn of Africa.

**Miss Tongue (S).** — I would like to ask the Commissioner what response has been given to an appeal that arrived on the Commissioner's doorstep on 12 September from the Disasters Emergency Committee of the United Kingdom, a committee that comprises 5 British charities. They have formally appealed to the European Community to take a lead in according even more aid, particularly to Ethiopia, and more aid in helping to maintain and expand transportation facilities in that country to ensure that food actually gets into the mouths of those who need it most. I would like to know how the Commission has in fact responded to this appeal. If it has not done so, why not?

Could the Commission also give advice to many Members in this House who are receiving scores of letters every day whilst horrifying scenes of the extent of the famine are being shown this very evening on BBC television. Our constituents quite understandably ask the question: with approximately 8 million tonnes of surplus grain in the EEC granaries, and with only 650 000 tonnes needed to feed Ethiopia until the end of 1985, why is the EEC not releasing more of these surpluses in the form of food aid to Ethiopia?

**Mr Burke.** — In answer to the honourable Member, I would like to indicate that in addition to the material in the answer I have given, last Thursday, 18 October, the European Commission approved a further emergency aid of 10 000 tonnes of cereals for Ethiopia — that is in addition to the 18 000 tonnes that I have mentioned already. This aid will be distributed by the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Save the Children Fund, in their bases at Tigré, Wallo and Gondar — the areas where the population is most seriously affected by the drought. In addition, the Community has sent milk-powder, butter oil and vegetable oil to the Christian Relief and Development Agency, which is the coordinating body for non-governmental organizations working in Ethiopia. This aid, which is to be developed over the next two months, has a value of 3.5 m ECU.

In order to place the overall aid to Ethiopia particularly in context, I should like to point out, on behalf of the Commission, that since December 1983 the Community has supplied 116 880 tonnes of cereals to

Ethiopia and, in addition, around 30 000 tonnes of cereals have been bilaterally supplied by Member States — which adds up to a total of 146 880. I share the honourable Member's very understandable humanitarian reaction to the number of representations made — I myself have been in receipt of these — and I can assure the honourable Member of the House that the Commission has, in fact, within the limits placed upon it by the constraints of the budget and so on, done everything possible to meet this very urgent case.

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — (NL) I regret that the funds for emergency measures to combat the present drought and famine in Africa are still inadequate. However, I should like to ask the Commission a few questions in connection with this aid.

Firstly, in the matter of food aid, is sufficient attention paid to such underlying structural factors as deforestation and reforestation, single-crop agricultural systems and social injustice?

Secondly, in the matter of the implementation of the food aid programme, are the non-governmental organizations and the local communities sufficiently taken into account, for example, in the distribution of the food aid?

Thirdly, is sufficient account taken, in connection with this food aid, of the possible disturbing effects on market mechanisms, in the sense that the domestic markets in the countries concerned can be distorted by the food aid?

**Mr Burke.** — The Commission's policy in regard to these matters is carried out on the lines of two important documents, which I bring to the attention of the House, namely COM(83) 695 final, which deals with the implementation in relation to food of alternative operations in place of food aid, and another document, COM(83) 141 final, which deals with the general questions of food aid for development. A perusal of those documents would indicate that the Commission has, in fact, over the last couple of years, and particularly with the impulsion imported by the 1980 resolution of this Parliament, given a new thrust to its policy on the lines of those two documents, and I should like to indicate to the honourable Member that care is taken in these matters and that the non-governmental organizations are, in fact, involved, as I have already indicated in regard to one particular country. The whole question of how to deal with the market and so on is at the basis of the thrust of these documents to which I commend the attention of the House.

**Mr Van Miert (S).** — (NL) The Commission says that over the past years food aid has been somewhat increased. This is certainly true; nevertheless, anyone can see for himself that this food aid is insufficient when set against the tragic conditions that prevail in

**Van Miert**

various African countries. On the other hand, there is so much surplus food production in the European Community that food aid can undoubtedly be further stepped up. The Commissioner said that the Commission was considering the possibility — I think I am quoting him accurately — of further supplementary programmes for this year. I should be grateful to him if he could indicate to us already at this stage what the additional possibilities are that he has in mind.

**Mr Burke.** — Of course the honourable Member will realize that the Commission cannot go outside the limits placed upon it by the quantities placed in the budget in respect of these particular areas and within those constraints we have practically exhausted the tonnages available for the various countries. It is true that we have, in fact, increased the amount over and above 1983, and would like to do more. But in that we will have to appeal to the other budgetary arms — the Council and Parliament — in the discussion of future budgets to take heed of the humanitarian appeal of Members of this House and try and increase the amounts where necessary. I would like to indicate to the Member that we are doing practically all we can within the constraints and that very little remains. In regard to Ethiopia, we have already increased by another 10 000 tonnes the amount being allocated to that country.

**Mr Kuijpers (ARC).** — (NL) First of all I should like to draw attention to the actual situation in Ethiopia. It is perhaps common knowledge that for the past 21 years there has been a struggle going on in Ethiopia in which Eritrea, which should have been made an independent State, has been oppressed by the regime in Addis Ababa. I would point out to the Commissioner that I was able to verify by on-the-spot observation that of the food aid — which has, in fact, been increased — very little, if any, is getting to Eritrea.

Secondly, we were able to establish on the spot that the food aid was being used to pay off paramilitary organizations being led by the Soviet 'advisors' in Ethiopia. That brings me to my question, which is a very direct one: Should the food aid being given by our Community be used for the oppression of peoples in Africa? My second equally practical question is: Can the Commissioner inform me whether he is having the implementation of the food aid programme monitored on a continuous basis and, if so, how and by whom this supervision is being carried out? Can he also assure me that in future this food aid will be administered by non-governmental organizations such as the churches first and foremost, the Red Cross and the other aid organizations that are there for that specific purpose and are not politically committed in any way? Only if this is done can we speak of genuine food aid.

**President.** — Our Rules of Procedure provide that each questioner may only put one supplementary

question on each question. You are trying to circumvent this by putting three questions.

**Mr Burke.** — The main point is the following: while one is aware of the extra factors brought to light by the last questioner, the policy of the Commission and the Community in regard to food aid is based solely on humanitarian considerations. Secondly, I can assure the House that there is continuous monitoring of where this food aid goes. And, finally, I have already stated in my reply that organizations which I have named are, in fact, the channel through which this aid is channelled in Ethiopia.

**Mr Prag (ED).** — It is very difficult from the piecemeal figures and information given by the Commission to know exactly what is the effect of its help and of Community help in Africa. Can the Commission state that in conjunction with the Member States the steps it is taking will use the large surplus of grain now in Community granaries to stop people dying of hunger in Africa, and is it impressing on the Member States the need to go beyond what was agreed in 1983?

**Mr Burke.** — The context of the cereal food aid programme is the Food Aid Convention of 1980, as updated by subsequent protocols. In that the contributions of various named countries, including the European Community and its Member States, is indicated. I can say that between them the Member States and the Community give the second highest amount of aid in cereals. The only other country which has a higher total figure is, of course, the United States.

It is possible, of course, to spend a lot of time giving a lot of details, but my main purpose here this evening is to say that within the constraints on the Community and on the Commission, we have done as much as we can for these countries, particularly those of sub-Saharan Africa, and I think a total figure of about 448 000 tonnes will be allocated in 1984. This may not be enough, but at least it is as much as can be done within the constraints placed upon the Community and the Commission.

**Mr Andrews (RDE).** — First of all I want to say to the Commissioner that I deeply regret that he will not be with us next year, and I want to thank him for his services to the Community. He and I entered politics many years ago in the same constituency.

I just want to ask the Commissioner if and when he returns to domestic politics, he will be able to explain to the people why we were paying to store grain and other food items and, at the same time, cannot supply sufficient food to Africa. We have a situation now where one in three Africans is threatened with starvation while at the same time Europe is rich in food and technology and other items that could provide assist-

**Andrews**

ance quite easily and quite simply if we cut out the bureaucracy.

I want to ask the Commissioner if he would not address himself to the problem. He has heard from all the Members of this House, from all sides of this House — the right, the left and the centre — a plea to stop the nonsense and send the food to where it is needed so that people can be saved from the agony of starvation. And just let me remind you, Commissioner and Members of this House, that we in Europe have suffered and we have an obligation and unless that obligation is met by this Community, the people will find us more and more irrelevant.

**Mr Burke.** — First of all I thank the honourable Member for his personal comments. Secondly, I indicate to him that within the Commission, in this House, within the Community and indeed in any other post I may hold later on, I shall do exactly as he says, that is, to try and draw the attention of public authorities everywhere to the scale of this need and hope that something increasingly efficient may be done about it in the future.

**Mr James Elles (ED).** — Mr President, on a point of order I should like to just draw the attention of the House to the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-850/84) on emergency food aid to Ethiopia and African countries of the Sahel tabled by the European Democratic Group and the European People's Party. In this resolution there is a specific suggestion on how to deal with this problem and I hope the House will adopt this when it comes up for urgent debate on Thursday.

**President.** — We shall do so at the appropriate time.

Question No 2 by Mrs Dury (H-175/84):

Subject: Selection of projects financed through the European Social Fund

The guidelines for laying down Social Fund priorities are well known. However, in view of the larger number of applications for funds which fulfil the criteria for priority, could the Commission state the actual criteria which determine which projects are selected for financing and how it intends to avoid making arbitrary decisions?

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — The honourable Member is quite correct in assuming that a large volume of Social Fund applications complied with the priorities set out in the guidelines for the management of the fund. Section 6 of the guidelines defines the procedures to be followed when available appropriations are insufficient to finance in full all the applications classified as priority.

May I just say to the honourable Member too that, in the Commission's view there is nothing arbitrary about

the procedures. The guidelines, we think, are fairly specific and we have endeavoured to the best of our ability to operate those guidelines as successfully as we can.

**Mrs Dury (S).** — (FR) The Commissioner is, of course, right when he says that there are certain well-defined guidelines that help the Commission to decide which projects must get financial backing.

The question I wanted to ask was this. Which criteria are, in fact, used when the Commission has on its desk a number of projects all of which comply with these guidelines?

**Mr Richard.** — The point raised by the honourable Member concerns the difficulty caused very simply by the fact that there are many more applications which qualify with a priority label on them for the Social Fund than there is money in the Social Fund to meet all those applications. The only way one can deal with this difficulty is to have some guidelines enabling a weighted reduction of the applications made.

As far as the applications coming from the super-priority regions are concerned, there is a linear reduction. I do not think there are any great problems as far as those are concerned. It is the weighted reduction ones that the honourable Member is concerned about.

The best thing I can do is to refer her to the terms of the guidelines themselves. What we have said is that the Commission, after consulting the Member States, will select the applications relating to operational areas to be fully financed — in other words, where the weighted-reduction procedure should not apply. At the same time account will be taken of those cases — and this, I think, is the answer to the honourable lady's question — where Community assistance is of particular importance to the carrying out of the operations and also to the promotion of new operations. In regard to the choice of areas, the Commission shall take account of particularly severe regional employment imbalances.

So, if I can put it in a sentence, what we try and do is to preserve full financing, in a situation where money is short, for those operations where Community money is really important to the carrying out of the operation or where it is new or where the particular area concerned is one where there is a severe regional imbalance.

Those are the guidelines upon which we operate, and I must say to the House that I do not really see what others we could use. They are sensible ones, drawn up after a certain amount of pain and difficulty. If the House wishes to change those guidelines, then, of course, it will have an opportunity to do so with regard to 1986.

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — (NL) I should like to ask the Commissioner what attention the Commission pays, in applying the Social Fund criteria, to the tragic situation of the mining areas of Europe. To what extent is the Belgian province of Limburg, which has enormous regional imbalances, ranked amongst the priority areas? It has 20 000 miners in really dire straits and 35% of the young people are unemployed.

**Mr Richard.** — I would not wish to evade any question that was put to me by an honourable gentleman — or lady for that matter — but it really does seem to me that if at this rostrum I am asked specific questions about specific constituency points in specific constituency areas, then I am perfectly certain that every parliamentarian in this House could produce some examples from somewhere in his constituency where he felt that the Social Fund was not paying sufficient attention. The only answer I can give in specific terms to the honourable gentleman is that if he thinks we are not paying sufficient attention to a particular part of his constituency and if he would be kind enough to write to me giving me the details of why and how he thinks it is insufficient, I would be delighted to have a look at it personally and send him a reply.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — (NL) I might perhaps say straightaway to Mr Ulburghs that his province is classed amongst the Social Fund priority areas. I cannot understand therefore why he had to put that question.

I have heard from a number of areas that they have received no money as yet for this year's projects, even though the said projects were all approved in August and should therefore have been financed as from August. I should like to know therefore from the Commission what the position is at the moment with regard to the financing of projects for 1984, whether all advances have been paid or whether perhaps it is a question, as I have heard reported, of the till being empty? At least that is what I have been told by some government departments.

**Mr Richard.** — I could wish that the honourable lady had raised this point specifically with me rather than just in a general way at Question Time. My recollection is that most of the difficulties in relation to some of the payments in 1984 have been ironed out and that when the final *tranche* of payments for 1984 has been made — it will be made shortly — that should deal with many of the problems that have been raised.

**Mr Newens (S).** — In view of the fact that there are some urban areas like Inner London which do not qualify for regional aid but which have sections of the population more deeply afflicted by poverty than in many areas that do so qualify, could the Commissioner tell us what efforts are made to see that inner

city areas such as those I have referred to get adequate consideration? Could he tell us whether in the case of Inner London he considers the position satisfactory at the present time?

**Mr Richard.** — In my view, the position as far as the inner cities are concerned is certainly not satisfactory at the present time. There are two difficulties which, if I may, I will put to the honourable Member.

We are bound, to a very large extent, by national regional classifications. As far as Inner London is concerned, according to the British Government, it is not deemed to be an area of deprivation or of poverty. It is therefore not an assisted area within the definitions applied by Her Majesty's Government. In that event, it is not possible for us in the Social Fund to open the doors for Inner London to the extent that we can open the doors, say, for Manchester or for Liverpool.

I, personally, regret this, because I think that the problems of Inner London and the other inner cities are such that Social Fund availability should be greater than it in fact is. However, that is the problem.

What I have tried to do about it is to extract from the old Social Fund, in the review which took place a few years ago, a number of actions which local authorities — or indeed in some cases even non-governmental organizations — can take which hitherto would have been subject but which now are no longer subject to that regional classification.

In a few words, while the door is by no means wide open as far as the inner cities are concerned, it is now more open than it was three years ago and I hope that, in due course, it may be opened still further.

**Mr Elliott (S).** — I should like to follow the question from my colleague, Mr Newens. Is the Commissioner aware, when we talk about priority area classifications, of the strong representations being made by the Greater London Council which covers the area of which Mr Newens and myself and a number of others represent to the effect that the proposal to classify London as a single area is bound to mean that it will not meet the priority criteria, and that London should be — as we understand Paris is being — divided into a number of separate areas? We fail to understand why it is that the capital city of Paris can be divided up into a number of areas and yet London cannot. There are many parts of London which are in serious need of aid because of the very high degree of poverty, unemployment, social deprivation, bad housing, and so forth. Is the Commissioner aware of these representations and what does he feel might be done about it?

**Mr Richard.** — Very briefly, in answer to the honourable gentleman, yes I am aware of the problem, yes I am aware of the representations, yes I hope that the

**Richard**

classifications will change. Frankly, I do not think the Commission can go further than that.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — On a point of order, Mr President. I thought there was a convention that only one person from each group would ask a supplementary question. This group has asked two already.

**President.** — I shall bear that in mind in future.

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC).** — *(NL)* I find it very odd that the Commissioner had no apposite comment to make in reply to the question put by Mrs Maij-Weggen, which was after all a very important one. I too have heard reports of delays in making payments. I should like to know therefore whether there is, in fact, a time-lag in payments for the projects in question. If so, what is the reason for this? I should be very grateful for a serious answer from the Commissioner to this question.

**Mr Richard.** — The short answer is there are three reasons. First of all, this is the first full year we have been operating under the new guidelines and therefore, obviously, it takes time to work its way through. Secondly, the volume of applications this year has been very considerably up on last year. Thirdly, in order to safeguard the position under the guidelines, it is necessary for us, when we are applying a weighted reduction, to do so in accordance with the principles that I put in the answer to the question raised by Mrs Dury. That inevitably takes time, and I regret I do not have more staff in the administration of the Social Fund to do things more quickly. We are doing our best. We hope we will iron it out by the time the final *tranche* of 1984 comes.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, can you tell me what rules in the Rules of Procedure are used to justify the procedure followed in Question Time whereby only one person from each group may speak to each question? I have not been able to find anything in the Rules to support this.

**President.** — Mrs Van den Heuvel, it is not laid down in the Rules of Procedure, but it is in keeping with the practice which has hitherto been generally followed. You will have noted that I have applied this Rule very generously, and I intend to continue to do so. If, however, every Member of the larger groups wishes to speak now it will be impossible to do so. I have therefore exercised my authority to curtail or to refuse to accept requests to speak. I would therefore ask you help me in this and to put your question as concisely as possible.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to suggest that you take advantage of this opportunity

to submit to the Bureau the question of whether Question Times ought not to be extended.

**President.** — I have noted your suggestion and shall discuss it with my colleagues in the Bureau.

Question No 3 by Mr Barrett (H-177/84)

Subject: Regional Fund payments

Under the terms of the new Regional Fund will the Commission indicate to what extent direct payments to local authorities will be made possible in Ireland?

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — According to Article 26(3) of Council Regulation (EEC) 1787/84 of 19 June 1984 on the European Regional Development Fund which will enter into force on 1 January 1985, the Commission shall make the payments to the Member State or a body designated for this purpose by the Member State. Consequently, direct payments to Irish local authorities are subject to a request from the Irish Government.

**Mr Barrett (RDE).** — I would like to ask the Commissioner in how many Member States payments are made directly to local authorities and individual applicants, and also, if the Commission itself favours direct payments to individual applicants and local authorities, and if it is less expensive to administer the particular payments from the Regional Fund when applications are received directly from the applicants and payments made directly to the applicants rather than payments through the national government?

**Mr Richard.** — Dealing with the last point first because, with respect, I think it is probably the most important of the questions that Mr Barrett asked me, it really does seem to me that the question of whether payments are made direct to local authorities or not is essentially a matter for the Member State. If the Member State wishes Regional Fund payments to be administered in such a way that the money goes directly to local authorities rather than to the central government, then they will no doubt tell us, as they are entitled to.

I have to say that in relation to Ireland no such request and no such designation has been made by the Irish authorities and all payments to Ireland are therefore made to the Department of Finance. I do not think it is for me to speak on the advisability or otherwise of the Regional Fund entering into direct relationship with the local authority. I would only say in relation to the Social Fund, because it is partly the same question and the same issues that arise, that I am not only pleased; I am indeed anxious that more local authorities should have direct links with Brussels. Very frequently one finds that local authorities know the problems in their area rather better than central govern-

**Richard**

ment does. One finds that very frequently local authorities have their own schemes, their own ideas for dealing with those problems. Very frequently one finds — and it is extremely important when we have not got very much money in the Regional Fund or the Social Fund anyway — that the money we can put in is genuine seed money and genuine fresh money and therefore it means the difference between a project surviving or a project dying. Therefore, in principle I certainly, as far as the Social Fund is concerned, am in favour of this direct linkage. The one qualification I would make is that patterns of local government differ very much in the 10 Member States and what may be applicable to, say, the United Kingdom or Ireland may not necessarily be applicable in France, Denmark, Belgium or the Federal Republic of Germany.

**Mr Howell (ED).** — Is the Commissioner aware that there is a growing disparity between the criteria laid down by national governments for what will and will not be regionally assisted areas? As a result of that difference in criteria, we are facing many examples where firms are locating in one area rather than another specifically because the regional aid that they can attract is higher in one country than in another. Is the Commissioner, for instance, aware that Laura Ashley — a very prominent company in the Welsh valleys — is currently considering moving to Holland specifically because it gets a higher rate of regional and social assistance in Holland than it does in the Welsh hills?

Understanding, as the Commissioner will, that the rate of unemployment in Wales is very much higher than Holland, how can he possibly justify such a situation?

**Mr Richard.** — If I may so, that was a good raft of questions. Perhaps I can try and extract a theme from among them which I can legitimately answer.

Of course there are differences in the regional policies of the 10 Member States. And of course, since we have free movement — and it is right that we should — it is up to an individual or a manufacturer or a company to decide where in the Community it wishes to locate. I would be very reluctant indeed to see the Commission pursuing policies in the name, if you like, of regional harmonization which have a major effect in slowing down the process of genuine freedom of movement from one country to another country.

I was interested to hear what Mr Howell said about Laura Ashley. The only thing I have read about Laura Ashley recently is that she is opening up in Japan. I am happy to say that the Commission has no competence or authority to do anything about the Japanese market.

Question No 4 by Mr Fitzsimons (H-179/84):

Subject: Dublin/Belfast gas deal

In view of the fact that the Commission expressed its pleasure last March in the European Parliament at the agreement to make natural gas from the Kinsale field in the South of Ireland available to industry and domestic consumers in Northern Ireland and since the British Government has subsequently called off the deal which would have had significant implications for North/South economic and social relations, will the Commission indicate what steps, if any, it can take to relaunch this vital deal?

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — As the Commission indicated in its communication, Review of Member States Energy Policies, Doc. COM 84/88 final of 29 February 1984, and I quote

‘Transnational gas and electricity interconnections make an important contribution to the economics of operation and the security of supply in other Member States. The possible benefits of interconnections for Ireland should be examined further.’

The original agreement was considered a welcome development in the expansion of the Community gas infrastructure. The Commission, however, has no direct influence on the negotiation of such contracts which are essentially the concern of the Member States’ governments and/or their respective gas transmission companies. The Commission would hope that the opportunity for a further review of the situation may present itself to the parties involved in the near future.

**Mr Fitzsimons (RDE).** — I appreciate the Commissioner’s reply, but it would seem to me that the Commission has still a function here to do everything possible to have this deal resurrected in view of the fact that it is the flag ship of North/South economic and social relations, and that the collapse of the gas industry in Northern Ireland will cost the exchequer £ 100 million plus approximately 1 200 jobs.

Would the Commission not think that it should exhort the Taoiseach as President-in-Office of the Council to resume negotiations with Mrs Thatcher to put the deal back on the table?

**Mr Burke.** — The Commission has expressed its interest in this matter, both in the way I have described to you by quoting from a paper on energy projects and also in Vice-President Natali’s statement to the House last March. But, as I have indicated to the honourable Member, the Commission feels that it is not itself directly a part of this, and apart from drawing attention — as the House is now doing — to the desirability of a review of the situation, the Commission does not feel — and I personally do not feel — entitled to go any further than to say that this seems on the face of it for the reasons given to be a desirable project and

**Burke**

I hope that the parties may be able to come to some arrangement in the future.

**Mr Hume (S).** — Would the Commissioner agree that the news of the fact that the Northern Ireland authorities had reneged on the Kinsale gas deal with the Irish authorities was greeted with a great deal of dismay in Northern Ireland because of the job loss involved in the gas industry? Further, could he tell us whether the British Government has explained to the Commission its reasons for reneging on this deal? Thirdly, could he tell us whether the British Government has made alternative proposals to the Commission to safeguard the gas industry in Northern Ireland and take advantage of the generous offer of assistance that the Commission has made to protect and develop that industry?

**Mr Burke.** — I am aware of the various statements made by Ministers on both sides, particularly the statements of Mr Adam Butler, Minister of State at the time, and the Tánaiste or Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic, Mr Spring.

That the Commission should pronounce on whether it was right or wrong to do this would, I think, be asking the Commission to go beyond what is usually expected of it. The Commission notes the various statements made by the gas industry and other interests and has expressed its interest in seeing the deal put back on the rails again. As far as I am aware, though I am not in a position to say for certain, the UK Government has not explained the reasons behind this, apart from the public statement made by the Minister in question.

As to alternative proposals, apart from the general indication over a number of years that alternative linkages for the gas situation in Northern Ireland, particularly links with Scotland and so on, are being discussed generally from time to time, I am not aware that there are any alternative proposals suggested by the UK Government in the matter.

**Mr Taylor (ED).** — Is the Commissioner aware that not only has the British Government rejected this proposed supply of gas from the Irish Republic but it was also rejected last week by the elected representatives of the people of Northern Ireland, the Northern Ireland Assembly, simply because this gas supply is too costly?

Should an alternative source of gas from Scotland become available as a viable source for Northern Ireland, would the Commission give similar sympathetic consideration and support to that project?

**Mr Burke.** — I am quite sure that the Commission would examine any reasonable proposition brought forward. Speaking purely personally, however, it seems to me that the amount of money involved in

getting an alternative source of supply might make it more difficult than the original proposal which we are now discussing.

**President.** — Question No 5 by Mr Andrews (H-180/84):

Subject: Drug trial controls

Does the Commission believe that the health of people participating in drug trials in the Member States of the Community would be better protected if common rules were applied *re* level of dosage and the number of persons to be involved in trials and does the Commission intend to consider the introduction of such controls?

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — Clinical trials conducted on a limited number of individuals under strict medical supervision constitute a valuable and a necessary stage in pharmaceutical research. The appropriate number of subjects or doses cannot be determined in advance, since all scientific experiments have to be adapted in line with the treatment in question. The principles for the conduct of and the methodology applicable to the clinical trials of medicinal products are set out in Part III of the Annex to Council Directive 75/318/EEC, as amended by Directive 83/570/EEC. This directive provides in particular that no trial may be performed on humans until the results of sufficient prior pharmacological and toxicological trials have been notified to the clinician concerned. It provides, too, that trials must not be carried out in opposition to commonly accepted principles of medical ethics. These provisions are also contained in the Helsinki Declaration.

Clinical trials are regulated in the Member States by a system of authorization or prior notification to the national authorities. This control was recently reinforced by the creation on a general basis of local ethical committees consisting of members of the profession and an independent representative. For its part, the Commission has just sent the Council a proposal for a recommendation on the testing of proprietary medicinal products which contain some dozen explanatory notes on clinical trials. These explanatory notes, which were drawn up in the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products, are intended to improve the quality of clinical trials. Support for this activity is provided by the clinical trials project developed under the Community programme in the field of medical and public health research.

**Mr Andrews (RDE).** — The Commissioner will be aware that recently in Ireland a young man died as a result of drug trials and overdosage. He is obviously aware that this kind of trials has been banned in Britain, Switzerland and other European countries. In view of the anxiety and even horror felt by people at

**Andrews**

vivisection and the conduct of experiments on animals, would the Commissioner agree that there is a need to draw up regulations to stop this in the European Community?

**Mr Richard.** — Trials of this sort are bound to raise difficult questions — medical, social, legal and perhaps even moral and ethical as well. I totally accept that. The role of the Commission in, so to speak, entering into this difficult field is, I think, necessarily limited. Within the competence that we have got — as I endeavoured to set out in the answer, and I apologize for its length, but it seemed to me important that what the Commission has done in this should be on the table — I think we have gone quite a long way to try and make sure that such trials as are conducted, are conducted under conditions which are as safe as possible, with safeguards built into the procedures in the way that I have outlined so as to make them as safe and as reasonably acceptable to people as we can.

**Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED).** — Can the Commission tell us if such trials involve narcotics? Can the Commission also say how much duplication is taking place which could be avoided by setting up a common data base on work performed and results achieved?

**Mr Richard.** — The short answer to both the questions is, I am afraid, 'not without notice'. But if I am given notice then, of course, the Commission will provide the answer.

**Mrs Banotti (PPE).** — Mr Andrews referred to the tragic case in Dublin in which a young man died some months ago. The subsequent court case found that he did not die of an overdose but rather of the interaction between two mutually antagonistic drugs. It was not an overdose; and that is the basis of my supplementary. Would the Commission not agree that although free and informed consent must remain the ideal objective for all research involving human subjects, the capacity of schizophrenic, severely depressed or mentally defective patients is inevitably compromised and often completely lacking? Would he not agree that where drug trials are carried out in such circumstances, it should be mandatory to seek the opinion of a second clinician and the consent of the legal guardian of vulnerable individuals of this sort since, regrettably, the subjects used in such tests are often taken from the vulnerable sections of the community?

**Mr Richard.** — I do not think I could really accept a number of the factual assumptions upon which the question is based. If the situation is as the honourable lady described, clearly there would be cause for disquiet and cause for concern. But I must say, as I said in the original answer, there are a number of safeguards which are now built into the procedures in the

Member States. We have set up — as again I said — a monitoring committee which is going to look at this. I really do not see how very much further down this particular road the Commission can go at this stage. If there are specific instances of the sort that the honourable lady has referred to in general terms here, naturally the Commission would like to know of them.

**President.** — Question No 6 by Mrs Lemass (H-182/84):

Subject: New integrated development operation for Dublin

Will the Commission take immediate steps to initiate aid for a new integrated development operation for Dublin under the heading already provided for in the general budget of the European Communities in view of the major unemployment and infrastructural crises affecting the city?

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — The Commission is aware of the serious social and economic problems in Dublin. It is always prepared to consider jointly with the national and local authorities in Ireland any proposals for the improvement of the situation in Dublin. Such joint consultation may be within the context of an integrated operation for the area or within the framework of existing aid, whichever approach offers the greater benefit to Dublin. However, whilst some formal discussions have been held between the Commission and regional authorities in Ireland about the future development of the Dublin area, including the possibility of an integrated operations feasibility study, the Commission is not yet in a position to make formal proposals to the Council for utilization of the special budget line for Dublin due to reservations on the part of the Irish national authorities as to the benefits of the integrated approach.

**Mrs Lemass (RDE).** — Would the Commissioner not agree that it is highly regrettable that the budget line which specifically mentioned Dublin in relation to an integrated development plan should have been deleted, and that it is particularly regrettable that this should have happened during the Irish presidency? Would the Commission recommend that the Irish authorities — and I think this is what he has said — make a formal application for funds to carry out a feasibility study, and would the Commission say that should such a study be done it would improve the chances of Dublin being favourably considered as a candidate for such an integrated development operation? I would just like to ask the Commissioner if he recommends the feasibility study, and if that is done, would we have a better chance of having Dublin as a candidate for an integrated development operation?

**Mr Richard.** — I think I can answer the honourable lady's question quite simply, and it is without, if I may

**Richard**

so, giving in to the temptation to follow her down some of the roads which were perhaps implicit in the way in which she put her question. I think I can say this: the Commission has taken a generally favourable line throughout the discussions about the possibility of an integrated operations feasibility study for the Dublin area. It is very much a matter, I think, for the authorities in Ireland to decide whether that is a procedure that they wish to explore further. If they do, then the Commission will be anxious and, indeed, perfectly ready and willing to explore that possibility with the Irish authorities. I have seen nothing which leads me to take the view that the generally favourable line throughout the discussions which the Commission then took has changed.

**Mr Andrews (RDE).** — I want first of all to thank Mrs Lemass for tabling this question, for it is something that we have been very anxious about, and to thank the Commissioner for his forthright reply which puts the blame, as I see it — and he can correct me if I am wrong — squarely with the national governments for not pursuing this matter.

**Mr Richard.** — It is not the job of the Commission to apportion blame as between governments and opposition. All I have done is indicate to the House, as is in fact the case, that at the moment, the integrated operations road does not seem to be one down which the Irish Government is anxious to go at a reasonably fast pace. Whether, in the Irish context, they are right or whether they are wrong in taking that view is certainly not for me to decide. It is essentially a matter for the government, the opposition and, indeed, for the people of Ireland.

**Mr Taylor (ED).** — Would the Commissioner agree that an integrated operation is more a means of providing greater cooperation between the existing Community funds and does not necessarily mean additional funds for a country?

**Mr Richard.** — I do not think it is an either/or issue, as the honourable gentleman puts it, but there is no doubt whatsoever that an integrated operation — indeed it is implicit in the title — among other things is designed to integrate the operation in relation to a particular area whether it be a city or whether it be a part of the Community. So certainly it has a very strong element of coordination of existing effort, as there must be, indeed, in any form of integrated operation.

**President.** — Question No 7 by Mr Debatisse (H-210/84):

Subject: Offences and complaints

Could the Commission indicate the percentage share of each Member State in the offences noti-

fied and complaints lodged during the first seven months of 1984?

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — I will send the honourable Member and Parliament's Secretariat summary tables for the first seven months of 1984 showing the number of complaints registered by the Commission and broken down by Member State, and the infringement procedures initiated and in progress over the same period. Though the figures have increased, it is too early to draw any meaningful conclusions and I would ask the honourable Member to wait for the second report to Parliament on progress in the application of Community law by the Member States, which will cover the whole of 1984 and will, I believe, be submitted to the House during the first quarter of 1985.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — (NL) At a recent congress in the Netherlands on European environmental questions, an official of the European Commission said that there was a substantial time-lag in the Netherlands in relation to the implementation of environmental directives. The number of directives in question was, in fact, 18. The congress was also told that in not a single case had infringement procedures been initiated, even though for some of these directives the time elapsed amounted to, I think, 4½ years. Can the Commission tell us when it does, in fact, initiate infringement procedures? Should these procedures not get underway as soon as the deadline for implementation has passed and as soon as it becomes clear that the Member State has not enacted legislation on the basis of the directive? I find it a little too much that these 18 environmental directives are there and that nothing is being done about them.

**Mr Burke.** — I have no personal knowledge of the statement allegedly made by a member of the Commission's services in regard to any particular area of activity of the Community. Since an attempt to pursue these matters with only seven months of the year passed would be less than totally satisfactory, I would respectfully ask Mrs Maij-Weggen to take the same view as Mr Debatisse and to await the publication of the full report so that a balanced, overall picture can be obtained of the situation.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Mr President, in the light of your strict but none the less very fair ruling on the number of supplementary questions to be allowed, I should like to ask you once again to give serious thought to the question of whether such an important item as Question Time, with its spontaneous contributions by Members of Parliament and Members of the Commission, cannot be extended.

Having said that, I should like to ask the Commissioner this question. Can he assure me that in future

**Rogalla**

the statistics requested will be furnished by the Commission every six months without its having to be asked for them, and could these statistics include a breakdown by various sectors so that in cases of violation of the Treaty the culprits can as often as possible be specifically identified?

**President.** — Mr Rogalla, I apply the Rules correctly, not strictly.

**Mr Burke.** — I have noted what the honourable Member said about the desirability, in his view, of a more frequent approach to this matter. Nevertheless, if I may briefly draw the attention of the House to the first annual report to the European Parliament on Commission monitoring of the application of Community law, I find that the resolution adopted by the European Parliament in February 1983 requests that a report be submitted annually. Until that is changed by Parliament as a whole, I think it would be unwise of the Commission to give anything other than a general answer of this nature. If it is changed the Commission will then consider the position.

**President.** — Question No 8 by Mr Simmonds (H-211/84):

Subject: Conference on trade in violent and pornographic video cassettes

What action has the Commission taken to call a conference of the relevant bodies from Member States to discuss common action on the trade in violent and pornographic video cassettes? This conference was called for by Parliament through my resolution in May.

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — (DE) First of all the Commission would like to put on record its express approval of the stated objective of Parliament's resolution of 24 May 1984, which was to bring under strict control and, where necessary, to prohibit the production and sale of violent and pornographic video films. It agrees with the desirability of consistent and uniform provisions at Community level on this whole matter.

An initial preliminary examination of the legal position in this regard, however, has convinced the Commission that there will be considerable difficulty in enacting uniform and consistent provisions of this kind on the basis of the EEC Treaty. The point is that it could possibly require the harmonization or even the enactment of penal sanctions in this entire area, whereas the EEC Treaty affords no direct legal ground for doing so. Furthermore, the differing sociological attitudes prevailing in the Member States could make it extremely difficult in practice to arrive at common binding criteria for determining whether all the various matters that lie in the inevitable grey areas can be

categorized as pornographic or as lending themselves to the glorification of violence. In view of the importance of this whole topic and of the need to find suitable solutions, the Commission would like to suggest that this might be a suitable occasion for a public hearing of the European Parliament or of its committee responsible, which could lead to the establishment of a Community-wide consensus on this matter. Notwithstanding a shortage of staff, the Commission will, for its part, make every effort to organize a meeting with the competent authorities and with experts from the Member States in order to work out preliminary solutions that will be, from a legal point of view, feasible and above all practical.

**Mr Simmonds (ED).** — Will the Commissioner accept my thanks for his support for my cause? Will he also accept my expression of dismay that it was only because I tabled this question that I have been able to get any response from the Commission to the resolution which was passed by Parliament back in May? I am a little concerned that we should have to resort to this method to get reports on Community action and reports particularly to the effect that the Commission now has doubts as to the Community's competence in this field. However, will he accept that I am extremely grateful for his suggestion of a hearing and also the offer of Commission help in this field? I will leave it to one of my colleagues to ask a further question.

**President.** — That has no direct connection with Question Time, it is of course pleasant to hear that someone is pleased when you answer.

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) I am grateful for both these comments. I share the concern of the honourable Member, but I must make the point once again that there are serious legal doubts as to whether the Community can in any way claim competence in the field of penal law or in the grey areas that lie between penal law and commercial law. That is disputed by some Member States in this context.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — Maybe I can shock the Commissioner into more action. Is he aware of the current case in Britain where a shopkeeper is alleged to have had his toe cut off and put in his mouth, and worse done to his wife in imitation of an actual video tape? And is he aware of the terrible scenes of cruelty to animals on these videos? Does he not see this as pointing to a need for more urgent action? What he says is far too leisurely.

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) My reply must fall into three parts.

1. I had not heard of the case referred to in Britain and I am not familiar with any English video horror films or anything of that kind.

### Narjes

2. The legal position is, unfortunately, exactly as I have outlined it.

3. I have made it clear that I share all the misgivings and all the unease that have been expressed on this matter. I must also point out in this connection that, as the law stands at present, Article 36 of the EEC Treaty clearly affords the possibility of withdrawing from circulation, where necessary, imported films of this kind and prohibiting their importation, provided the conditions laid down on numerous occasions by the European Court of Justice in respect of the applicability of Article 36 are complied with.

**Mr Habsburg (PPE).** — (DE) I should like first of all to add my thanks to those being proffered to the Commissioner from all sides. His answers are usually very informative.

In recent times I have received a large number of letters from people in the German customs service complaining bitterly about the pornography coming into Germany on video cassettes and asking whether the Community could not take decisive action as quickly as possible to clamp down on these cross-border operations.

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) I must refer to my last answer. Article 36 of the EEC Treaty permits Member States to take action when public morality is affected or endangered by imports of this kind. They may not take it on themselves to do this in any arbitrary way, but only subject to the rules and in compliance with the conditions laid down by the European Court of Justice.

My initial reply alluded to the problem of whether it was possible to arrive at a definition of public morality that could be accepted throughout the entire Community. Whether this is possible at all remains a very difficult question. It is very difficult to draw a line of demarcation between the glorification of violence and what is barely permitted in simply depicting violence. Similarly it is very difficult to distinguish between the various categories and degrees of pornography, something which I cannot go into at length here. For this reason it would probably all boil down in the end to categorizing as offensive to public morality anything declared by legal sanctions to be so. To arrive at any harmonization on this would be a very difficult process, requiring that a prior consensus be reached which could then be given the force of law. Until then we will probably have to be satisfied with national measures.

**Mr Cassidy (ED).** — Would the Commissioner not agree that there are enormous difficulties in trying to define what is meant in particular by pornography? Certainly in the English language — I cannot speak for the other languages of the Community — there is

no clear legal definition of the word pornography nor is there any clear acceptance of where eroticism ends and pornography begins. However, can the Commissioner at least undertake some sort of investigation as to whether or not it is possible to get some agreement to make sure that the violent video cassettes, the so-called video nasties, are not actually made in the European Community?

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) Echoing my earlier remarks, I would like to point out that we do realize very clearly that there is no such thing as a single Community-wide definition of what constitutes pornography. My suggestion that the European Parliament should hold a hearing to establish the facts of the situation and to determine the extent of public agreement in Europe on these matters could be quite a valuable contribution towards helping the Member States to arrive at the second stage of agreeing on joint actions. I should like to make one further remark addressed to the producers of these films. When all is said and done, it is their ideas on morality that are at the heart of the matter. If these ideas were on a certain uniform level everywhere, the problem could even be solved by asking the producers of these cassettes to undertake to subject themselves to a certain self-discipline and self-criticism. It is common knowledge, however, that not all producers have the sound moral attitudes that would enable such a reasonable step to be taken.

**President.** — Question No 9 by Mr Lalor (H-195/84):

Subject: Reclassification of disadvantaged areas

Can the Commission confirm that they have received a formal request from the Irish authorities to extend the present disadvantaged areas and also to reclassify certain of those areas already designated as less favoured in Ireland and furthermore if their answer is affirmative can the Commission indicate what are the areas concerned and how soon they anticipate taking decisions and making recommendations on the application?

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — The Commission confirms that a request has been received from the Irish Government to classify a number of areas as less favoured under Council Directive 75/268/EEC. The Commission services have requested further information from the Irish authorities and the application must be examined in detail before the Commission can decide if a request justifies a proposal to the Council.

**Mr Lalor (RDE).** — Does the Commissioner claim that the information which he failed to give me when I asked whether the Commission can indicate what areas are concerned and where these areas are located is classified or confidential information between the Irish Government and the Commission? If not, why can he not give me the information I sought?

**Lalor**

In addition may I ask if it is the case that the ceiling for designation has already been reached and when does he feel that the Commission can submit to the Council the Commission's recommendation for raising the 2½% limit? Does he moreover, as Commissioner, not agree that a similar request submitted this time last year by the United Kingdom and the Netherlands Governments was far more speedily and sympathetically dealt with? I am looking for sympathy from the Commissioner. I am glad it is Commissioner Burke who is replying. I was hoping that he might have been able to gather some extra information from Commissioner Dalsager. If so, I hope he can impart it now by way of a supplementary reply.

**Mr Burke.** — The honourable Member is correct when he states that the possibilities provided by Article 2(3) of the Directive, which allows the Commission to classify up to a certain percentage of the agricultural area of a Member State, have been exhausted for Ireland. Since that is the case, a Council procedure will be necessary to extend the list.

As I have indicated, we received a request from the Irish authorities on 2 August — which was a copy of the request made to the Council — for an extension of the less favoured areas in Ireland. They also told us that a proposed reclassification at national level within the existing areas classified was requested.

The reason I am not in a position to give more detailed information is that the information provided does not yet put us in a position to say with clarity what exactly we will be able to do about this matter, because we must be absolutely sure that the criteria for classification will be met.

We wrote back to the Irish authorities on 20 September asking for clarification and for further details to allow a proper appreciation of the request. Once this information has been received, it will be examined to see if the request justifies a Commission proposal to the Council to extend the areas.

**Mr Clinton (PPE).** — Could the Commissioner say whether the nature of the extra information sought by the Commission is such that it is likely to take a long period or a short period? Will it take a lot of work to find the sort of information the Commission requires in order to make a decision?

**Mr Burke.** — I think that the information sought should not take too much time. In fact, I had hoped that it would be available to me at least on the telephone today so as to enable me to answer the question more fully.

In further reply to Mr Lalor, I would indicate that the point he made about the UK must be seen in the context that only 52.5% of the territory of the United

Kingdom is classified in the way we suggest, whereas 62.5% of the territory of Ireland is already so classified. He can draw his own conclusions as to whether the Commission is more sympathetic to the one than to the other.

**Mr Fitzgerald (RDE).** — Could the Commissioner indicate to the House what type of additional information was sought from the Irish Government in the request of 20 September?

**Mr Burke.** — I do not have a copy of the actual letter or communication, but I would think that it would be for clarification of areas and more details as to their extent and as to whether, in regard to particular areas, existing areas were to be reclassified upwards in order to benefit from certain aspects of the directive.

I might say in conclusion that the Commission submitted to the Council last October a proposal in the socio-structural area which, if passed, would raise the limit which might be dealt with in this manner to about 4%. There might be some hope, if the Council is able to accept this higher percentage, that something can be done for the areas which are no doubt of interest to the honourable Members who have spoken.

**President.** — Question No 10 by Mr Wolff (H-202/84):

Subject: Dairy quotas in mountain areas

Given the disparities in farmers' resources caused by production difficulties in mountain areas, and in view of the fact that altitude and climatic factors rule out the option of diversifying crops, does the Commission intend to propose special arrangements for the fixing of quotas to be revised upwards in order to maintain a decent livelihood and normal activity for the farmers concerned?

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — The Community regulations on the super-levy and quota system permit a Member State to vary the basis for determining quotas according to certain criteria, including regional differences in the trend of deliveries. France has used this facility in order that the quotas in mountain regions are set at a higher level in relation to 1983 deliveries than is the case for other regions.

**Mr Wolff (L).** — (FR) It is true that the French Government has taken certain measures. However, I feel that we should realize that there is simply too great a disparity between the mountain areas and other regions. We are speaking of areas with a total production volume of 45 000 litres by comparison with other areas which can produce up to 240 000 litres.

Could not the Commission make approaches to the Council to have special rules laid down at Community

**Wolff**

level for the quotas applicable to mountain areas, which account for only 4% of the total volume of milk production in the Member States?

**Mr Burke.** — The Commission is aware that there are particular difficulties arising in many regions such as the honourable Member has mentioned. However, there was a certain flexibility given in the regulation to various Member States to deal sympathetically with these problems. As I indicated already, the French Government has availed itself of this facility and flexibility under the regulation. Of course, there are other possibilities arising in regard to crop diversification under other Community proposals, but I think the honourable Member wishes me to give indications of a Commission change of view in regard to this matter. Unfortunately, and subject to whatever may happen in the immediate future, I am not in a position to suggest that we will be open to change.

**Mrs Faith (ED).** — Recognizing the difficulties faced by farmers in mountain areas and also recognizing the excellent work carried out by farmers in areas such as my own, Cumbria, in protecting the environment, does not the Commission think it would be better to give these farmers a social wage instead of encouraging them to produce expensive surpluses?

**Mr Burke.** — Not having special responsibility for the agricultural dossier, while having a certain sympathy for the problems of people in mountain areas, I think I would have respectfully to decline the honourable lady's request to follow her on that path.

**Mr Debatisse (PPE).** — (FR) Does the Commission envisage increasing the special aids for mountain areas? Furthermore, since the farmers in these areas are engaged in what might be regarded as non-agricultural work, namely, the maintenance of the region, and since, being cheese producers, they are responsible only to a limited extent for milk surpluses, could not the Commission exempt them completely from quotas in the future?

**Mr Burke.** — Coming from the country I do, I can see that there could be a development in the future somewhat on the lines mentioned by the honourable Member. I speak purely personally. It would be inopportune if I were to suggest that the Commission at this stage has any such ideas and since I shall not be around after the end of this year, in any event, I look forward to whatever may come from the new Commission in the future.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED).** — Will the Commission accept that one would have greater sympathy for the milk producers in the mountain areas of France if

France's production had been reduced by 1.3%, as was asked for and agreed by Ministers back in March of this year, rather than increasing by 2.3% as it seems to have done?

**Mr Burke.** — If I might respectfully duck this one — the year is not yet finished and the position is not too clear. I would hesitate to follow the line of the questioner. That remains for a full assessment at the end of the milk marketing year, which is next March.

**President.** — Question No 11 by Mrs Lizin (H-215/84):

Can the Commission state what progress has been made as regards the action taken in this sector and give its opinion on the opening of new zinc production plant in Wallonia?

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — (DE) In its decision of 6 August 1984 the Commission imposed fines totalling 3.3 m ECU on several zinc producers in respect of infringements against the competition provisions of the EEC Treaty. This decision was published in the Official Journal of 17 August 1984. As far as the Commission is aware, none of the undertakings concerned has appealed to the European Court of Justice against these decisions. This means that, while it may be reviewed at a later date, this decision must be regarded in the meantime as having the force of law.

With regard to the development of new production capacities for zinc in Wallonia, the Commission would refer to its answer to Written Question No 578, also by the same author. The Commission pointed out in particular that decisions with regard to plant closures or the development of production capacities are first and foremost a matter for the undertakings concerned. The Commission is obliged to intervene only when the granting of State aids is involved.

**Mrs Lizin.** — (FR) If it should become apparent, in the course of the negotiations at present underway in connection with the reopening of the Prayon plant, that the closure was the subject — within the framework of unofficial agreements between cartels — of an agreement between the undertakings concerned not to reopen the plant, would the Commission be empowered in this case to take legal proceedings and impose a fine on the company that was the original owner of the plant in question?

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) If I have understood the question correctly, it is intended to insinuate that the company that was the original owner was also guilty of contravening Article 85 of the Treaty. I see that the honourable lady is nodding her head in agreement. This is something that only the Commission departments re-

**Narjes**

sponsible for competition can decide. I cannot therefore answer this question in an oral exchange during Question Time.

**President.** — Question No 12 by Mrs Caroline Jackson (H-218/84):

Subject: Social Fund grants

Can the Commission confirm that future allocations of Social Fund grants will continue to be made strictly according to the merit of the applications and their conformity to the Rules of the Social Fund, and that any attempt to alter this state of affairs will be opposed by the whole Commission?

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — The Commission is happy to confirm that, as in the past, allocations of the European Social Fund will be made strictly according to the relevant rules which are: Council Decision 1983/516, Council Regulation 2950/83 on the tasks of the Fund, and the Commission guidelines on the management of the Fund. The high levels of unemployment throughout the Community have greatly increased the pressure of demand on the Fund's resources. It has, therefore, been and will continue to be, necessary to interpret and apply the rules in a rigorous and a fair fashion.

**Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED).** — Thank you very much for that reply, Mr Richard. There is no smoke without fire and my question related to a report in the *London Times* of 25 July to the effect that Mr Natali, your colleague, complained at a recent Commission meeting that Britain was getting too much of the European Social Fund's resources. Does the Commissioner not agree that in allocating the European Social Fund, it is Community rather than national priorities that must be overriding, and that if his colleague, Mr Natali, has any complaint about the fact that Italy fell from first to second place in getting European Social Fund grants in 1984, the thing he should do is to persuade the Italian authorities to put in better applications rather than change the rules which he and the Commission have only just recently approved as revised?

**Mr Richard.** — I would be very reluctant to answer a question on the administration of the Social Fund as if it were an adversarial conflict between my colleague, Mr Natali, and myself or indeed as if it were a conflict between the British and the Italian Governments. It is not. What is, however, undeniable is that for there to be a regular flow of Social Fund money from Brussels to a particular country, it must follow that there has to be a regular flow of applications from that country for Fund assistance. It also must follow that in accordance with the guidelines, the priorities accepted, not only by the Commission but by Parliament and the Council, in

relation to that regular flow of applications the Commission is seen clearly and undeniably to be applying the priorities which everybody has agreed to be right. I think, with respect, that is what we have tried to do, and in the short time at least that I shall remain in charge of the administration of the Social Fund, that is precisely what we will continue to do.

**President.** — Question No 13 by Mr Marck (H-227/84):

Subject: Publication of information by the Community

Can the Commission state what measures it has taken to put into practice the proposals which the European Parliament put forward on 24 May 1984 in adopting the resolution on the compulsory publication of information by the European Community?<sup>1</sup>

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — (DE) I regret very much that all that I can do for the questioner is to tell him the procedure that is being followed. The Commission has not yet completed its examination of the questions raised in the resolution of 24 May. The main reason for this is that four of the seven paragraphs do not concern the Commission alone and in part do not even concern it directly. Furthermore, the Member States and other interested parties are involved, and this has delayed the preliminary work. However, the Commission is also itself looking forward with great interest to further clarification of the points at issue, which is what Parliament also wants. The Commission is fully prepared to take an active part in Parliament's work on this matter, in so far as it is empowered to do so, and I would suggest that a thorough and wide-ranging debate might be held in committee on the seven paragraphs in the May resolution, so that concrete results may be achieved.

**Mr Marck (PPE).** — (NL) I thank the Commissioner for his reply, which actually brings within reach what I had been aiming at all along, namely, a reopening of the discussion on this matter in Parliament and in the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, which is where the whole matter originated. Has any progress been made on the four paragraphs with which the Commission is empowered to deal, and when can concrete results be expected?

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) The dossier that I have to hand goes into the whole matter paragraph by paragraph and makes it quite clear that paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 do not fall within the Commission's competence, or at least not exclusively, whereas paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 do fall within our terms of reference. We did intend,

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 172 of 2 July 1984.

**Narjes**

however, to deal with them all together, and therefore I do not have at the present moment an answer that has been approved by the entire Commission.

**Mr Kuijpers (ARC).** — (NL) I should like to ask the Commissioner whether paragraph 2 does, in fact, fall within the Commission's competence. I feel that this second paragraph falls within the competence of this House and that we should be asking the President of Parliament to authorize Parliament to set to work on it. In effect therefore we should be putting this question to ourselves, or have I got it the wrong way round? I should like to hear what the Commissioner thinks about this paragraph 2.

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) I do indeed share the questioner's viewpoint on paragraph 2, which we in the Commission cannot deal with alone.

**President.** — The first part of Question Time is closed.<sup>1</sup>

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED).** — Mr President, on a point of order. We really could have finished this

Question Time an hour earlier than we have. Because of the way in which the sitting has been conducted this afternoon — not by yourself in the Chair, I am not criticizing the Chair — the House has gone into recess not once but twice and we have lost exactly an hour. We had to do that between 4.55 p.m. and 5.30 p.m. and again just before 6 p.m. until 6.30 p.m. because we had 'run out of business'. This really is not good enough and we could perfectly well have taken the vote on the report by Mrs Scrivener when we finished the debate on it. We could not have brought forward, I grant you, Question Time, but really, Mr President, this is most unsatisfactory. I know you cannot do anything now, but would you please report to the Bureau that I, and I hope a lot of other colleagues, are remarkably dissatisfied by the way it has happened today; and it is not the first time.

**President.** — Sir James, as you know we have agreed on fixed times for the votes and for Question Time. That is clear. None the less I sympathize with the point you make. Your comment has been noted and I can assure you that I shall discuss it with the President and my colleagues.<sup>2</sup>

*(The sitting was closed at 8 p.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> See Annex of 24 October 1984.

<sup>2</sup> *Topical and urgent debate (Announcement) — Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1984

### Contents

1.	<i>Application of the Rules of Procedure:</i> <i>Mr Ford; Mr Huckfield . . . . .</i>	53			
2.	<i>Commission statement:</i> <i>Mr Pisani (Commission); Mrs Focke; Mr Pannella; Mr Bersani; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Trivelli; Mrs Flesch; Mrs Ewing; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Pannella; Mr Chaboche; Mr Turner; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mr Chinaud; Mr Guerneur; Mrs Heinrich; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Pearce; Mrs Dury; Mr Seligman; Mr De Gucht; Mr Pisani; Mr Elliott . . . . .</i>	54	7.	<i>Economic recovery — Oral questions with debate (Doc. 2-610/84) by Mr P. Beazley and others to the Council, (Doc. 2-704/84) by Mr von Wogau and others to the Commission, (Doc. 2-816/84) by Mrs Tove Nielsen and others to the Commission, and (Doc. 2-817/84) by Mr de la Malène to the Commission:</i> <i>Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr von Wogau; Mr De Vries; Mr Juppé; Mr Barry (Council); Mr Welsh; Mr Patterson; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Rogalla; Mr Patterson . . . . .</i>	82
3.	<i>Unemployment — Action on behalf of women — Reports (Doc. 2-786/84) by Mrs Maij-Weggen, (Doc. 2-788/84) by Mrs Van den Hewvel, and (Doc. 2-785/84) by Mr Megaby:</i> <i>Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Van den Hewvel; Mr Megaby; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mrs Lenz; Mr Quinn (Council); Mr Chanterie; Mr Andrews; Mr Bachy; Mr Iodice; Mrs Caroline Jackson; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal . . . . .</i>	63	8.	<i>Question Time (Doc. 2-790/84) (continuation)</i> Questions to the Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Question No 56, by Mr Marshall: Court orders:</i>  <i>Mr Barry (Council); Mr Marshall; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 57, by Mrs Lemass: Drug controls:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Lemass; Mr Barry; Mr Rogalla; Mr Barry; Mr Marshall; Mr Barry; Mr Van Miert; Mr Pearce; Mr Sherlock; Mr Van Miert; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 58, by Mr Lalor: Reclassification of disadvantaged areas:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mr Lalor; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Glezos . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 59, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre: European integration:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Thome-Patenôtre; Mr Barry; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Barry; Mr Seligman; Mr Barry; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Barry; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 60, by Mr Ford: Accession of the Spanish colonies of Ceuta and Melilla to the European Community:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mr Ford; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Van Miert; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> </ul>	102
4.	<i>Formal sitting:</i> <i>Mr Pflimlin, President of the European Parliament</i> <i>Mr Alfonsin, President of the Argentine Republic</i> <i>Mr Pflimlin . . . . .</i>	76	8.	<i>Question Time (Doc. 2-790/84) (continuation)</i> Questions to the Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Question No 56, by Mr Marshall: Court orders:</i>  <i>Mr Barry (Council); Mr Marshall; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 57, by Mrs Lemass: Drug controls:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Lemass; Mr Barry; Mr Rogalla; Mr Barry; Mr Marshall; Mr Barry; Mr Van Miert; Mr Pearce; Mr Sherlock; Mr Van Miert; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 58, by Mr Lalor: Reclassification of disadvantaged areas:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mr Lalor; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Glezos . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 59, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre: European integration:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Thome-Patenôtre; Mr Barry; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Barry; Mr Seligman; Mr Barry; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Barry; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 60, by Mr Ford: Accession of the Spanish colonies of Ceuta and Melilla to the European Community:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mr Ford; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Van Miert; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> </ul>	113
5.	<i>Topical and urgent debate (objections):</i> <i>Mrs Castle; Mr Taylor; Mr Sherlock; Mr Newton Dunn; Mrs Castle; Mr Glinne . . . . .</i>	81	8.	<i>Question Time (Doc. 2-790/84) (continuation)</i> Questions to the Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Question No 56, by Mr Marshall: Court orders:</i>  <i>Mr Barry (Council); Mr Marshall; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 57, by Mrs Lemass: Drug controls:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Lemass; Mr Barry; Mr Rogalla; Mr Barry; Mr Marshall; Mr Barry; Mr Van Miert; Mr Pearce; Mr Sherlock; Mr Van Miert; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 58, by Mr Lalor: Reclassification of disadvantaged areas:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mr Lalor; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Glezos . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 59, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre: European integration:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Thome-Patenôtre; Mr Barry; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Barry; Mr Seligman; Mr Barry; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Barry; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 60, by Mr Ford: Accession of the Spanish colonies of Ceuta and Melilla to the European Community:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mr Ford; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Van Miert; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> </ul>	113
6.	<i>Unemployment — Action on behalf of women (continuation):</i> <i>Mrs Chouraqui; Mr Flanagan; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mrs Lehideux; Mr Ulburghs; Mrs d'Ancona; Mr Chanterie; Mr Tuckman; Mrs J. Hoffmann; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mrs Dury; Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou; Mrs Daly; Mr Alavanos; Mr Flanagan; Mrs Crawley; Mrs Banotti; Mrs Trupia; Mrs Salisch; Mrs Lenz; Mr Kyrkos; Mrs Gadioux; Mr McCar-</i>	81	8.	<i>Question Time (Doc. 2-790/84) (continuation)</i> Questions to the Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Question No 56, by Mr Marshall: Court orders:</i>  <i>Mr Barry (Council); Mr Marshall; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 57, by Mrs Lemass: Drug controls:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Lemass; Mr Barry; Mr Rogalla; Mr Barry; Mr Marshall; Mr Barry; Mr Van Miert; Mr Pearce; Mr Sherlock; Mr Van Miert; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 58, by Mr Lalor: Reclassification of disadvantaged areas:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mr Lalor; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Glezos . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 59, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre: European integration:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Thome-Patenôtre; Mr Barry; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Barry; Mr Seligman; Mr Barry; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Barry; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> <li>• <i>Question No 60, by Mr Ford: Accession of the Spanish colonies of Ceuta and Melilla to the European Community:</i>  <i>Mr Barry; Mr Ford; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Van Miert; Mr Barry . . . . .</i></li> </ul>	116

• Question No 62, by Mr Selva: <i>Equivalence of university diplomas:</i> Mr Barry; Mr Selva; Mr Barry; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Barry . . . . .	118	• Question No 72, by Mr Marshall: <i>Aryeh Tukachinsky:</i> Mr Barry (Foreign Ministers); Mr Marshall; Mr Barry; Mr Alavanos; Mr Barry . . . . .	123
• Question No 64, by Mr Hutton: <i>Ad hoc Committee on Citizen's Europe:</i> Mr Barry; Mr Hutton; Mr Barry; Mr Pearce; Mr Barry; Mr Van Miert; Mr Barry . . . . .	119	• Question No 73, by Mr Wurtz: <i>The human rights situation in Turkey:</i> Mr Barry; Mr Wurtz; Mr Barry; Mr Alavanos; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Alavanos . . . . .	124
• Question No 66, by Mr Newton Dunn: <i>Majority voting at the Transport Council:</i> Mr Barry; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Barry; Mrs Piermont; Mr Alavanos; Mr Hutton; Mr Barry; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Barry . . . . .	120	• Question No 74, by Mr Kyrkos: <i>Statements by the US Department of Defense:</i> Mr Barry; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Barry; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Barry; Mrs Caroline Jackson; Mr Barry . . . . .	125
• Question No 69, by Mr Chambeiron: <i>Anticipation of Tokyo Round tariff reductions:</i> Mr Barry; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Barry . . . . .	121	• Question No 75, by Mr Chambeiron: <i>Use of atomic weapons during the Falklands War:</i> Mr Barry; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Barry; Mr Marshall; Mr Barry; Mr Cryer; Mr Barry; Mr Maher; Mr Barry; Mr Kyrkos . . . . .	125
• Question No 70, by Sir James Scott-Hopkins: <i>Quotas on the level of domestic dairy production:</i> Mr Barry; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Barry; Mrs Caroline Jackson; Mr Barry; Mr Alavanos . . . . .	122	• Question No 77, by Mr Alavanos: <i>Chemical weapons:</i> Mr Barry; Mr Alavanos; Mr Barry; Mr Hutton; Mr Barry; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Hutton; Mr Taylor . . . . .	126
Questions to the Foreign Ministers:		Annex . . . . .	128

## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1984

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)<sup>1</sup>*

### 1. Application of the Rules of Procedure

**President.** — In accordance with Rule 111(3) of the Rules of Procedure, I inform the House that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has given the following interpretation of the rules on parliamentary immunity:

Requests that the parliamentary immunity of a Member be waived which were introduced during

the lifetime of the previously elected European Parliament are deemed to have lapsed and must be resubmitted.

Unless there are any objections to this interpretation, it shall be deemed to have been adopted. Objections may be raised during today's proceedings, or before the approval of the minutes tomorrow morning at the latest. They should be put briefly in writing and handed in during the day or just before the approval of the minutes tomorrow morning.<sup>2</sup>

**Mr Ford (S).** — Mr President, I would be grateful if you could tell us when the topics for urgent debate are to be announced. I see on the agenda that at 3 p.m. we are to vote on the objections. As I understand it, there has been no announcement as to which resolutions will be taken. So could you please tell us when you are

<sup>1</sup> *Approval of Minutes: see Minutes.*

<sup>2</sup> *Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution: see Minutes.*

**Ford**

going to announce which resolutions are going to be taken and in which order, so that we can put down amendments if we feel so inclined?

**President.** — Mr Ford, that was done yesterday evening and was also announced today. You can find the list and the order of items in today's minutes. Objections may be raised until 3 p.m.

**Mr Huckfield (S).** — Mr President, according to the list of topics for urgent debate which have been selected for tomorrow under Rule 48, the resolution that was submitted in my name, and that of the whole of the Socialist Group, the resolution on the miners' dispute in the United Kingdom, has not been selected for urgent debate.

Now, though it is true, as you have just told my colleague, Mr Ford, that we shall have the opportunity of tabling amendments on this issue this afternoon, I am bound to say that the way that that procedure has operated in previous weeks has not been very auspicious in that every time we put down an amendment to get that issue debated — though it has been selected as number one priority by the whole of the Socialist Group and though that resolution has a tremendous amount of support in this Chamber — the British Conservatives and the fascists always vote against it. That means that we do not always have the opportunity of raising it in this place.

I have to say to you, Mr President — and I hope that I shall be allowed to finish this point of order — that if we are to be told that we have to use the rules and procedures of this House to get the issue raised, then — and I put it as politely as I possibly can — every time we use the rules and procedures of this House to get the miners' dispute raised, we are voted down by the Conservatives and we are voted down by the fascists.

I put it to you that members of the Socialist Group have a right to be protected under your Presidency, and I put it to you that you have a duty to the members of the Socialist Group to ensure that when they raise issues in this Parliament they are discussed. If we are to go on being told by you that we . . .

**President.** — Mr Huckfield, we have understood your point. I would inform you that the order of items for urgent debate is fixed by the group chairmen in accordance with Rules of Procedure.

*(Interruptions by Mr Huckfield)*

Perhaps you regret that your group is not in the majority. You may raise objections until 3 p.m. This matter is now closed.

*(After the President had switched off his microphone, Mr Huckfield continued to speak using a megaphone)*

Mr Huckfield, we are not a propaganda instrument!

I warn you for the first time.

*(Mr Huckfield continued to speak)*

Mr Huckfield, I warn you for the second time.

*(Mr Huckfield continued to speak without heeding the President's warning)*

Mr Huckfield, I warn you for the third time and now have no choice but to suspend the sitting.

*(The sitting was suspended at 9.05 a.m. and resumed at 9.15 a.m.)*

## 2. Commission statement

**President.** — The next item is the statement by the Commission of the European Communities on the progress of negotiations on the Lomé III Agreement.

**Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission.** — *(FR)* The Commission offered to come and brief you on the stage reached in the negotiations during your last part-session because it feels that you have a right to the information you have asked for. It was unable to come because the negotiations, which should have been concluded on the evening of Wednesday, 10 October, were not in fact concluded until the early hours of Saturday, 13 October, following difficult discussions, but I do not believe that anyone can say they ended in a breakdown or that they were a failure.

The Commission's aim in coming here today is to brief you on the situation. I will do this by listing the results obtained and the matters still outstanding, concluding my analysis with the financial issue to which the texts drawn up by Parliament at its own initiative — and which are to be discussed during the next few days — have attached particular importance.

Forgive me for going into great technical detail in my analysis of the results obtained, something which is wearisome in certain respects. But such detail is necessary for you to be fully briefed. And this is what I shall do.

The main advance achieved in the Lomé III Convention, as compared to the Lomé II Convention, during the negotiations which have now been wrapped up, is the general structure of the Convention and the inclusion, at the head of the new Convention, of general provisions, which may be seen as summing up what has been achieved in ten or twenty years of cooperation depending on your point of view. The previous Convention started off by dealing immediately with trade matters before touching upon other issues. This

**Pisani**

new Convention defines the aims and the modalities of cooperation.

In political terms the accord is important. In terms of public opinion it is vital. It will be much more readable than it was previously.

As regards financial and technical cooperation — i.e. use of the European Development Fund — some progress, which is not yet quite wrapped up, has been made on planning. You know that the Committee on Development and Cooperation — which plays such a major role in shaping our ideas on this matter — pointed out to us that planning missions of two days' duration, after which a programme is adopted, are too short and do not allow thorough analysis of the situation and the priorities, and that improvements must be made in this regard. The text, which is now virtually accepted by the two parties, improves things and should allow the Community and, more particularly, the Commission to tailor its aid more effectively to the policies pursued by each of the ACP countries.

As for trade, you know that the ACP countries' main products enjoy zero-duty access to the European market. You also know that in agriculture in particular they demand a wider opening, and that they have expressed shock — hardly surprisingly — at the fact that some of the requests they submitted to us were the object of extremely long procedures culminating in thoroughly disappointing results, especially for seasonal produce.

The Community agrees to write into its procedures a commitment to reply within six months and to provide a detailed response to the ACP countries' requests. We can only ameliorate the procedures at the moment, but I think this heralds positive changes for the future.

I shall only deal briefly with the rules of origin. Not because they are unimportant — the rules of origin play a considerable part in determining how the products are treated when entering the Community — but I will only say that we have made progress, that we have improved, in particular, the exemption system. These matters are already settled.

As regards Stabex, we have improved by mutual agreement the calculation methods and rules. One major point is still being discussed — and I shall come back to this in a moment — and this results from the Community's desire for use of the Stabex funds to be linked to the reasons for the funding decision. Stabex is meant to stabilize export earnings. Erosion of these resources is often the result of erosion of the production base. The Community wants the Stabex funds to be used by the recipient State for restoration or conversion of its production base. A real debate is going on here, a useful debate which has made some progress during the past few days.

As for Sysmin, we have also made progress. Whereas it has so far applied to only two countries because of the

definition given it — Zaire and Zambia — it is now being given another definition which allows application of its advantages and mechanisms to three or four other countries. Although it will not become an instrument of general application, Sysmin will be less restricted than has been the case up to now.

I would like to devote special attention to the issue of investments.

We must be clear in our minds that, whatever amount the Community allocates to the European Development Fund, official aid will never be more than a relatively small contribution to the requirements of the ACP countries and thus to the aid they need.

If private enterprise in Europe feels no obligation to become involved in development of the ACP countries, if only official funds contribute to this development, the ACP countries will not get very far. If, on the other hand, private enterprise became involved in this field then there might be a complete change. For the first time private enterprise would play an active part in development cooperation. The new chapter contained in the Convention also makes it possible to lay down the rules governing the guarantee which companies need. I am almost certain that in the following months, proceeding from the Convention text, we will manage to expand on the idea of a joint assurance scheme between the Community and the ACP recipient States, something which will be a considerable step in involving private enterprise in development.

As for agriculture, I will not spell out all the new elements because they result, basically, from the debates and reports of your Assembly and from the cooperation established between it and the Convention. The priority given to food and agriculture, not forgetting crops for export, the coherence of the agricultural development policies, the acknowledgement of rural development as one of the essential elements of development, all this makes for a coherent programme, and I think the European Parliament will be very satisfied with the progress made in this field.

It will also be satisfied by the inclusion of the fight against desertification among the objectives of the European Development Fund. There is no need for me to recall the studies we have all carried out on the need for international support in the fight against the desert. Your own concern as regards world famine and food shortages in these regions, shows that long-term measures must be taken.

In addition, I would like to say that technical progress — and you will soon see this when you read the text — has been achieved in industry, in energy, and especially in fishing, the ACP States having called for a general definition of relations between themselves and the Community as regards fishing, and that has now been done. As for shipping, there was a somewhat

## Pisani

doctrinaire debate between the ACP States, who wanted a shipping system just for themselves, and the Community, which only wanted to help shipping within the framework of open competition. Clearly, poor shipowners on remote islands, who would have to compete with the large shipowners in our countries, would not be able to develop their own capacity by themselves. The ACP countries want an arrangement which, to begin with, will at least allow shipowners with intra-regional lines to receive special support.

Important provisions concerning refugees will appear in the Convention. On several occasions the Development Committee and Parliament have stressed that, above and beyond fixed emergency aid measures, a system of support with a view to integration should be devised. Such a system has been found; it is linked to the chapter on emergency aid in order to maintain the necessary flexibility in administering the loans. We now have here a new instrument of a kind we have been seeking for a long time.

Following this over-long but none the less hurried account, we are left with the issues the debate is now concentrating on. I shall analyse them quickly before telling you the Commission's position on the amount and what is to happen next.

The first issue on which there is a debate, and a difficult one at that, is the issue of human rights. Accord has practically been reached on Article 4 of the Convention's general provisions in which development aid is placed against the backdrop of opportunities for the individual, of respect for the individual. The Convention text affirms the aim of development as being essentially human — both individual and collective — with women's rights also being included, and respect for women being one of its special features.

But the Community is also calling for a specific and solemn reference to human rights.

At the end of a debate which was positive, because we discussed these things very calmly and seriously, without passions becoming aroused between us, the ACP States indicated that a proclamation concerning human rights did not necessarily belong in a convention whose aims were basically economic.

For its part, the Community insists that this is quite essential.

I do not know if we will reach an accord easily. I hope so, and all the more since, when it comes down to it, there are no basic differences, it is simply a question of whether it is right to mention this important issue in the general structure of a convention with other aims. This very day, and tomorrow, we will be trying to make progress on this point. I hope that the two partners, who basically agree with one another, will not be intransigent when it comes to the modalities.

The second important point concerns all the measures we wish to have in the Convention and which would aim to increase the effectiveness of our aid, be it pre-planning, supervising use of the funds, or — as regards Stabex — use of the funds for converting or revamping crop production.

During the final hours of the ministerial meeting we made very considerable progress, and I can say that here again basic agreement was reached on the definitions and the mechanisms, and that what is left is more a difference over words than substance, with the word 'dialogue' seeming unacceptable to certain ACP States which accept it as defined in the text. On the other hand, the Community wants it to be stated that European aid is not given without debate, that European aid is provided within the framework of an exchange of views and joint discussion between the Community and the recipient State. I do not believe that in the final analysis this will turn out to be an insurmountable obstacle.

As regards trade issues, several difficult points still exist, for example on beef and veal or on rice. I will spare you the details on this. A solution will be found as part of the final package. There are no longer any fundamental difficulties, it is just a question of weighing up the advantages the ACP States request and which the Community occasionally hesitates to give them.

I would now like to deal with the question of finance. The funding issue can be approached in two different ways: an approach based on analysis of needs, and an approach based on analysis of resources.

The approach based on analysis of needs gives rise to substantial figures, and the World Bank report is very revealing here. I must say that, when they presented a document on their needs, the ACP States themselves were very restrained in quoting a figure, because they submitted the figure of 8 300 million ECU for five years and not the kind of figure they put forward a few years ago.

While not denying the existence of these needs, the Community proposed the figure of 7 000 million as part of the budget, plus 1 100 million from the European Investment Bank.

During the subsequent negotiations two weeks ago the ACP States said these figures were unacceptable to them.

At this point I would just like to say that Parliament cannot be unaware of the fact that the figure appropriated for the Lomé Convention has never, strictly speaking, been the subject of negotiations. It is the European Economic Community which, after taking into account and considering all the factors, decides on a figure. But everyone knows as well that during the previous negotiations a figure was put forward,

**Pisani**

then after a certain time a second figure was proposed by the Community and was accepted by the ACP countries.

Today, I have to say that the Council has adopted the figure of 7 000 million and believes this figure to be non-negotiable. But in view of the position adopted by the ACP countries, i.e. that this figure does not correspond to their needs, the Council will have to say whether the ACP States' position constitutes a new factor inducing it to discuss the matter again or whether, on the contrary, it wishes to go no further.

The Commission believes that the figure of 7 000 million, which in monetary re-evaluation terms corresponds exactly to the figure adopted a few years ago, does not take account of new ACP members or of the sum necessary to tackle the very bad situation in certain ACP regions. But the Commission also believes that the Community's offer of 7 000 million, compared with the developed countries' approach in replenishing the IDA, constitutes a political stance of some substance.

Mr President, these are the things I wanted to say about what has been achieved or not achieved.

I would now like to give you some indication of the timetable. The Lomé issue comes before the informal Council of Foreign Ministers on Saturday of next week in Ireland.

Then there will be a meeting between the presidents of the ACP and the EEC institutions together with the Commissioner, about the 6th or 7th to see whether — on the basis of the deliberations — we can bring things to a conclusion, and reach final agreement on the whole package. The two sides hope, despite the difficulties which seem to arise every day — but that is what negotiations are about — that the Lomé Convention will be signed in Lomé on 7 December this year.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, please do not think this is just optimism on my part. I am saying what our intention is and what is almost certain to happen.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Focke (S), Chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.** — (DE) Mr Pisani, is it possible that the purpose of the many details you have explained was to try and gloss over the real problem currently facing us, i.e. the financing of Lomé III?

Is it possible that, even though you tell us that negotiations have not yet been broken off or reached deadlock, they have nevertheless got into a serious impasse?

Do you think it will be possible for the Convention to be signed on the scheduled date, 6 December, if the

European Community fails to make a very different and much better offer for the financing of the sixth European Development Fund and do you not think that there are in fact new additional reasons why this must be done rather than trying to bring the offer down to the lowest common denominator, as in the case of the one which has already been submitted? Is not the fact that the IDA has not been topped up and the European Member States are economizing in this area a further reason to do something at least in this field, which is our most fundamental responsibility as regards development cooperation? Could you be so kind as to tell us quite clearly once more here today what the Commission thinks is correct and what criteria were taken as the basis for its financing proposal? Can you confirm that the ACP and Community Ministers had already agreed to this proposal — or is that not true? — and that it is not simply penny-pinching but that there was in fact a wish to agree on objective criteria before the sum was fixed? To put it quite plainly once more — what do you regard as the appropriate criteria and what is the minimum amount which should be made available if the problems are to be dealt with realistically and the European Community is to meet its responsibility?

**President.** — I would point out to the House that, in accordance with Rule 40(2) the statement is not followed by a debate. Members of Parliament may, however, put briefly worded questions for a total of 30 minutes in order to have specific points in the statement clarified.

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — (IT) President, I should like you to help me to understand how Parliament's proceedings work. I seem to recall that I entered my name on the list of speakers two days ago. I have been informed that I was the first one on the list. I should simply like to know the procedure adopted by the President as regards the order of names on the list.

**President.** — For your information, I shall just read the list of speakers in order: Mr Bersani, Mr Christopher Jackson, Mr Trivelli, Mrs Flesch, Mrs Ewing, Mr Kuijpers, Mr Pannella, Mr Turner, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mr Chinaud, Mr Guermeur, Mrs Heinrich, Mr de Courcy Ling and Mr Fellermaier.

**Mr Bersani (PPE), President of the ACP-EEC Joint Committee.** — (IT) Mr President, I would like to ask Commissioner Pisani the following questions.

Does he not find it absurd that at the very last moment, a year after the beginning of the negotiations, the Council of Ministers is encountering difficulties of which we are all aware regarding both the distribution key and the total amount?

Does he not find it surprising that at the last moment the Council of Ministers is divided — not only on

**Bersani**

questions relating to the amount but also on the general approach to the Convention — between those who focus on the market and those who focus on aid, and that as regards this point the United Kingdom, with two-thirds of the Lomé countries English speaking, has taken a particularly firm line?

Does the Commission not think that in the light of this Parliament's clearly defined position, a position confirmed in the joint bodies representing Parliament and the ACP, and in the light of the Council's stance, it should make more strenuous efforts to support an easing of the proposed financial measures?

**Mr Christopher Jackson (ED).** — Does the Commissioner agree that the logic behind efforts to increase ACP exports of manufactured or agricultural products is destroyed unless we make more strenuous efforts to give trade access to EEC markets? Has there been consideration of internal measures within the EEC to ease transition of affected industries so that when requests are made by ACP countries for improved access, the answer can more often be 'yes' than 'no'?

My second question to the Commissioner concerns population. Is the Commissioner aware that at the UN Conference on population problems Africa emerged as an area of particularly acute difficulty? Does the new Convention offer the possibility of accepting requests for help with these difficulties?

**Mr Trivelli (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, the problem of dialogue is obviously very complex as is evident from the Commissioner's statement, which referred tactfully and somewhat blandly to disagreements on form. I would like to remind you that the problem of dialogue both at the recent Assembly and in the Joint Committee has a history of dissension. There was a split in opinion during the meeting of the Joint Committee and agreement was only reached at the Assembly thanks to a well-balanced recommendation that took as much account of the duties and constraints of Member States as of the responsibility of ACP countries, and which extended the concept of dialogue to that of joint management.

I would like to ask the following question: would it be possible either to adopt the recommendations and positions taken up in the resolution of the recent Consultative Assembly at the next Lomé Convention (even if not in formal terms) or to use them as a basis on which to formulate the criteria for dialogue and for the relationship between the two bodies at the third Lomé Convention?

**Mrs Flesch (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the main problem is obviously that of the amount of money involved. At the present stage and with the amount proposed, our credibility is at stake. We have stated time and time again that Lomé was a model of

North-South relations, and before comparing its relative success with the failures of other international meetings, does the Commissioner think that we shall be able to set ourselves up as an example in future if we do not go beyond an offer of 7 000 million ECU, a figure which does not allow for the population increase over the last 10 years? It is a figure which does not allow for the additional membership of Angola and Mozambique; nor does it allow for the need to implement new policies to combat drought and the spread of deserts and to tackle the problem of hunger in the world.

What does the Commission intend to do to get the Council to review its position?

**Mrs Ewing (RDE).** — May I ask Commissioner Pisani to give an undertaking that there will be a specific section dealing with cooperation and fisheries in the text of the third Lomé Convention and not just annexes, as this was called for unanimously in the resolution adopted in Luxembourg on 21 September? Will the Commission give an undertaking that provisions will be incorporated into the third Convention to encourage the negotiation of fisheries agreements with ACP coastal States that are mutually beneficial on a nondiscriminatory basis and without prejudice to the existing agreements between developing countries in the same area, as this was also called for in the said resolution?

**Mr Kuijpers (ARC).** — *(NL)* Mr President, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, I have three questions. I should like to know which Member States or which ACP countries adopted a restrictive position in the negotiations for Lomé III and are against an increase in the amount of 7 000 million ECU.

Secondly, I should like the Commissioner to tell me what the view is on the price of raw materials, since that is the cornerstone of the entire Agreement.

Thirdly, during the negotiations was there any discussion on the influence of the various world powers? I mean by this that, although Lomé III is a good thing, its effects are often thwarted by the policies pursued by the United States and the Soviet Union in the ACP countries. What was the result of any discussion on this point?

**Mr Pannella (NI).** — *(FR)* I believe, Mr President, that agreements are signed between free parties. It is hypocritical to keep on stating that the ACP countries are free in their relations with us while international politics and local realities do not give them the liberty to refuse the alms from those who grant them, or the blackmail that accompanies them.

Does the Commissioner really believe that it is possible to hold up as an example an agreement between two

**Pannella**

parties which is a joint agreement at the moment of signing but the implementation of which is totally entrusted to the culture, staff and organization of only one of the two parties? Is it really an example of a free market economy, free enterprise and intellectual honesty not to include the EDF in the budget, not to institutionalize the implementation of the Agreement, and to refuse joint management? If you are satisfied, I can see why, since in Europe there is everything!

**Mr Chaboche (DR).** — (FR) Mr Commissioner, I should like to ask you two questions. The first concerns sales of dairy products to ACP countries. In 1980 the EEC sold 577 million tonnes; 571 million in 1981, 550.4 million in 1982 and 367.8 million in 1983. What are the reasons for this decrease?

I should also like to ask you about the progress of the negotiations being conducted under Lomé III with a view to guaranteeing investments in the countries receiving our aid.

**Mr Turner (ED).** — The new Convention contains certain clauses relating to newly-accessing countries in the Community and the ACP. At present Portugal buys 300 000 tonnes of cane sugar annually on the world market. I am concerned as to whether, when Portugal accedes to the EEC, these 300 000 tonnes of sugar will be transferred from the world cane-sugar market to the beet-sugar market of Europe, which would be very undesirable for the economy of the Third World. Does the Commissioner agree that we should ensure that whether or not 70 000 tonnes or so are to be brought into the sugar protocol for the benefit of the ACP, none the less, Portugal should still continue to be able to buy the rest of its sugar on the world market and that it should be cane sugar? Otherwise, we shall transfer 300 000 tonnes from the world cane-sugar market to the European beet-sugar market.

Secondly, may I ask him to state whether or not the major proposals of Ambassador Chasle's reports on culture have, in fact, been included in the new Convention?

**Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM).** — (IT) Mr President, in all his statements, including today's, the Commissioner is rather optimistic about the result.

The first question I should like to ask is the following: will the Council change its position on the amount or does it consider that the ACP countries will be placed in a situation where they must 'drink or drown', as we say in my country, i.e. take it or leave it? Is it not the case that the signing of the Agreement in this way removes the gloss from this Convention, which is always held up as a shining example of the Community's achievements?

Secondly, is the Commission able or does it intend to take action to bring about a change in the Council's

attitude? Is the Commission willing to tackle the problem of the present relationship between the European Development Fund and the Member States' bilateral aid? This is not a problem of absolute financial impossibility but one of political choice, whether Community or non-Community, and so it is a practical problem of deciding which political considerations should determine the action to be taken. Is it not in the Commission's interest to tackle thoroughly, together with the Council, the question of bilateral aid, which takes precedence over the European Development Fund?

I should also like to ask whether the Commission can give us more detailed information on the joint guarantee system for private investment.

Lastly, I should like to have more specific and accurate details on the role of women in development policy under the Convention.

**Mr Chinaud (L).** — (FR) Mr Commissioner, according to the information published in the specialized press, it seems that the export quota for ACP rum was about 175 000 hectolitres, but it ought to be pointed out that at the moment the ACP countries only export 100 000 hectolitres, only 55% of the quota authorized to enter the Common Market free of customs duty. The ACP countries have always protested against this quota system, which they feel prevents them from exploring new markets. However, the statistics do not seem to prove them right since they only use a little more than half their quotas. As you know, it is not enough to have export quotas, you also need to sell a product which appeals to consumers. So do you not think that the problems encountered by the ACP countries in exporting their rum is a problem of quality rather than of quotas? And this remark also applies to products other than rum.

Secondly, I should like to ask why export quotas need to be increased again. Why keep on pretending that the economies of the ACP countries can only progress by means of quotas, as if this well-worn Socialist method made it possible to conquer world markets and, by the same token, to develop the economy? We are well aware that this is not true. The responsibility which we as developed countries have does not consist in imposing on the weakest countries economic policies which are on the way out in most developed and progressing countries. This is one aspect of the basic problem of defining a new development policy which, in my opinion, this House should deal with again, whether in connection with Lomé III or not. Indeed, this problem seems to me just as important as that of the amount of aid granted to the ACP countries.

**Mr Guermeur (RDR).** — (FR) Mr President, we know that some countries have refused to go beyond the limit of 7 000 million ECU and that others have

**Guermeur**

asked for their share to be reduced. This being so, are we to understand that there is to be no compensation for the terms of trade or even for inflation, that when Mozambique and Angola join, the overall share will be smaller, and that when Spain and Portugal join the Common Market, the share of each member of the Community will also be smaller? That is my first question.

Secondly, Mr President, in the negotiations on the enlargement of the Common Market is it planned to consult the ACP countries on the content of the accession treaty, since this treaty will very greatly affect exports from ACP countries?

Thirdly and lastly, Mr President, the system which was adopted to deal with emergency aid was an extraordinary item in Article 958 of the budget. This appropriation expires at the end of 1984. What is to happen in 1985 with regard to emergency aid to countries in difficulty? Furthermore, since the EDF will obviously include only the associated ACP countries in emergency aid, what about the others which are not associated? Is all emergency aid to the latter to be stopped?

**Mrs Heinrich (ARC).** — *(DE)* Mr President, it has been said that food, agriculture and preventing the spread of deserts are to have priority. What is the European Community doing to change the structures which are the main causes of those things which are to be changed, namely hunger and environmental problems? Another problem is development aid. It has been considerably reduced, but I think that it is dishonest to talk about aid when you think that a large part of Lomé aid is basically an export subsidy for the surpluses provided by our magnificent EEC agricultural market.

**Mr de Courcy Ling (ED).** — Mr President, will the Commissioner try to define the minimum level of prosperity which is necessary in a developing country before private enterprise investment is appropriate? He mentioned private enterprise in his admirable statement. Would he not agree that private enterprise investment in countries as poor as, say, Tanzania, Chad or Niger hardly seems appropriate? Secondly, would he say whether there will be guarantees against the expropriation of European Community investments in the Convention and guarantees in favour of the remission of dividends by enterprises investing?

**Mr Fellermaier (S).** — *(DE)* Mr Pisani, I should like to return once again to the allocation of resources to the Fund. As far as the public is concerned, the statement that the European Community is prepared to offer 7 000 million plus 1.1 million from Investment Bank funds remains an abstract number until you can demonstrate clearly — and I would ask you to do so — how much purchasing power was lost as a result of

world inflation in the previous amount allotted to the Development Fund and how, with further inflation forecast all over the world, this must have just as negative effects at the end of the Sixth Fund as in the case of the Fifth. Then what is now an abstract number will probably become a completely different number, since it will prove that the promises of the individual national governments at the beginning of the negotiations were very different from their promises now that the negotiations are coming to an end and resources must be allocated to the Fund according to certain criteria.

Secondly and lastly, has the Commission examined to what extent a further opening up of mainly agricultural markets in the European Community — much to be welcomed from the point of view of the ACP countries — would entail a revision of the agreements with the Mashreq and Maghreb countries?

**Mr Pearce (ED).** — Mr President, will the Commission have adequate powers under the new Convention to give suitable advice to recipient countries where problems of corruption or of economic mismanagement in their countries in fact detract from the value of the aid provided to them by the European Community?

**Mrs Dury (S).** — *(FR)* No-one will be unduly surprised if I speak about two problems: the problem of refugees and the situation of Third World students in our countries. As regards refugees — and I appreciate why Mr Pisani was relatively vague — the Committee on Development and Cooperation has made very specific proposals seeking to deal with the problem of refugees as part of regional projects. I should like to know what chance there is of this type of approach being adopted.

Furthermore, what guarantees are offered to Third World students, particularly those from ACP countries, so that they can continue to receive types of training which are unavailable in their countries and on which our industrialized countries pursued, until recently, liberal policies.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — Would the Commissioner give us some interesting statistics? What percentage of GDP is represented by the aid to ACP nations? When I say GDP I mean the whole of the Community's GDP — gross domestic product. What percentage is represented by aid to other developing nations outside the ACP? Thirdly, what is the aid by Member States outside Lomé to the developing world? Those three statistics would give us the whole picture. I recollect that under Unctad 1% of all member nations' GDP was to be devoted to aid to developing countries. I wonder whether it comes up to 1%.

**Mr De Gucht (L).** — *(NL)* Mr Commissioner, is it right that Europeans actually have two different attitudes, the one favouring more financial aid and the other favouring easier access to European markets? In this context is it also correct that the United Kingdom has threatened those ACP countries which also belong to the Commonwealth that if they keep on making additional demands for financial contributions, bilateral aid will immediately be reduced?

**President.** — Mr De Gucht was the last of the 20 Members listed to ask questions. Since each one asked on average three questions, you have 60 questions to choose from, Mr Pisani.

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission.** — *(FR)* Mr President, if ever a parliamentary debate has seemed to me to be useful and well conducted, then it is this morning's. The only difficulty is that if I wanted to reply to all the questions addressed to me I would have to ask you to put off your lunch, something I would not want to do for reasons of courtesy. Anyway, your schedule dissuades me from doing so.

Mr President, I will therefore deal with some of the questions which seem to me — perhaps I am mistaken about this — to be the most important.

I shall not name the Members whose questions I shall deal with. No-one should feel left out, but I am not sure whether I can follow my hastily written notes.

I would like to start by pointing out two things. The Commission is charged with preparing the negotiations and with carrying them out, but it is the Council which has the final say. When there is a ministerial meeting the Commission takes part, but only in an expert capacity.

Secondly, I have made it a rule — and I am ready to be judged on this — never to take the easy way out, which consists of criticizing the Council by saying that the Commission would have done much better. This would be easy, but I think it would be disloyal and dangerous for the institutional set-up.

I can say that, in its initial proposals concerning the amount, the Commission had a figure above 7 000 million ECU, and that it based its calculations on an exact revaluation in monetary terms, and also took into account the decline of certain economies, the probable accession of two Member States and the inclusion of a new important section in the convention on the fight against desertification.

The Commission — the figure is known, so why not quote it — arrived at the figure of 8 500 million. The Council decided on 7 000 million.

Between an approach based on needs, which was the Commission's approach, and an approach based on resources, which was the Council's approach, the Council adopted the figure of 7 000 million.

I was asked whether the Commission stood up for itself, or if the Commission was able to get the Council to budge on this.

The Commission has its hand tied by the rule that the amount appropriated is not a subject for negotiation. But within the institutional framework it is also entrusted with helping to formulate policies and to make proposals. Taking account of the ACP States' position, it is seeking a method of reaching agreement on the amount and on the wording as well.

Mr Pannella asked whether I was satisfied with the way in which these negotiations are conducted, with the way in which all negotiations of this kind are conducted, if I could say whether the negotiations between the ACP States and the Community were equal or unequal negotiations. Mr President, I have to say that in the nature of things the negotiations are unequal. They have more need of us than we believe we have of them. But given this fundamental fact, which is a basic world fact, I believe that Lomé marks substantial progress compared to many bilateral aid arrangements and to many decisions taken by multilateral organizations.

To give a very precise answer to Mr Pannella's question: I would say that I am well aware — as an ordinary person and a citizen — that the day of equal negotiations is far off. But I am also quite aware that the European Economic Community has set up a system which is better than all others currently in operation throughout the world.

I was asked whether the figure of 7 000 million was likely to strengthen, increase or consolidate the credibility of the convention and of the Community. I personally believe that clear-cut support by the ACP States for the package which will make up the convention would do much for the Community's credibility. And I have to say that I think the figure of 7 000 million will not produce the kind of ACP support I have just described.

Mr Bersani asked the Commission to show greater courage. Dear Mr Bersani, during the week of negotiations in Brussels a few days ago, I was the only one among those sitting a round the table not to have made any press statements. It seems to me that the most effective place for proving one's stubbornness, courage or persuasiveness is not outside but within the institutionalized decision-making system with which the Community is endowed. And to repeat what I said at the beginning — I would never engage in some kind of blackmail of the Council by adopting positions at variance with it. I prefer to believe that the Council and the Commission enjoy relations which should

allow the Commission to obtain a hearing for the arguments it feels are most pertinent.

The question of overpopulation has been broached. This is a matter which Parliament has often dealt with. It is a long-term problem. It is a problem we will help to solve if we are asked to do so. It is a question on which the Commission refrains from having an active policy with regard to the ACP countries.

The problems of birth rate and population are too closely bound up not only with the biological reality, but also with the cultural reality and the beliefs of each people, for the Community to become involved here. It sometimes happens that we discuss this during conversations with officials. I refrain from applying any kind of pressure here. I hope that these countries' officials will take account of the risk they run with too large a population explosion, and that they themselves will make the necessary adjustments.

I was asked several times about access for ACP products to the European market.

To give an idea of the situation, let me tell you how one trade minister from an African country caricatures the European Economic Community: when you go to northern Europe to talk about North-South relations you are told: 'market access, not aid'. When you discuss this in southern Europe you are told: 'aid, not market access'.

I believe quite honestly — and this is by way of reply to the questions put after my statement — that our experience, disregarding any considerations of doctrine, leads us to believe that help for countries which are our main talking partners under the Lomé Convention should include both aid and market access, and that in a certain number of cases aid currently takes priority over market access.

If we had set out to subject the economies of a certain number of ACP countries to market forces alone, we would now see that they have no market structures and no companies, and that to open them up to the market alone is simply to open them up to foreign companies.

Under these circumstances it seems necessary to us to mix market resources with aid resources, so that they can gradually play just such a role in the economic field.

I would like to draw the attention of a number of Members to the fact that, in the most advanced countries — Japan, the USA, the countries of Europe — the public sector, i.e. the sector covering public utilities or linked to public utilities, makes up some 50%, which is why we have roads, schools, railways, telephones and a whole network of utilities which private enterprise makes use of.

In the countries of Africa, even where the whole economy has been nationalized, the public sector meaning the public utilities sector, is practically non-existent, and this is the only sector we can help to improve through the budget.

With this in mind I have been asked the threshold above which private investment is possible. I believe that there are several quite different approaches to this matter, but they all complement one another. Firstly, for industrialization to take off on its own demands a degree of development which very few of the countries who are our talking partners have been able to achieve. Isolated cases of industries being established on some site or other to take advantage of a natural resource, of manpower or of a market are possible; but industrialization limited to a few places is not very significant. Thus I believe that we must provide simultaneous support for localized industrialization and for industrialization based on the kind of infrastructure which factories always need.

Mr President, I hope that in the coming months we will be able to have a real debate on the relationship between private enterprise and development, between opening up markets and development aid, and I would be delighted if an own-initiative report were to come from Parliament itself, so that we could try to study in depth a problem which is very difficult to get to grips with and over which opposing economic doctrines clash. I am convinced that it makes good sense for these economic theories to compete against one another in the advanced countries. However, I am convinced that in the most underdeveloped countries it makes no sense for there to be a clash of economic theories about private enterprise or official funding, because these countries need both.

Mr President, I propose to give a written reply to the Members who have broached issues of a more technical nature. Some of them require figures and tables which I would be unable to give now.

So as not to take up any more of Parliament's time, I would like to thank you for the searching questions put to me. I should just like to tell Mrs Ewing that a specific section is devoted to fisheries. That is something I had almost forgotten, and knowing Mrs Ewing I would certainly come in for strong criticism during a future part-session.

I would like to thank Parliament for the way it has questioned me, for its searching questions, and for the support which overall — I would even say almost totally — it has given to the Commission's approach on the development issue. During the past years we have been involved in debates which were sometimes difficult but our conclusions were the same. To reply to some of the questions put to me, I would say that the Commission views Parliament's support in the Community's internal debate, prior to conclusion of

**Pisani**

the Lomé negotiations, not just as support but also as a duty.

(Applause)

**President.** — The debate is closed.

**Mr Elliott (S).** — Mr President, Commissioner Pisani gave some very brief and interesting information about the dates for negotiating the conclusion of the third Lomé Convention. I wonder if you can advise me as to what further opportunity this Parliament will have for making some additional input to those final decisions in the brief time that remains. Some of us only got to know a day or so ago that Commissioner Pisani was going to make this statement this morning, and we have not really had an opportunity to put forward in a full form the sort of points we would like to make. I am asking your advice as to what further opportunity there will be for this Parliament and its committees to make some input.

**President.** — The first opportunity will be on Thursday in the urgent debate, in which one of the items is to be a joint debate on Lomé III. Resolutions on the subject may be drawn up.

### 3. Unemployment — Action on behalf of women

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on the following three reports:

— report (Doc. 2-786/84) drawn up by Mrs Maij-Weggen on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on

the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-776/84-COM(84)484 final) on action to combat long-term unemployment;

— report (2-788/84) drawn up by Mrs Van den Heuvel on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-269/84-COM(84)234 final) for a draft recommendation on the promotion of positive action for women;

— report (Doc. 2-785/84) drawn up by Mr Megahy on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-456/84-COM(84)379 final) for a decision on specific Community action to combat poverty.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE), rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, while agreeing with the Commission's communication on the increase in long-term unemployment in the Member States, we nevertheless find it disturbing, since the facts it describes are both revealing and disconcerting. Whereas in 1980 there were barely 2 million long-term unemployed, this figure has now risen to around the 6 million mark. Some 4 million European citizens have been out of work for over a year and some 2 million for more than two years. Thus, a good 50% of the 12 million persons unemployed in Europe come under the long-term unemployed category. Of the Member States of the Community, Belgium, the Netherlands and Italy are currently in the lead, but the other countries are not far behind. Only Denmark — which I intend to deal with presently — has found ways of effectively combating long-term unemployment. Only 5% of the unemployed population in Denmark is in the long-term category and this is quite an achievement.

In addition to these revealing figures, the Commission's communication contains other interesting facts, I should like to mention four of them.

Firstly, it would appear that long-term unemployment is no longer confined to the traditionally backward areas of southern Europe, particularly in Greece and Italy. Industrial centres in the north of Europe are also increasingly affected and the cause would appear to lie in a serious delay in changing over from traditional to modern industries.

It would also appear that long-term unemployment is affecting sections of the population other than the traditionally vulnerable groups, such as unskilled and migrant workers, handicapped persons, young people and women. More than half of the long-term unemployed are men with good formal qualifications between the ages of 25 and 55. This means that the problems are increasingly affecting even those groups who are relatively strongly placed on the labour market.

A third point which is directly related to the previous one concerns the updating of long-term unemployment statistics in the various Member States. This cannot be criticized enough since some Member States are knowingly or inadvertently guilty of obfuscation, whereby certain groups disappear from the statistics. For example, in some Member States persons are no longer registered after the age of 55 or 57. However, the same is true of young school leavers and women returning to the labour market after a period spent as housewives. They are registered as 'seeking work' rather than 'unemployed' even though in some cases they have been without work for years. The Member States reason that they have either never worked or have not worked for a long time and that they cannot therefore be described as unemployed. The result is that the real number of long-term unemployed is probably much higher than the number registered

### Maij-Weggen

would suggest. According to the European Federation of Trade Unions we should be thinking in terms of 8 to 10 million people rather than 6 million.

A fourth interesting point in the Commission's communication is that all the Member States are currently taking action aimed at combating long-term unemployment. However, the various efforts are somewhat fragmented and almost totally uncoordinated and produce very different and in some cases very disappointing results.

Only projects which have a firm basis at grass-roots level would appear to be proving successful — for example, the Danish project, which involves offering training or alternative work to young unemployed persons after 16 months and older persons after 22 months.

Where do all these things lead? They lead to an increasing rise in long-term unemployment and considerable social and economic problems for the European Community.

The economic problems include the fact that human energy and production capacities are being wasted, with the result that our economic growth is some 5% less than it could be.

In addition, skills are being lost, which necessitates expensive retraining. Thirdly, unemployment benefits are costing more and more and already account for 5% of the national budget, and fourthly, the falling incomes of the unemployed lead to shortfalls in the national economies.

The social problems include the increasing poverty and isolation of large groups of the population and feelings of discouragement and humiliation, which can result in either despondency or aggressiveness or indeed political extremism, racism and ultimately even a distrust of democratic institutions.

It is a good thing, therefore, that the Commission has proposed an action programme to the Council with a view to combating long-term unemployment.

The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment broadly speaking supports this action programme, except that we would like to make the resolution more urgent in character. We would prefer to speak of an *emergency programme* which must be regarded as priority issue and dealt with as a matter of urgency. We would also like to expand it and tighten it up in certain respects.

As regards the contribution of the Member States, we feel that they should undertake to offer persons who have been out of work for longer than 12 months a programme involving further training, retraining and part-time work. Denmark can serve as an example in this respect since it has conducted projects of this kind

with considerable success, with the result that the long-term unemployment figures have dropped to 5%. These part-time work programmes must not of course lead to exploitation of unemployed persons or pose a threat to existing jobs.

We also believe that people following these training programmes or doing community work should receive a supplement to their social benefits. We strongly oppose the current practice in some countries of making deductions from the benefit paid to these people since this leads to complacency and moonlighting.

We in the Social Affairs Committee also advocate alternative employment programmes based on the principle of benefits wholly or partially compensating for the wage costs. The Netherlands can serve as an example in this respect. We feel that the European principle of equal treatment for men and women and for indigenous and migrant workers must also be respected in all these programmes. As regards the European Community's contribution to this emergency plan, we feel that first and foremost we must have harmonized and honest statistics so that we can get a genuine picture of the situation. The Community could also coordinate the various national activities so that the most effective of them, such as the Danish programme, could be given priority and held up as an example to other Member States. In addition, if it was increased the European Social Fund could help to finance effective coordinated programmes, and we would remind you here of the fact that the Council of Ministers has undertaken to double the ESF in five years. To be quite honest, we saw little signs of this happening in the recent budgetary talks.

Finally, the European Community could take the initiative of laying down, at European level, minimum benefits to be paid to long-term unemployed persons. This could offset many of the economic problems, such as the drop in demand, and many of the social problems, such as the poverty.

I should like to conclude by making two further remarks on behalf of the Social Affairs Committee.

We were annoyed at the speed at which the Council wanted to rush this through Parliament. Our annoyance stemmed from the fact that the Council itself has not yet finished dealing with several other files which also concern unemployment. We are thinking, for example, of the directives concerning part-time and temporary work, the directives on equal treatment for men and women, the recommendations on the redistribution of work and flexible pension systems and the resolution on an economic recovery plan. Why, Mr President of the Council, are these matters not been dealt with? They are at least as important as the question we are discussing here today.

Secondly, we regard an emergency programme to combat long-term unemployment as absolutely vital

**Maij-Weggen**

since we are talking here about 6 million people who have had their backs to the wall for years and this is just not good enough. What we need, furthermore, is a structural solution; which means that the various European Member States must all pull together in the social and economic fields. The economic recovery plan I have just mentioned and which was adopted by this Parliament last May in fact provides excellent guidelines for a policy of this kind. Only if we can bring about such a united social and economic policy at Community level will we be able to combat unemployment from the structural angle in the longer term. The Social Committee hopes the Council will waste no time in dealing with this plan.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS

*Vice-President*

**Mrs Van den Heuvel (S), rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, it frequently became apparent in the course of the difficult election campaign in which we were recently involved that there was at least one group of voters to whom it was easy to make clear why the European Community is of decisive relevance in our daily life. Women understood this perfectly when we were able to draw their attention to directives originating with the European Commission, the Commission's action programme, the resolutions adopted by this Parliament and the Commission's observations in connection with them.

Can these women now put their minds at rest, particularly as regards the attitude of the European Commission? The document under discussion today, i.e. the recommendation on the promotion of positive action for women might well raise some doubts. However, if you compare this recommendation with the action programme — particularly the section devoted to positive action — you may well actually become alarmed since in this action programme the aim of positive action is described as promoting coordinated legislation at national level with a view to developing positive action. As the Commission states in its action programme, experience shows that in the absence of a basic legal framework of the kind which exists in the United States to determine the type of action to be taken, the means to be used and the sanctions which must be imposed, action of this kind does not get off the ground. That is putting it plainly, and since we can safely assume that the Commission has no need for action which never gets off the ground, it is obvious that what we need is a binding instrument — in other words a Community-level directive.

However, in spite of the fact that the Commission repeats in the explanatory statement to the recommen-

dation currently before us that there is an urgent need for coordinating legislation and reiterates the aims, i.e. to promote legislation of this kind, it concludes, after consulting the two sides of industry and the Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities that binding Community legislation would not be the appropriate instrument at this stage. If anyone understands this, they can let me know.

I am sure you will agree that the Commission might have realized when it drew up its action programme that certain objections might be made.

However, the Commission obviously thought differently then and did not intend to let this stand in its way. Now that the Member States are less inclined to take measures in view of the crisis, this is the very time when we must endeavour to step up action at Community level, as the Commission rightly states, but in this case what we need is a forceful Commission policy, and not a Commission which gives up as soon as the Member States cease to be cooperative. If this results in the Commission opting for a recommendation, which we regard as a far inferior way of tackling the question, we could at least expect it to devote more attention to ensuring that the recommendation is in fact put into practice. But no, the Commission blithely gives the Member States three years to get down to business. The Committee on Women's Rights insists that this period must be reduced. We realize that it will take time to draw up the programmes and would be glad to allow two years. However, after these two years it is vital that progress reports be produced on an annual basis and should it transpire that the Commission had in fact been right when it had still had enough courage to say that in the absence of basic structured legislation action did not get off the ground, it can at least not lose too much time before coming up with a proposal for a directive after all.

As regards the contents of the recommendation I should like to say that many of the fields for which the Commission has made recommendations for positive action clearly show how much inequality women still have to contend with, and the picture is borne out by results of surveys which are regularly published in the Member States. For example it emerged from a very recent study in my own country that only 10% of newspaper journalists are women, that there is not a single woman editor-in-chief or assistant editor-in-chief and that only 5% of the women journalists are in a position of authority. This is only an example but unfortunately the situation is no better in many other fields.

It is understandable, therefore, that the Commission should have listed a wide range of possible fields for positive action. However, this might also be dangerous, since we all know from experience that the more general recommendations are, the easier it is to get round them. The idea put forward in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment of giving clear

**Van den Heuvel**

priority to the new technologies would certainly appear worthy of consideration, therefore. Unfortunately, shortage of time meant that this proposal could not be discussed in the Committee on Women's Rights, but I assume that it is completely in line with the general views of the members of that Committee.

The European Commission has an opportunity to stress the seriousness of its proposals by giving priority to positive action among the various projects proposed as candidates for aid from the European Social Fund. We therefore assume that the Commission will adopt a proposal to this effect.

It may well be said that it is up to the Commission, the Council and of course the other institutions too including the European Parliament — we must also be prepared to look at home — to give an example, but so far this has clearly not led to any spectacular results. Indeed, what the Commission has managed to do in its own staff policy according to the interim report on the implementation of the action programme, is more reminiscent of a first-aider running around applying emergency dressings here and there than a report on positive action as recommended by the Commission to the Member States.

We would be grateful if the Commission would tell us here today what progress it has made as regards structural measures in its own staff policy, whether the Equal Opportunities Committee which Mr Burke mentioned earlier is now in operation and whether the Commission has already introduced, within its own institution, the expert supervision proposed in its action programme for the Member States, and, in the somewhat longer term — we mentioned two months in the motion for a resolution — we would be grateful if the Commission would submit a progress report worthy of the name.

Finally, Mr President, a few questions to the representative of the Council. As Mrs Maij-Weggen has already mentioned, this Parliament was under enormous pressure to deal with this recommendation in a very short time so that it would be possible for the Council of Social Affairs Ministers to take a decision in December. Obviously, we are delighted that the Council has all of a sudden become so ready to make decisions, but can the representative of the Council tell us whether it is just as enthusiastic about making decisions on the directives we are currently discussing, which are so important for women and relate to social security arrangements, temporary work, part-time work, maternity leave and the position of women in the professions? If so, when can we expect decisions to be taken — at the December meeting of the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs too? That would be very nice.

My second question is whether the Minister is prepared to draw the attention of his colleagues in the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs to the fact that

the various problems facing women, regardless of whether they are just coming on to the labour market or have been on it for some time, are interrelated. You cannot support a recommendation for positive action on the one hand while at the same time reducing crèche facilities and the like. You cannot undertake to eliminate the obstacles with which women have to contend while at the same time maintaining other ones or creating new ones as regards, for example, social benefits or taxation. I am very interested to hear what the Commission and the Council have to say in answer to my questions.

(Applause)

**Mr Megahy (S), rapporteur.** — Mr President, this report on specific Community action to combat poverty has proceeded through the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment at what I would call unprecedented speed. From the point of view of effective parliamentary scrutiny, that is obviously undesirable. The committee, however, quite wisely in my view, took the view that by cooperating it could ensure a swift and favourable response from the Council of Ministers on the poverty action programme. I trust that this is the case and that the Irish presidency will use the opportunity to expedite matters with as much priority and speed as has been shown by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment of this Parliament.

In presenting the report, I stress the point that poverty is becoming the central political issue of the 1980s in rich as well as in poor countries. Although six of the 10 EEC countries are amongst the world's 10 wealthiest States, the facts depressingly show that as the wealth of the Community has increased over the post-war period, so also has the scale of poverty. Indeed, because of marked inequalities within the countries of the world, there is now an overlap of living standards between rich and relatively poor countries. It is estimated, for example, that the poorest 20% of the British population are a lot poorer than the most prosperous 20% of the populations in Mexico, Yugoslavia, Malaysia and Turkey.

Thus, in the first programme of pilot schemes and studies, the Commission itself estimated that around the mid-1970s there were at least 30 million people living in poverty within the European Community — that is, excluding Greece. That must be an underestimation for the position today. Not only has there been a marked deterioration in the economic situation over recent years, there is also the fact that many poor people get excluded from many of the surveys and official statistics on which estimates are based. Indeed, at a recent conference organized by Eurolink Aids, the figure was quoted of 40-45 million living in conditions of poverty within the Community.

Whilst there might be academic argument about precise definitions of poverty, no one can really doubt

## Megahy

that the experience of the last 30 years shows clearly that economic growth in itself has not eliminated poverty, nor have expanded social services necessarily had a major redistributive effect towards the poorest. To quote from the final report from the Commission on the first action programme:

The long-term poor live in the worst housing for the least desirable areas, suffer the most ill health and disability, are the least well-educated, work in the most unsatisfactory jobs in the poorest working conditions, endure chronic economic and personal insecurity and can offer the least hope for a better future for their children.

This group, of course, is joined by what has been termed the 'new poor' — the 'new poor', by others who are now old, disabled, in chronically poor health, by single-parent families or those who belong to industrial or agricultural areas in decline. In fact, what is happening is that different minorities of the population are in fact being shepherded into what could be called states of dependency. If these difficulties were not enough, we now have in many Community countries the additional burden caused by cuts in social expenditure which affect the living standards of the poor and exacerbate the so-called poverty and unemployed traps.

The Community action programme proposed by the Commission will not, of course, rectify this highly-disturbing position nor, indeed, can it. The main causes are deeply rooted in the nature of society, and the remedies available lie mainly in the major social and economic programmes of member governments. For my own part, I would agree with the recent statement that the conditions of the poor can be improved in the long run only by restricting the power as well as the wealth of the rich. However, as the late Lord Keynes said: 'In the long run we are all dead.'

The proposed action programme deals with the short term — for a period of five years in fact. The European Parliament, which supported and sustained the earlier programme, already in 1983 welcomed the prospect of new Community action.

While recognizing the limitations of scale in relation to the immensity of the problem, I believe I can say of the whole of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment that, while we are critical in some respects, we believe that such a programme can, if used properly, provide valuable lessons for both the European Community itself and the member governments. This is recognized in the early part of our resolution, where we indicate the nature of the task and point out that it is imperative that the Community and the Member States combine their efforts and take urgent and decisive action towards finding effective and durable solutions to the problems of poverty.

Nevertheless, the committee is critical of the Commission's proposals, which we feel are both unclear and

unspecific. We are disappointed that no clear indication is given of the kind of schemes forthcoming, and insist that when more specific details become available Parliament itself must be consulted.

Above all, we stress that the essential focus of the second programme must be on action. That, I think, has been a recurring theme in the comments and speeches made by members of the committee. The committee takes the view that the first programme of pilot surveys should provide more than simply an adequate research base for an effective action programme. Indeed, we specify that at least 80% of the budget must be used for action research. We agree with the need for a poverty clearing-house and emphasize the importance of public awareness campaigns, which members of the committee felt had been rather neglected in the first programme.

The committee is concerned to point out, in particular, that the various measures should relate to the wider structural factors forming the underlying causes of poverty. There is a danger that if the programme is concentrated too narrowly upon so-called problem groups, these wider factors may be ignored.

We say that the projects should relate to the mainstream domestic programmes of Member States, complementing but not duplicating them. We emphasize very much the point that the results of this action research should be a guide for action, a guide for decision-making, and should be taken into account in policy-making at Community and Member State level. Indeed, in the last report one sees very little evidence that the lessons that were learnt then are now being applied in the various Member States.

Now, small as this programme is, it should be fashioned, in the view of the committee, as an essential tool of policy-making designed to deal with this massive problem of poverty. If it is used properly, it can reflect a genuine commitment at Community and Member State level to tackling the needs of the poor. If it is not backed, however, by financial strength and by a radical change in social priorities, then in my opinion it will merely become a cosmetic device to save the face of a relatively uncaring Community. I hope that the Council, when considering not only this programme but the budget that lies ahead, will make sure that if they do commit themselves to a programme of this kind, sufficient funds are available to ensure the success of such a programme.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L)**, *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.* — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this is a matter which costs very little but at the same time can be of interest to the people of Europe, since they are directly involved.

### Larive-Groenendaal

I could hardly have had a better subject on which to give my maiden speech — though 'maiden' is perhaps something of an exaggeration. At any rate, the draft recommendation on positive action for women is — and I am speaking on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment — a logical step in the direction in which the European Community, and in recent years the European Parliament too, I am glad to say, have been moving. It has become apparent that the legislation which has been introduced in the interests of female emancipation is inadequate — although the European Community has already very clearly won its spurs in this field. In practice, there are obstacles which fall outside the field of legislation as such and for this reason we need positive action to back up the women of Europe and ensure that they enjoy in practice the equal opportunities which they have on paper.

The Committee on Social Affairs is therefore in favour of positive action. However, we are not so pleased about the draft recommendation itself since it is messy, vague and bombastic. There is also a risk that the Member States will make the magnanimous gesture of adopting the non-binding recommendations next month — after all, that will not cost them anything — and then simply continue as before. In the hope of avoiding this becoming a mere sop to women, the Social Affairs Committee firstly calls for a clear and specific progress report — after two years in the first instance and on an annual basis thereafter — and secondly, if it should emerge from the progress reports that the Member States have failed to translate their fine words into action, a proposal for a binding legal instrument, i.e. a directive.

You will also be receiving a corrigendum, since although as a result of an administrative error all the amendments apart from No 23 have been tabled only in my name, they are in fact on behalf of the entire Social Affairs Committee and I would point out, as the rapporteur, Mrs Van den Heuvel, has already said, that the Social Affairs Committee has been obliged, owing to lack of time, to make its opinions known by means of amendments. I find this very unfortunate since if we had had more time I am sure there would have been no objection to parts at least of our opinion, the opinion of the Social Affairs Committee, being incorporated into Mrs Van den Heuvel's report.

We should like to congratulate Mrs d'Ancona who stepped in very quickly and capably.

As I have already said, the text of the draft recommendation is vague and lacking in binding force. To quote one example, it states that the Member States are called on to encourage the participation of women in all occupations and sectors of working life where they are at present underrepresented, and at all levels of responsibility.

Where is this kind of thing going to get us? We must be much more precise, since this is the heart of the

matter. Generally speaking, women tend, as a result of cutbacks and rationalization, to be concentrated in a very limited number of frequently vulnerable professions and for this reason the Social Affairs Committee has tabled a specific amendment to the effect that, as a temporary measure, a minimum number of jobs, expressed as a percentage, should be reserved for women in all those sectors in which women are underrepresented and, in particular, in those occupations which tend traditionally to be a male preserve as well as — and I think this is particularly important — the relevant vocational training.

I should like to mention one specific amendment, although I obviously hope you will give consideration to all the amendments tabled by the Social Affairs Committee. Since nowadays 'for better or for worse' often tends in practice to mean worse and women are suddenly landed with the problem of fending for themselves and their children, we call for analysis and research, of which the results should be published, into the feminization of poverty, since inadequate education or vocational training often means that these women often come to grief, with all the psychological and financial consequences which often — and we should bear this in mind — have repercussions on society in general. Thus it is high time that we brought emancipation down to earth and our Committee regards positive action as a step in the right direction.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Lenz (PPE), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Women's Rights.** — (DE) Mr President, I should like to make a number of points on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights in connection with the debate on the problem of long-term unemployment. This Parliament has already discussed the problem of employment among women on three occasions this year and numerous documents produced by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment deal with this aspect, which is of great relevance to the question as a whole. The Committee on Women's Rights largely supports the report by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the motion for a resolution. We have, however, tabled two amendments to draw particular attention once more to this aspect.

The unemployment figures, including those concerning long-term unemployment, include a disproportionate number of women and in particular young girls — which is the really disturbing aspect. In spite of the fact that in some cases they have left school with better qualifications and are very willing to undergo further training, in Germany, for example, two thirds of girls leaving school find no opportunities for training, and if we want to avoid bringing about or aggravating this sort of structural unemployment in the long term, we must also highlight these aspects of unemployment among women in connection with long-term unem-

**Lenz**

ployment, particularly as they affect society in several ways, i.e. in terms of the effects on the unemployed persons themselves, then in the effects of the unemployment of the man they might marry during this period, and then the effects on the family and the position of the women in the family if she should end up not being able to do an effective share of the work as a result of many years of unemployment. Account should also be taken of the effects of unemployment among young people on the family and the effects of unemployment on women, who can no longer cope with modern technologies in today's and tomorrow's world, not only in purely practical terms but also in terms of their implications for society as a whole. Women are particularly hard hit by unemployment in this respect.

The Committee on Women's Rights would like to add a few remarks which it was not able to do at an earlier stage in view of the limited time available — as has already been pointed out here today. However, we would ask the Commission and Council whether it can really afford, in view of these urgent problems totally to disregard the debates of the European Parliament in their documents and even to declare, as happened in my Committee, that the relevant statistical material is lacking. This is simply unacceptable where one of the today's most crucial issues is concerned and in view of the statistical machinery at the Commission's disposal. However necessary it may be for the Member States to take action to deal with this problem, it nevertheless goes without saying, as we see it, that all the institutions of the European Community must cooperate in order to overcome these problems and fulfil their social responsibilities.

**Mr Quinn, President-in-Office of the Council.** — Mr President, it is an honour for me to have the opportunity to speak to an elected Assembly that represents 270 million people who have been brought together by the process of free, fair and democratic elections — indeed, an Assembly of persons of whom President Mitterand said:

Beyond the political divisions and national rivalries, you, the Members of this Assembly, are the workers of an immense undertaking which will change radically fundamental political and geopolitical ideas.

Mr President, I came here today to speak to you and the Members of this Assembly as the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs of the European Community. I speak to you also on the eve of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment, which represents organized workers and employers within the Community and which, like the Parliament, is seized with the fundamental question of how to deal with the issue of mass unemployment in Europe.

Mr President, I speak to you in a personal capacity, as the representative of the Irish presidency — a nation

of 3½ million people within the Community of 270 million people. I speak to you as an Irish European who approves of, is involved in, and passionately believes in the European ideal — an ideal which has made Ireland's presidency a reality.

Finally, Mr President, I speak to you and to the elected Members here in this Assembly as a socialist, aware that I am addressing both fellow socialists and non-socialists in this marvellous representation of parliamentary democracy.

Mr President, Members of this Assembly, I wish to confine my address to the central issue of employment and unemployment, which lies close to most if not all of the problems which confront our Community and our citizens today. There are 12.4 million men and women out of work within the Community as we speak this morning. One out of every 9 Europeans in the active population is out of work. Significant regional variations exist, and in some regions the rate of unemployment amounts to 1 in 4 of the active labour force. The magnitude of these figures is of itself a serious cause for concern. But the gravity of the problem only becomes apparent when one considers the structure of the unemployed recorded within the confines of these statistics.

The number of EEC citizens who have now been unemployed for over a year has risen dramatically over the last few years. In over half the Member States, more than 1 in 3 of the unemployed have now been without work for over a year and, in a couple of the Member States, the figure is close to, or indeed over, 50% of the entire unemployed population. The estimates that I was working from gave us a figure of 4.6 million. But I listened this morning with interest to an upward estimate of approximately 6 million from Mrs Maij-Weggen. I share her concern for the need for accurate statistics, but in all probability the actual figure is higher than the one that even she mentioned and may well fall within the range of between 8 and 10 million.

The estimated number, whatever it might happen to be, of citizens who constitute the Community's long-term unemployed, not only reflects an immense tragedy in human terms, but also constitutes an enormous waste of human resources and of taxpayers' money. A recent study by the European Trade Union Institute finds that as a consequence of lost production, unemployment in the countries of Western Europe in 1982 cost approximately 6.7% of GNP, or almost 20 000 million US dollars.

These statistics lead me to the starting-point from which I believe any socialist minister for labour or employment must approach the problem of the economic crisis which now confronts our Community. I believe now, as I have always believed, that the economy, under whatever system we choose to operate it, must be harnessed to service the needs of the citizens.

### Quinn

We must reject any approach which implies that in some way or other the needs of ordinary men and women are subservient to the abstract needs of the economy. I make no apology for this opening position, because it must determine the way in which we confront the crisis we are experiencing and the methods which we subsequently employ to defeat it.

The origin of the present economic crisis cannot be attributed solely to the oil crisis of the 1970s, although these events triggered off and compounded it. I think it is now widely recognized that other factors such as the impact of new technologies, the end of the cheap supply of raw materials and the emergence of new, rapidly-industrialized Third World countries have contributed significantly to the duration and intensity of our present economic difficulties.

To these can be added the indebtedness of developing countries, the importance of international monetary institutions and agreements, and the spectacular rise in real interest-rates, all of which affected considerably the fiscal and financial markets which have a direct bearing on the Western European economy.

Many of us here may disagree about the significance of the various causal factors, but few would doubt the conclusion. We are for the first time in a situation of major structural change. What, therefore, when confronted with that unique experience — certainly as far as working politicians are concerned — has been the reaction of the various Member States of this Community to this problem? Some have sought to revert to a policy of deflation and cautious monetarism in the hope that, by reducing inflation, employment and increased employment would follow. While that recipe may appear to have worked in the past, it has, with tragic consequences, manifestly not worked in the present. Severe deflation in some of the economies of the Member States has brought about, on the one hand, reduced inflation, but, on the other, short-term hardship of an unprecedented kind and, most important of all, no apparent prospect of the economic uplift which was the hoped-for cure promised at the end of the very distasteful medicine.

Other Member States have attempted to avoid the human hardship of deflation, with all its well-known evils, and to employ the instruments of the State to generate economic activity at a time of depressed demand in order to stimulate growth and employment. This cure, though clearly less distasteful than the other economic remedies, has been tried in the past and is therefore presumed to work in the present. It will not. The experience that individual countries have had with selective national policies of reflation has been in the short term expensive, painful and, most important of all, without success.

Ironically, these two diverse approaches to our economic problems as applied in the different Member States have compounded our own European difficul-

ties. I can think of no more appropriate forum than the Assembly of the elected representatives of the peoples of Europe to call for the utilization of the combined economic and political strength of all the Member States to bring forward a coordinated relaunch of the economies of our Member States in planned and programmed fashion so that the benefits of that economic policy can be harvested for all of our citizens.

In July of this year, the Taoiseach of Ireland, Dr Garret FitzGerald, the current President of the European Council, when addressing the inaugural session of this Assembly stated that it was the objective of the Irish presidency to restore the issue of employment to the agenda of the nations of Europe, the question of unemployment being, as far as we were concerned, the number one issue which must be confronted by the governments and politicians of the European Community.

Following the apparent success of the Fontainebleau Summit and the resolution of some of the internal housekeeping difficulties which have beleaguered and besieged this Community for the last two years, it appeared in July both reasonable and timely that such an objective should be set by an incoming presidency. It was made all the more compelling because of the fact that within Ireland we have the highest percentage level of unemployment within the entire Community.

We recognize at home in a particular way that the problems which confront us can no longer be solved by our acting on our own. We wish to convey that message to the rest of the nations of Europe, both rich and poor, both big and small, who have to date themselves singularly failed to deal with this fundamental human problem. Together, Members, we might be able to resolve it. Divided, acting on our own and independently of each other, we know to our bitter cost that we cannot solve the problem of the unemployed citizens of Europe and we shall never as politicians be able to get the men and women of Europe back to work unless and until we ourselves work together.

I would add, Mr President, that within all of the institutions of the Community, at Community level and at national level, social dialogue is absolutely essential to achieve that kind of cooperation.

Mr President, it has been suggested by some commentators that all that is now needed in order to bring about full employment is to dismantle the entire framework of protective worker legislation which has been so carefully constructed and painstakingly fought for throughout this century. It is suggested that, were the legacy of that struggle to be demolished, we could somehow or other emulate both the success of the United States and Japan in transforming our economies and creating millions of new jobs.

This view in its most benign form is based on a simplistic comparison between the United States economy

## Quinn

on the one hand and the European Communities on the other. Unlike Europe, which operates an open economy and which has a historical structure and tradition, the US economy is relatively self-sufficient. It has a vast indigenous industrial base which can respond rapidly to any increase in demand from a huge domestic market. It has considerable control over monetary markets and it has a relatively open and flexible labour market.

What America has been able to do is to harness the extraordinary benefits of its size and of its scale. No American economist talks about the deflation of the economy of Texas, of the economy of Alabama, or of the economy of Rhode Island. Why should we Europeans therefore fall into the trap of trying to do simply that? Mr President, we must devise methods of coordinating the relaunch and the deflation of the European economy, but we must learn how to do it together. This Assembly must respond to such a call and, indeed, quicken its pace.

Let me set out four points upon which there should be coordinated action at Community level. Let me start with deflation. I believe the European Community, acting in unison, should coordinate a programme of planned and targeted deflation by directing public and private investment into certain key sectors of the European economy, both at national and at Community level. This will require the coordinated policy action of the Council of Ministers, on the one hand, and the utilization to the maximum effect of EEC funds.

Given the pessimism of the current business outlook, governments, I believe, in all of the Member States and at Community level will have a crucial role to play in the recovery of investment by means of selective expansionary policies.

The second point is the question of restructuring. Mr President, it is now clear, because of the age of many of our established industries, that a major restructuring at European level of our industrial base is now essential. For some time now the productive sector of our Community, whether it is in public or in private ownership, has been engaged in a process of technical innovation and automation on an extensive scale. This process is essential if our industry is to survive and prosper. But it has created a major upheaval in the labour markets of the Community. While this restructuring is necessary, if indeed not essential, it is critically important that the subsequent short-term unemployment, which will of necessity be brought about, is properly counteracted by both national and Community programmes in the localities where such structural unemployment is caused.

The third point I want to raise is the question of new technology. It is essential that European industries, assisted by the Community institutions, further develop research in the new technologies and establish

companies and organizations which will apply such technologies to the productive process. We have lost ground in this technological field to both North America and Japan. If we are to develop a new technologically sound basis for industries and hence create durable employment for the future, it is essential that we have a coordinated programme of investment in and application of such new technologies throughout the Community. This will undoubtedly require a degree of innovation and courage on the part of managers and entrepreneurs.

It will also require a degree of flexibility and openness from the workforce. Work practices and traditions that belong to an earlier age and derive their validity from the physical conditions of that industrial process have no place alongside the technologies of the future and the radically different processes that they bring about.

Finally, the fourth point I wish to make is on the question of the reorganization of working-time. There is an undoubted need to reorganize the current division of working-time so as to ensure that existing employment is redistributed more equitably among the workers of Europe and that the potential for increasing productivity is harnessed to provide more jobs for all rather than more income for some. Working-time can and should be reorganized so as to take advantage of increased productivity, which will result in labour unit costs remaining constant and enable enterprises to involve more workers in the productive process. The Community should, I believe, assist Member States to bring about the conditions where the negotiation of the reorganization of working-time between the social partners can best be facilitated.

I believe that coordinated action along the four fronts that I have outlined offers the best prospect for the people of Europe in their struggle to confront the major problem of unemployment, which, in its present guise and form, is new to all of us. If we succeed in coordinating the energies of the Community along the lines I have suggested, then I have no doubt that we shall reduce significantly the number of Europeans currently out of work.

However, as I said at the outset of my speech, approximately 12.4 million European men and women are out of work. Even the most optimistic among us in this European Assembly would not expect that figure to be reduced overnight or indeed halved to a level of 6.2 million people over the next two to three years. Accordingly, as President-in-Office of the Council of Social Affairs and Employment Ministers, I have undertaken to establish an initiative at Community level which will assist all the individual Member States to develop programmes and economic activities that will offer the prospect of a least part-time work to many of those who are currently long-term unemployed within the Community. This approach is designed to complement the coordinated economic activity to which I have referred and to ensure that the

**Quinn**

long-term unemployed are not required by the rest of Europe to remain permanently idle until such time as we have effectively created full employment again.

As I have already said, the cost of unemployment in Western Europe in terms of lost production and revenue represents at a minimum 6.7 % of Community GNP. It is, I believe, an absurd situation which we have allowed to develop whereby, in compensation for the fact that they could not obtain work, we pay the unemployed small sums of money on condition that they do not work. This is a wholly unacceptable situation, demoralizing for those without work, equally so for their families and friends and inexplicable to all those who can perceive the elements of the situation.

It is within this framework, I believe, that we must bring about a situation in all of the Member States where we can harness the energy and drive of those who are currently unemployed into socially useful work which will both increase their incomes and ensure that they remain active within the community. I would like to stress that while such work and activity is of value in its own right, it is not a substitute for full-time employment within the economic sector. However, it is a critically important form of activity, particularly for those who might otherwise remain unemployed for periods of more than 24 months. There is now sufficient scientific evidence as well as human experience to indicate that people who are put into enforced idleness for such a long period of time develop medical and social problems for which, perhaps, we have no cure. It is now critical for their very well-being that the rest of the community remove their sentence of enforced idleness and pursue a range of vigorous coordinated policies of reflation at Community level to bring about the transformation of our economic base.

The point that I want to underline here is that, parallel with the pursuit of a coordinated relaunch of Europe, to which I am personally fully committed, we must devise methods, design schemes and produce programmes which will maximize the energy of all of our people and harness their commitment.

I would like to refer briefly to two points raised in the course of the debates earlier today which I had the honour of hearing. I have dealt, I think, with the first report on long-term unemployment, and the document that the Commission has produced will be discussed in full at tomorrow's meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment and at the Council of Social Affairs Ministers in December. I would like to refer briefly to the report from the Committee on Women's Rights and the positive action programme. I welcome the report and I welcome the renewed political energy and heat that has been put into it. There is as much of a need — and all must recognize this — to change social attitudes as there is to change laws and regulations. What is needed most of all at this stage is

renewed political action. You have taken an important step in debating that report today.

For my part as President-in-Office of the Council of Social Affairs Ministers, I would say that I would agree with much of what is in the report and with much of the criticism. Many of the proposals are on the table. Many of the matters to which Mrs van den Heuvel referred have been there for a long time. They were there when we took over the presidency in July of this year. Quite frankly, a lot of them will still be there at the end of this presidency because of the lack of political will to get things moving at local level.

It is for that particular reason that I have taken the initiative of having a totally informal political meeting with my fellow ministers this evening in advance of the Standing Committee on Employment tomorrow to see in what way we can as politicians unlock the political blockages that all of us know are there. Here it would be unfair to allow the conclusion to be drawn that there might be in some way criticism resting at the door of the Commission or indeed of the Commissioner. From my limited experience, no one has been more active in pursuing these matters than Ivor Richard and the people in his section of the Commission. It would be unfair to allow that suggestion to appear anywhere in the record of this House.

Finally, though I did not go into this matter earlier on, the fact that the programme for positive action for women is on the table is something of which I am aware. I would give a renewed pledge to the Members of this Assembly that we will be taking action to ensure that it makes political advances within the constraints that we talked about.

The last point that I want to deal with briefly in reply to the debate — and I come from a parliamentary tradition that insists on replying to points made by Members — is the question of poverty and the report thereon. I myself, and I think all of the Irish Members, share the deep conviction that what we need now is positive action on the ground, either by people directly confronted by the reality of poverty or people who can help. We no longer need academic research to tell us the extent and the nature of poverty. What we need is action both directly by and for those who are confronted with the reality of poverty. What we need most of all is funds and resources at national and Community level to assist that action. I share very much the sense of urgency that Mr Megahy conveyed when introducing the report.

In conclusion, I thank Members for their time and patience and for the opportunity of speaking to this House. We are now just 16 years off the edge of the twenty-first century. Seventy years ago this autumn, the nations of Europe went to war against each other in the name of outdated nationalism and a nineteenth century conception of life and work. Since the ending of the enormous tragedy of the Great War, successive

## Quinn

generations have struggled to defeat the forces that brought about continued hostilities among Europeans. Our presence here today in this elected Assembly representing 270 million people is a striking testimony to their struggle and a monument to their success.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if previous generations of Europeans, our parents and our grandparents, were capable of turning around the armies of hate which marched against each other in the autumn of 1914, is it too much for us to ask of ourselves in this generation that we should turn around the armies of the unemployed and create, drawing upon all the genius that Europe has shown in the past, a new economic and social order that can and will not only make room for us but make room for them as well. That, I believe, is the challenge that faces us in the remaining 16 years of this century. I ask the elected Members of this Assembly to help us win this vital battle that confronts us now.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Chanterie (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to thank the President of the Council for being present at this important debate but at the same time point that I am astonished at a phrase he used at the beginning of his speech when he said 'I am addressing fellow socialists and, indeed, non-socialists'.

Mr President, I have great respect for the Socialist Group, which includes many of my friends among its numbers, but I would protest against the President of the Council who spoke as if this Parliament consisted of socialist goodies and non-socialist baddies. I think this point should be put right.

**Mr Andrews (RDE).** — Mr President, with regard to the last speaker's suggestion, I do not accept what he said. I think the Minister made a very good declaration and he was generous to all sides of the House when he spoke.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Bachy (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, unemployment is the main cancer of our society and long-term unemployment a particularly virulent form of this cancer. First and foremost because of its social consequences: excluding those who wish to work from the labour market for months and even years on end and delaying the commencement of active life for millions of young people means that they are alienated, excluded and plunged into poverty in a way that is wholly unacceptable.

There is a direct link in the Member States between the increase in long-term unemployment and delinquency, which is often an expression of despair. The increase in long-term unemployment also constitutes a

threat to our democracies; unemployment, especially when it is long-term, is a breeding ground for inequalities, racism, egoism and all forms of violence.

However, long-term unemployment also constitutes a threat in economic terms. The inactivity of millions of workers represents an inconceivable waste. Mass laying off of an available work force represents both for collectivity and for our economies an excessive loss. It is a paradoxical phenomenon within the context of our so-called 'liberal' capitalist societies where economic effectiveness and rationality are the main criteria.

In this respect, social policy measures to combat long-term unemployment are essential but insufficient in themselves. They are essential, but we as socialists prefer to speak of social justice and solidarity rather than assistance. However, we all know that the answer to unemployment, in particular long-term unemployment is above all an economic one. This is why the Socialists argue so forcefully in favour of the implementation of a different industrial policy in Europe. The 'laissez-faire' credo which is at the root of policies in certain Member States governed by conservatives, can do nothing to resolve the crisis. Of course, it costs a lot of money to set up voluntary training policies, job creation and job sharing schemes and the competitiveness of firms must not suffer as a result. Nowadays technical progress enables us to produce more with fewer people. How are we going to avoid lasting structural unemployment with all the economic and social costs that this implies, if not by policies geared at economic revival and at sharing of the work available?

Ensuring an improved level of social protection for the long-term unemployed should be a common goal linking all of us assembled here. We therefore support the Commission's initiatives and the suggestions made by Madame Maij-Weggen, rapporteur, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs whom we would like to thank for having considered certain of our proposals and amendments during that Committee's discussions.

Above all though, we would like the texts of the resolutions adopted by this Parliament for the implementation of a concerted fight for jobs to be put into effect.

Dear colleagues, the time for lofty words is over. Now is the time for deeds and I agree whole heartedly with what Mr Quinn has said in his capacity as President-in-Office and as a Socialist.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Iodice (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in tackling such an important subject, we must take account of the Community's present political situation, characterized among other things by budgetary difficulties, and of the piecemeal and sporadic way in which the phenomenon of long-term unemployment has been treated.

### Iodice

It is essential that we take action to combat an evil which is now widespread but which just started to emerge at the end of the 70s in areas of traditional underdevelopment such as the Mediterranean region and the south of Italy in particular.

The development of the economic crisis has resulted in a transition phase — from an industrial to a post-industrial society — in which the consequences of the international recession are combined with the changes brought about by technological innovations.

Nowadays, the emphasis is on quality rather than quantity of work. The most depressed areas have seen a fall in demand of late, with the risk of being gradually squeezed out of the labour market and a background of lack of prospects for young people and for the socially underprivileged. Unemployment increases where development takes place, bringing about structural changes. This results in an increased cost of living, which also affects those in employment, and reduced possibilities for the unemployed and non-wage earners to enter the world of production due to lack of skill or professional qualifications.

We must also bear in mind that Member States have different ways of looking at the phenomenon depending on their policies in this area. This serious problem is accompanied by an almost complete absence of an internal market owing to insufficient contact between the Member States to coordinate economic and energy policies and scientific research programmes.

Social and ethical imperatives demand that we put more effort into making concrete decisions, because long-term unemployment is the source of damaging uneconomic operation due to the increasing incidence of social security costs on national budgets, to the reduced spending power of those without work and to additional expenditure on training and retraining as a result of loss of skills and experience.

We are motivated to take action for ethical reasons in particular because the problem of unemployment can induce aggression, lethargy and a sense of discouragement both in individuals and groups of people, resulting at times in destructive and delinquent behaviour.

Having said this, we are largely in favour of the document drawn up by the Commission and transmitted to the Council, because it tackles this widespread phenomenon at Community level. But we cannot see why the Council has asked Parliament for its opinion as a matter of urgency.

In our opinion the subject merits a more detailed treatment, but this is in fact provided by Mrs Maij Weggen's report and motion for a resolution as far as analysis and outlook are concerned.

As the problem is serious, it would have been better if the Council had first stated its views on the decisions

already taken by the Parliament on this matter, on the subject of economic policy in general and on the request to double the appropriations for the Social Fund or to raise it to at least 10% of the budget.

If we hold to the tenet of Community solidarity we cannot allow this phenomenon to spread, whether due to internal protectionist measures or to the continuing development of the American and Japanese economies.

Employment and social welfare must become the real testing ground for a demonstration of the political will to achieve union, with a view to reestablishing the sectoral and geographical balance. This must be done at the very top level of coordination between the Community institutions and their financial structures, as well as at the very top level of national and local authority and of social forces. Every effort must be made because if we do not succeed at least in keeping the phenomenon in check in order to undertake an economic revival, then we will witness the deprivation of future generations on a massive scale.

Let us hope that our concern and the suggestions made will go beyond the confines of this hall and make as effective a contribution as possible towards a future of social justice and liberty.

*(Applause from the centre)*

**Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED).** — Mr President, I would like to concentrate exclusively on the Maij-Weggen report on long-term unemployment, as I think Mr Quinn's speech, unhappily, made it clear that the ability of the Council of Ministers actually to affect events in relation to long-term unemployment is extremely limited — probably limited, in fact, to exhortation, because the policies being pursued by the different Member States are themselves so different and the solutions offered by the communication and, indeed, by Mrs Maij-Weggen are so difficult to implement.

Therefore, I think we have to turn to the second part of the communication and to the second part of the Maij-Weggen report, which relates to measures that the Community can itself take. Mrs Maij-Weggen is suggesting the creation of a European Community institute for the study of employment. Frankly, that is not much help if you are one of the 12.4 million unemployed; that is not much of a message to go from this Parliament. But one thing where she does have the complete support of our group is her emphasis on the need to increase the European Social Fund. To take Mr Iodice's point, it is a very sad fact that while unemployment has been increasing, the proportion of the budget going to the Social Fund has been decreasing: 6.9% of the budget in 1983; 6.7% in 1984, and, Mr Quinn, 6.4% in 1985. Those of you who were here earlier will remember that one of the great issues in my country is the current question of the miners' strike,

**Jackson**

where, in fact, and I hope that this point can get home to people — the National Coal Board is offering very generous terms for those people who are willing to take voluntary redundancy. A miner of 37 would be able to take redundancy pay of £ 24 000. But the trouble is, what do you do when you are made voluntarily redundant other than look at the cheque that has been handed to you? We have to give people some hope about the sort of jobs that they might do. In my opinion, the European Social Fund, under its intervention areas E.4 — Local employment initiatives and E.5, has that possibility. However, here we are in this Parliament debating unemployment with all the effectiveness of a water pistol when what we actually need is to concentrate, use our powers, increase the European Social Fund with the effectiveness of a laser gun.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**Mrs Squarcialupi (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, unemployment has now reached such proportions that it is necessary to subdivide it into categories. Today we are going to look at unemployment of a year's duration or more which applies, as we have heard, to almost four and a half million workers of whom more than two million have been unemployed for over two years. Each individual case is a human, personal and family drama and one affecting the whole of society. But there are many cases in which workers, above all women workers get tired of searching for work. The road to poverty is, it would seem, very short.

Changes in production methods and the development of new technologies means that the number of people in these two categories increases continuously, and the burden of unemployment is borne in particular by less qualified workers, by young people and by women. Moreover the worst hit are those with the most disadvantages: e.g. age, geographical location and level of qualifications. As far as age is concerned, the worst affected are young people; people under 25 constitute 28% of the long-term unemployed. In many cases this means not only that they are not employed, but that they have never had a job.

The economic, social, psychological and physical consequences are therefore incalculable, and the document drawn up by the Commission reviews these various aspects and points out the need for the European Community, the Member States and the local authorities to join forces against unemployment. As representatives of the Communist and Allies Group, we too would like to make a contribution, one that has already earned the widespread approval of the Committee on Social Affairs.

Above all we would like to discourage any attitude of resignation. We mean to show that we should in no way diminish our efforts and therefore we call for the confirmation of the agreement to amendments 3, 11 and 12, already approved by the Committee on Social

Affairs. First and foremost we would like to state that the minimum wage or the minimum guaranteed assistance should not be a form of pensioning off but must be accompanied by measures to establish vocational training and retraining in new fields of employment.

Further, we would underline the need for creating new jobs in small and medium-sized undertakings, in craft industries and in cooperatives, at the same time looking for any new occupations that may be opened up by the development of new technologies. In order to bring this about, we would ask for the creation of a Community employment institute to help achieve a genuine and active employment market policy; this would be a means of coordinating the different analyses of the situation and trends. We do not in any way want to create new structures or a new bureaucracy; all we want to do is to restructure what already exists in the Community institutions, and which is at present somewhat dispersed and sometimes a little disorganized.

**Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, having spoken on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on the question of positive action, I should now like to explain briefly on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group why we are in favour of action of this kind.

We know from bitter experience that as soon as they hear the word 'emancipation' with all its associations many people — and by no means only men — at best politely suppress a yawn, or else pour themselves a drink. This is shortsighted, to put it mildly. We used to see the same sort of reaction in the 60s when the question of environmental pollution came up. In those days we were not interested and had no time or money to spare for such matters. The result is that we are now faced with the problem of saving whatever we can, and the various political forces are falling over each other trying to convince the voters of how much importance they attach to a clean world.

My Group is afraid that things might go the same way in the case of emancipation. We will end up trying to lock the stable door after the horse has bolted.

The problem is that the right of every individual, man and woman alike, to personal development is a fundamental principle common to Liberals, Socialists, Christian-Democrats or what have you. There is no getting away from this fact, but it does not in itself get us very far. It is not a question of helping women get a nice job or taking away a man's bread and butter. What we must do is prepare the ground for a society which makes full use of its human potential, without discriminating within the sexes. This is not mere idealism: it is absolutely vital, since in 20 years time the average age of the population will have risen substantially and we will urgently need all the available talent and

**Larive-Groenendaal**

expertise we can find to do the work which needs to be done and support the ever-increasing group of the population which is dependent on the active working population. Let us, therefore, look a bit further than the end of our short-term noses for once.

We all know that in the not so distant past the most absurd arguments were used to try and get women into factories or offices when this was needed. Now in 1984, attempts are being made to keep women at home or send them back home. However, soon enough we will find ourselves in the year 2000 and it will be no use looking for well-trained and qualified men and women who will be able to hold their own on the labour market, which will by then have become highly specialized. For this reason, in this very period of economic recession, when it is so tempting for many people to forget about women's rights and insist instead on their rightful place, encouragement is called for rather than discouragement. Both on the labour market and in education and training — particularly in the professions of the future — there will be a serious need for men and women who are willing and able to do the work.

We must therefore put a stop to all these negative actions aimed at discouraging women. I need only mention, for example, of the increasingly vociferous calls for penalizing couples who are both working. Education for girls and boys with a genuine eye to the future begins right at the kindergarten stage and goes on to include retraining and further training. Europe is relatively poor in natural resources, but we do have human resources, and we must make use of them since this is what will give Europe a chance of surviving into the futuristic world of the 21st century. Then we will fully — and not just manfully — be able to face the already cut-throat competition of the United States and Japan, for example.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The proceedings will now be suspended since it is time for the formal sitting.

*(The sitting was suspended at 11.55 a.m.)*

#### 4. Formal sitting

*Address by Mr Pflimlin, President of the European Parliament, on the occasion of the official visit of Mr Alfonsin, President of the Argentine Republic*

**Mr Pflimlin, President of the European Parliament.** — *(FR)* Your Excellency, my colleagues and I are most honoured to welcome you.

As President of the Argentine Republic, you are the representative of a noble nation, with which over a

long period of history Europe has had links based on a shared civilization and on the same values of liberty, respect for human rights and fraternity, and in greeting you, your Excellency, we are also greeting the statesman who has re-established democratic freedoms in Argentina.

*(Loud and sustained applause)*

It is an event which touched us deeply. During recent years we have followed, often with anguish, the ordeals which the Argentine people have had to suffer, and we were happy to see the return of democracy ushering in a new era.

We know that your concern, the concern of one who has taken on a task which we all realize is a most difficult one, is to make Argentina a true democracy. Thus it seems to me that your aims, your inspiration and your ideal are at one with the spirit pervading the whole of this Parliament before you today.

We are grateful to you for having agreed to visit the European Parliament. We shall listen with the greatest interest to what you have to say both about your preoccupations and about your vision of a future free of a certain legacy of the past. So I shall waste no time, your Excellency, in giving you the floor.

*(Loud applause)*

*Address by Mr Alfonsin*

**Mr Alfonsin, President of the Argentine Republic.** — *(ES)* Mr President, I welcome the opportunity afforded me to speak before the European Parliament. Above all, I hope that what I am going to say will stimulate a dialogue and boost cooperation between Europe and Latin America, since the current world situation urgently calls for such dialogue and cooperation.

I am both troubled and hopeful as I stand before you here today. I am troubled by the serious problems in my own country, by those afflicting Latin America and those besetting the entire world. Although each case has its own particular features, they are nevertheless definitely and inextricably linked. I am not just worried, however, I am also hopeful. I am hopeful because I am convinced that all these problems can be overcome if we use clear heads to study them and have the courage to implement sensible solutions.

I should like to review briefly the problems as we see them.

In order to understand the concerns of the Argentine Government, it is useful to remind ourselves, first of all, that our history in the last 50 years has been a tumultuous one and has turned out very differently from that which we might have hoped for and desired.

### Alfonsín

Half a century ago, the richness of our land and the characteristics of our people and society seemed to portend peace, prosperity, freedom and justice.

Instead of prosperity, however, we endured a continuing economic crisis, with many Argentinians suffering from poverty and even hunger, and instead of freedom we were subjected to authoritarian regimes with a lamentable frequency. Instead of peace and justice we suffered violence, intolerance and inequality within our own country and conflicts with the world outside.

Last year, the Argentinian people showed their desire to put an end to this half century of tragedies and frustrations through free and democratic elections. My government received a clear mandate to restore democracy and to guarantee freedom, pluralism, human rights and the due process of law.

There is no need for me here to stress the enormous challenges which faced the democratic government. But it is fitting to point out that, while some of these goals can be reached wholly through the efforts of the Argentinians alone, some require the collaboration of others as well.

In response to the wishes of our people, peaceful coexistence among Argentinians has been restored. We have achieved this by guaranteeing freedom, enforcing the rule of law, and respecting and encouraging others to respect human rights in our country.

In the same way, and for the same reasons, we advocate peaceful coexistence with other nations, this being not only desirable but also feasible and the most beneficial for the international community. Our determination to resolve international disputes in a peaceful and diplomatic fashion was clearly borne out in the case of our dispute with our neighbours the Chileans. This example is proof of the attitude with which we are facing and will continue to face our international problems.

*(Applause)*

It is also evidence of the extent to which peace can be guaranteed when there is a joint will to achieve it.

Peace within our country and in our relations with the outside world, and democracy and freedom in our country, need to be backed by the material and spiritual well-being of our people. We know that there is no peace or freedom, nor any lasting democracy, without a healthy and prosperous economy to sustain them. This is a point on which I must dwell a bit longer, not just to explain our concerns and our hopes, but also because it highlights, in my opinion, some facets of a problem which does not just affect Argentina.

Quite apart from the violence which reigned in our country in the last few years, our economy also suf-

fered enormous harm. The sectors of production were disrupted, central government departments were in disarray, per capita gross domestic product slumped to levels of a decade ago, industrial activity declined similarly, average salaries fell sharply and the overall share of workers in the national product was reduced from about 50% to well below 40%. While all this was going on, Argentina ran up — paradoxically — an enormous debt of 45 000 million dollars. The benefits from this debt were evidently minimal in terms of real investment, since in the meantime — as I have just said — there has been no growth or prosperity, but quite the opposite.

Part of this debt was due to the irresponsible attitude of an authoritarian government, which was more disposed to enjoy the privileges of unlimited power than it was to honour the kind of obligations which any authority must assume. Most of this debt, however, was caused by unbridled speculation, which was encouraged by that authoritarian government and — it has to be said — abetted by the way the international financial system operates.

The democratic government of Argentina has frequently expressed its willingness to pay off debts contracted by the nation, just as Argentina always has done. In order to meet these commitments — which the democratic government did not itself undertake, but inherited — it is essential that the efforts and sacrifices demanded of our people be feasible and realistic. In other words, we must have the right conditions in order to pay off the debt.

So it is with regret that I have to assert that the conditions which apply in the international market are far from being the right ones.

Sooner or later — and the sooner the better — it will have to be understood that, if we do not manage to change the conditions, it will be economically impossible and politically unfeasible to repay the foreign debts of our countries. It will not be possible economically because not enough wealth will have been produced to meet the payments. Politically it will not be feasible because, to demand even greater sacrifices without offering people the guarantee of a better future will undermine the strength of a democracy whose whole policy, precisely, is to foster an attitude of cooperation and not confrontation with the developed world.

We believe that the best attitude to the problems besetting us is to examine them without fear or prejudice. We also believe that we have to look for solutions which are both sensible and lasting by exploring any possibility which might lead to a reasonable agreement, and we are ready to strike a compromise in order to reach agreement. But, as in all international questions, all the parties involved must try to be sensible and reasonable. That is why we put our faith in and encourage dialogue.

*(Applause)*

**Alfonsín**

Apart from its own specific features, Mr President, Argentina's situation has much in common with that of a number of other Latin American countries. Throughout Latin America, as in my country, there has been a resurgence of efforts to restore or consolidate democracy.

*(Loud applause)*

The experience of authoritarianism has been rejected. We are tired of violence, whether from terrorism or from the forces of repression. We need to live together peacefully and in a civilized manner if we are to solve our problems and work towards our future.

Democracy now represents the hope of our peoples. It is the responsibility of everyone not to squander this opportunity. It is primarily the responsibility of the Latin Americans themselves, but it is also that of all free men.

Just as in Europe after the war, it is vital that democracy should prove viable in Latin America. In other words, it must at least be able to provide conditions which guarantee the freedom and prosperity of its inhabitants.

A great deal of effort and tenacity is required to reach this goal, we know that. But, as long as our democracies grow stronger by showing that they are capable of resolving our problems, the people of Latin America will not come to regret their political decision.

Meanwhile, however, this picture is overshadowed by a threat. Right now the majority of Latin American countries — just like Argentina — are overwhelmed by an enormous burden of foreign debts. Until a few years ago, structural faults in our economies used to oblige us to incur external debt in order to transform our productive systems and stimulate progress in our societies.

But in more recent times, and for reasons which you all know full well, the international financial system gradually became distorted and our foreign debts increased sharply without our receiving any tangible benefits, thus favouring speculation of all kinds.

I must stress that, so long as no change is made to these new conditions which are governing the world financial market, it is highly unlikely that economic realities will allow the region to pay off its foreign debt. Despite this, there are those who currently believe that the burden of these debts should be borne by those who have the least and who have gone completely empty-handed.

If this were true, and we were to accept it, there is not much chance that the democracy that we all desire so greatly for the entire continent would be able to survive.

If this were to happen, we would be adding political disarray and social upheaval to our serious economic problems, and violence would probably break out again. The peace and stability of the region would be threatened.

I am sorry to say that, in my opinion, the economic and financial restrictions which are applied in the international sphere, and political viewpoints and threats of this type, are not always adequately perceived in the developed democratic nations.

Some progress has definitely been made in dealing with these problems. There is no doubt that there has been increasing awareness during this year of the dangerous repercussions that such problems could entail. These moves are encouraging but inadequate. Much more needs to be done, and it needs to be done faster. How do we go about it?

Simply by doing what we have recommended time and time again. In other words, we must get around a table and look at the situation, examine any new facets and decide whether the measures on which we are relying to tackle problems are adequate or have limitations. In short, we must study the problem rationally and look for reasonable solutions. That is the thinking behind the proposal for a dialogue which the countries subscribing to the Cartagena agreement — including ourselves — have put forward.

Mr President, the developments in Argentina and elsewhere in Latin America are not isolated incidents. If we look into the causes, we perceive disturbing signs of more widespread phenomena in the world. If we imagine some of the possible consequences, we can see much wider repercussions, not only economic and financial, but also political.

The world economy is marked by growing imbalances, not just in production and technology but also in trade. Similarly, financial distortions have discouraged investment in production, and have channelled one-way capital flows on a huge scale and encouraged speculation.

A large part of the world is being affected by these phenomena, but they appear to be particularly exacerbated in Latin America and a few other regions. Our continent is like a distorting mirror which exaggerates certain traits but which nevertheless reflects a tangible reality. It is to be hoped that it is not a warning of what could happen on an even greater scale.

Meanwhile, other world political developments are no less disturbing. We have witnessed the escalation of a policy of confrontation between the super-powers, with all its concomitant risks and threats, of which Europe is more aware than any other region.

In short, we are beginning to see a world in which increasing instability is more and more the dominant feature of both economic and political events.

**Alfonsin**

I should like to think that the picture I have described is a false one, but if it is not, I am worried about the impact of a worsening of Latin American problems.

I believe that it is vital for us to hurry up and solve them. We must be clear-headed if we are to look at reality without being prejudiced. We must use our common sense if we are to solve these problems. This is not an impossible task. If we are ready to talk and to compromise we can manage it.

Mr President:

Consolidating world peace calls for efforts on the part of a strong, united and democratic Europe.

We realize that it was necessary to form the European common market in order to achieve these aims, and we also realize that the agricultural policy is the cornerstone of the common market.

We understand, therefore, what the basis of the common agricultural policy is and that, as a result, it has to be maintained as it has been conceived. But we are also equally convinced that its application has many defects, causing undue harm not just to third countries which, like ours, are producers and exporters of cereals, meat and dairy products, but also to the Community itself, because it is not a good deal for consumers and adds to the Community budget. We believe that steps can be taken to find ways of applying this policy which would minimize its negative impact on our countries, and that instituting a procedure of regular, periodical and systematic consultations on these topics would be of great mutual benefit.

*(Applause)*

The pathway to solutions lies in increasing interdependency between Latin America and the Community, based on a formal or informal association between the two regions. There are a number of factors which militate against this suggestion, some general and some specific.

Among the first there is the uneven negotiating strength of the parties concerned, related not just to their respective economic and trading capacities, which themselves are highly disparate, but also, primarily, to differences connected with institutional features: while the European Economic Community's trade policy is centralized in the hands of the Commission, with precise objectives and efficient mechanisms, the countries of Latin America have only just begun to seek unity and to coordinate activities in the international sphere as part of an essential process leading to Latin American integration, to overcome the problem of the critical state of our relations with the rest of the world, or, in other words, to rectify its failure to adopt a common position on the development of its foreign relations.

To put it bluntly, the voice of Latin America has not been strong enough to make itself heard, and it was not in the Community's interest to listen.

A practical assessment of requirements on both sides needs to be made in order to encourage greater dynamism in the trade flows between Latin America and the European Economic Community.

On its side, Latin America requires:

- a high level of investment and resources;
- full access to international public financing, mainly through multilateral financial bodies;
- an increase in its exports.

On their side, the countries of the Economic Community need:

- reliable and long-term sources of raw materials of crucial importance;
- markets for their industrial exports.

For such conditions to apply and remain, there are certain changes which must be made:

- there must be a continuing reduction in the number of protectionist measures of all types to which the industrialized countries are resorting;
- the industrialized countries must be prepared to make structural changes in their economies to promote the development of new products, processes and technologies, rather than insisting on preserving sectors in which they have lost comparative advantages. At the same time, investment in developing countries should not be of the type which promotes 'export enclaves' because, rather than fostering growth in the region in which these are established, this perpetuates production conditions that ought to be dying out.

In brief, the challenges for effective and continuing cooperation between the countries of Latin America and those of the European Economic Community depend on the following:

- a recognition of the changes in comparative advantages, which will result in the products of Latin America having greater access to Community markets, accompanied by modifications to the agricultural and industrial policies of the countries of Europe;
- a recognition of the advantages of foreign investment in accordance with the individual countries' development priorities, while respecting their sovereignty and ensuring terms acceptable to both sides;
- the need for the integration processes in both regions to lead to forms of complementarity in order to forge stronger links in the world econ-

**Alfonsin**

omy and in order to arrive at global solutions to mutual problems;

- a recognition of the effectiveness of the free functioning of the international financial markets, together with a recognition of the need to find ways of financing developing countries in the long term;
- the need to give tangible form to the aims of the North-South dialogue by encouraging the transfer of resources and technology to developing countries.

There is an obvious contradiction between the advice to developing countries that they should modernize their economies by opening up to the outside world and integrating themselves more closely into world markets, and the growing tendency of others to resort to protectionist measures. The problem for Latin American countries is even more serious because they are discriminated against through institutional mechanisms. What is more, the restrictions which are proliferating under the neo-protectionism currently in vogue specifically affect all those sectors in which the countries of Latin America have comparative advantages or are acquiring them in a costly attempt at technological modernization.

Measures should be initiated to eliminate, or at least lessen, the restrictions on access to products of special interest for developing countries. In this way, imports attributed to market distortions should be excluded from any limitation measures, since it has been demonstrated that their share in the market is proportionally small. In any case, if distortions were to continue, discussions in suitable forums such as GATT could be held to study the roots of the problems and to devise agreed solutions.

As part of the same way of thinking, a study should be made of measures which would permit the developing countries' products to be included in the framework for trade under the Community's agricultural policy.

A policy of this kind would also make demands of Latin America and the other developing countries. These producing countries would have to guarantee security of supply in terms of volumes, prices and standards of hygiene. Businesses on both sides could doubtless play a very important role in all this through trade agreements, exchange of information, technology transfer, joint ventures, direct investment and other forms of economic coordination which would contribute to improving information and cooperation, thus ensuring genuine joint participation in the management of trade flows.

The system of generalized preferences schemes applied by European countries as a way of encouraging exports from developing countries to their markets should be extended, bearing in mind that the preferen-

tial margins agreed on in multilateral trade negotiations will be reduced.

To this effect, regulations in Western Europe which restrict the entry of so-called 'sensitive' and 'semi-sensitive' products should be gradually curtailed until they are finally eliminated while, at the same time, technical and financial assistance should be granted for the industrial restructuring of these sectors.

European firms should be encouraged to establish themselves in Latin America, either directly or through joint ventures. In this fashion, the process of modernizing the economy of our countries would be given a boost, domestic supply would be improved and, in addition, it would mean we had distribution networks offering increased opportunities for exports on both sides.

Many will argue, Mr President, that this is an unworkable plan, a utopian vision. But how could anyone in this House subscribe to such an objection? How could anyone here say such a thing, when the existence of this House is proof positive of what can be achieved when there is a political will and of what can be attained through dialogue and a conjunction of interests? Mentioning what is today a reality 40 years ago would have probably also been considered unthinkable. Nevertheless, here we are, in this European Parliament which, for a Latin American, constitutes the extraordinary achievement of three goals: unity, democracy and the definitive suppression of antagonisms which tore the old continent apart not so very long ago.

Europe with its institutions, and particularly with this Parliament, is a clear example of how confrontation, with its attendant wars and misunderstandings, can be replaced — through clear-sighted analysis and rational decisions — by lasting compromises which lead to peace and prosperity.

This inspiring experience of unity in democracy, gives fresh impetus to a possibility which deserves to be followed up, since it represents much more than an academic question for us: Why shouldn't it be possible to apply, beyond these borders, a thinking similar to that which bore fruit in Europe?

We are, after all, inspired by the same values and the same convictions as to the basic moral nature of our political commitment to uphold democracy and an equitable international order.

We do not mean, of course, to copy institutions or to naively transplant them. What we need to do is to adopt the approach and the method used in Europe to favour reconstruction and the achievement of political unity, so that a compromise can be found for cooperation between Latin America and the old world.

**Alfonsin**

We are convinced that an undertaking of this kind will act as a stabilizing factor in a world which is today marked by instability.

The proposal which inspires us and the aim which we in Latin America are trying to pursue is none other than to stress the need for a fruitful, constructive and — at the same time — bold discussion with the industrialized nations, so that we can pull ourselves out of the present situation with its bleak prospects.

That is the meaning of our appeal. Europe and Latin America are capable of analysing the situation lucidly and finding reasonable solutions. By reaching compromises with mutual obligations we can solve problems which, otherwise, could have grave consequences for the entire world.

Europe — which is profoundly homogeneous in its apparent diversity, thanks to almost uniform levels of education and living standards which made it possible to achieve without disadvantages for its members — and Latin America — a community of peoples united by a common language, geography, history and institutions, but which is nevertheless diverse while being apparently homogeneous — can find common ground. This must take the form of a dialogue capable of modifying current political and economic relations, thereby avoiding the burden of confrontation and promoting the merging of two continental blocs.

This is certainly a challenge. We need to build juster societies which are led by free men. There can be no doubt that freedom unites us: the freedom of men, of peoples and of nations.

That is more than enough reason, Mr President, for us to work together.

*(Loud and sustained applause)*

**Mr Pflimlin, President of the European Parliament.** — (FR) Your Excellency, the European parliament has listened to your words with the greatest attention, and the warmth of the applause which greeted your speech is proof that you have succeeded in reaching the spirit and hearts of my colleagues.

You have spoken to us about the difficulties which you must face and, after having heard you, we have a better understanding of what these difficulties are and of how serious they are.

You appealed for closer cooperation between Europe and Latin America, particularly your own country. I believe that this appeal has also been heard and understood.

We are well aware that underlying your thoughts and actions is the determination to defend democracy, since democratic pluralism as we understand it exists only in a minority of countries in the world.

This is one more reason why there should be solidarity between such nations, despite the oceans which separate them. The main message put across to us by your address is that of solidarity between democracies. I thank you for bringing it to us.

*(Loud applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting was resumed at 3 p.m.)*

**President.** — For the benefit of the English-speaking Members of this House, I should like to point out that Question Time this afternoon will be held from 6.30 p.m. to 8 p.m. and not from 5.30 p.m., as indicated in the English version of the agenda.

5. *Topical and urgent debate (objections)*

**President.** — In accordance with Rule 48(2), second subparagraph, of the Rules of Procedure, I have received the following objections, justified in writing, to the list of subjects proposed for the topical and urgent debate scheduled for tomorrow morning.

*(The President read the objections)<sup>1</sup>*

I would remind the House that the vote on these objections will be taken without debate.

**Motion by Mrs Castle, on behalf of the Socialist Group, seeking to include Mr Huckfield's motion for a resolution on the miners' dispute (Doc. 2-829/84) as the first item.**

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Madam President, I ask for a roll-call vote on this item.

**President.** — I should inform the House that I have six urgencies on which there are justifications. But I really think that if Members are to understand the procedure, it would be easier to take them one by one and, if this is agreeable to the House, I will do it in this manner.

**Mr Taylor (ED).** — Yes, I am with you so far, Madam President, but I would like you to explain to the House why this particular one is being taken first. What are the other ones, and does a decision on this one affect the chances of the others being debated?

<sup>1</sup> See Minutes.

**President.** — This happens to be first because this is the order in which they were received, and this is how they are dealt with in the office of the presidency, as I understand it. If the House wishes me to read them all out first, I can do so and then read them out again. But if you are happy that I read them out one by one, and there are six of them, I shall do it in that manner.

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Madam President, may I ask that our electronic geniuses for reference should quote the number of each proposal on the board which is provided for this purpose. That way we will reduce the chance of mistake.

**President.** — Mr Sherlock, I will ask for this to be done.

**Mr Newton Dunn (ED).** — Madam President, can you assure me that the request for a roll-call vote has been submitted in writing beforehand, as required by the Rules of Procedure?

**President.** — No, it has not.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Madam President, I am sorry but I had just been to the table before you came in and asked for a roll-call vote in the name of the Socialist Group. It was an official decision of ours. Nobody told us to put it in writing. That was my official application to the table before you came into the Chamber.

*(Parliament approved Mrs Castle's motion)*

\*  
\* \*

*After the approval of Mr Ulburghs' motion*

**Mr Glinne (S).** — (FR) I should like to ask you to assure us that certain people in the Chamber who, what is more, are occupying Members' seats, will not vote in place of Members in the vote we are about to take.

**President.** — That is, of course, a rule of the House, Mr Glinne. Anybody who is not a Member of this House and who is sitting in a Member's seat is asked to withdraw from that seat immediately.<sup>1,2</sup>

*Unemployment — Action on behalf of women  
(continuation)*

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on unemployment and action to combat poverty.

<sup>1</sup> Further information concerning the vote on the objections to the topical and urgent debate can be found in the Minutes.

<sup>2</sup> *Membership of a committee of inquiry:* See Minutes.

Before calling the next speaker, will those who do not wish to listen to this debate kindly withdraw from the Chamber so that the speaker will have the courtesy of being listened to by those who wish to remain.

**Mrs Chouraqui (RDE).** — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Europe and the other countries of the West thought they had eradicated poverty over the last thirty years, only to find, in 1975, when the first programme to combat poverty was introduced, that there were 30 million people in Europe whose income was less than half the per capita average.

Today we do not know the exact figure — 30 million? 35 million? 40 million? In any event more than 10% of the population of the Community. And people are calling this the new poverty. I should like Members to consider this term. I do not think the word 'new' is appropriate. There is nothing new about a situation which always produces social outcasts. It would be more accurate to talk about the *return* or *rebirth* of poverty. Why has poverty returned? How can we stop it? How can we fight it? We all know the major causes, which have been discussed by the Commission and in Mr Megahy's report. They speak of two types of poverty. First there is poverty caused by economic factors: the crisis, industrial change and relentless technological progress have all contributed. Then there is poverty as a social phenomenon caused by the development of social habits'. Changes in the structure of the family and the substantial increase in the number of one-parent families are all exacerbating factors.

Our greatest cause for concern today seems to be long-term unemployment, which affects approximately three million men and two million women in the Community — urban unemployment, and unemployment in depressed areas. How do these people survive today? They live on the minimum level of state benefits which, in some Member States, is below the poverty threshold laid down by the International Labour Office.

Let us be clear about this. Poverty exists and very quickly becomes extreme. As elected representatives, we have all seen it in our own countries: a lack of adequate food and clothing, loss of capital assets, unpaid rent, mortgages and forced sales. These are quickly followed by a loss professional skills and often by crime or illness.

From the state's point of view poverty is expensive. Unemployment benefits account for 5% of public expenditure. Production losses caused by long-term unemployment 3-5% of the Community GNP. And unless we combat poverty at national and European level, it will cost us even more dearly.

I cannot agree with what Mr Megahy said about economic growth in his speech this morning. Economic growth — *renewed* economic growth — is indeed possible and is the only way to combat poverty.

**Chouraqui**

The new technologies, youth training and job flexibility are all factors which create steady and productive employment. Would not job-sharing, which some people advocate, merely in fact be poverty-sharing?

I myself think Parliament is too half-hearted in its views on getting people back to work and on renewing determination and expansion. We must win the economic war in order to improve our work, our productivity and our standard of living.

How can the European institutions combat poverty? First by researching into and finding out about poverty, but above all by introducing a new programme of action.

The aim of the Megahy report is basically to stress the need to step up levels of action and to recommend that 80% of the budget be devoted to researching into poverty. We agree with this. We believe that a guarantee minimum income should be introduced in all Member States, but that the financial implications for each State should be examined. We consider that Parliament should repeat its request for the setting up of an anti-poverty clearing-house. Poverty is not inevitable; the struggle against poverty should be both worldwide and coordinated at local and European levels.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Flanagan (RDE).** — Madam President, I just wish to register a protest. When I asked two members of your group to kindly stop talking, they forthwith left the Chamber and ceased talking here. Two others declined to stop talking, and, as you can see, it is still going on in the corridor.

I am most grateful to you for the manner in which you have tried to get proper behaviour in the House by holding up this debate until people had left the Chamber or ceased misbehaving in the Chamber. Would you please inform the members of your group that that applies to them too?

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Flanagan. Your point has been noted.

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC).** — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like in this joint debate to concentrate on the Maij-Weggen report on action to combat long-term unemployment. This report has substantially improved the original Commission text. It is much more concrete and gives specific guidelines for immediate action. My whole-hearted congratulations to Mrs Maij-Weggen for this.

I share the rapporteur's regret that the Council asked Parliament to deliver an opinion so rapidly. May I point out that Annex II of the Maij-Weggen report presents the Council in a particularly bad light, since it

shows that we have discussed and approved no less than 14 reports on combating unemployment which the Council has, to a greater or lesser degree, ignored.

It also suggests, and quite rightly, that the local governments and trade union organizations should be involved in the employment debate. However, in my view, one link is missing if our action to combat long-term unemployment is to be really effective and show results, and that link is at regional level. In a number of Member States it is regional level which is responsible for legislation on employment and which decides how the funds are to be allocated. Take, for example, the situation in Belgium, where in-service training and retraining are entirely in the hands of the Flemish and French-speaking regional governments, but yet there is no provision under the Treaties for these bodies to enter into dialogue with the European Commission. How on earth can we expect the Council and Commission to formulate a policy aiming at concrete measures and results when the obvious discussion partners are involved neither in drawing it up nor in implementing it? I believe we need to completely rethink what we are doing because there can be no European unity without regional autonomy.

The regions must be given the opportunity to develop their own employment schemes in response to their very diverse needs, on the basis of an integrated development model. There is plenty of scope for new initiatives — as Mrs Maij-Weggen's report shows — such as adopting a cooperative approach, cutting through bureaucratic red tape, or developing the quaternary sectors, not to mention the new openings for employment resulting from technological innovations or in new areas such as the environment. In our view, regionalization and European unity go hand in hand, particularly as regards employment policy: growing towards unity, while maintaining diversity of approach — since the regions are the best judge of their own individual needs and can provide the best solutions.

This, Madam President, was why I tabled so many amendments to this, I say again, excellent report from Mrs Maij-Weggen. They are an attempt to draw the attention of the Council to the very essential missing link at regional level, which is vital if we are to make real progress in the battle against unemployment.

**President.** — I advise Members who will be speaking that they are requested to keep within the time allotted to them because we do not have any time in hand today — this, particularly, in order that the Commissioner can give a full reply at the end of the debate.

**Mrs Lehideux (DR).** — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it was with interest that the Group of the European Right examined Mrs van den Heuvel's report on positive action for women.

**Lehideux**

We noted many interesting points in the report, in particular concerning work, availability of interesting jobs, equality of pay and the training of young women to adapt to the new technologies, which will be with us very shortly.

However, there is one very important point which is not mentioned either in the report or within the Committee: it concerns the family and the upbringing of children. We have been told that the Community cannot express an opinion on this subject. Must we then call the upbringing of children by another name, to indicate that it is a job of work? Is it not, indeed, one of the most satisfying tasks for a young woman?

*(Mixed reactions on the left, applause from the right)*

... if women show little interest in bringing up a family nowadays, it is because they receive no assistance! A large number of women in France and in Europe as a whole would take great pleasure in rearing a family if something definite were done to help them. I do not think this would be difficult. Assistance could be given in the form of an allowance for women at home, leave for women bringing up children, the availability of property and subsidized housing.

*(Mixed reactions on the left)*

Much is made of the serious population crisis currently affecting France and Europe as a whole. Indeed it has such proportions that it merits our immediate attention and ought to be given priority in the Committee on Women's Rights.

There are of course many young women who want to work outside the home but equally there are those who prefer to work at home; they should be given help to stay at home and enable them to do that job of work.

What we want then, or what we would like to see, is the implementation of the measures we have spoken of: housing assistance, tax measures to enable women to stay at home, the possibility of retraining if, having brought up their children, they wished to return to work or were obliged to do so by certain factors. We are aware of the importance of the rôle of women in the world of work, and do not want this fact to be neglected. We would hope that they could fulfil this rôle in the best possible conditions. This does not mean that the woman's rôle in the family and at home is not vital; we should not forget this fact and it surprises me that so little attention is paid to it! This may seem hard to believe but is nonetheless true.

We hope that the budget item will not go exclusively towards the creation of nurseries and social facilities, but that it will also be used to promote a dynamic family policy which will contribute to the survival of Europe, which is seriously threatened.

*(Applause from the right — Protests from the left)*

**President.** — I would ask Members to pay to all Members of this House when they are speaking the courtesy of not interrupting. All Members require that same courtesy, and they are expected to give it to others. I would ask you all to please keep quiet when any Member from any part of this House is speaking.

*(Applause)*

I would remind those who perhaps do not know all the rules of democracy, from whichever side of the House they may be, that there is a right to speak and, at the same time, a right to be heard. I would therefore ask all those Members who wish to interrupt speakers to think how pleased they would be if it happened to them. I would request them to keep quiet while a Member of this Parliament is on his or her feet. You can make as much noise as you like after.

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — *(NL)* Madam President, I will only need three of my ten minutes.

The Maij-Weggen report is indeed a good report but I would nonetheless like to make a couple of comments. With an unemployment figure of 12 million in Europe, this must be one of our greatest problems, not just for the people themselves, but also for the most backward and neglected regions in Europe. The story is all too familiar: the most vulnerable people are affected in the most vulnerable areas. I am thinking chiefly of the young, women, immigrants. Behind the cold statistical figures lies tragedy, both socio-psychological and moral.

Madam President, the philosopher Illich stated in his books that we in the West can learn from the mistakes made in the developing countries using our own development models. There as here we see the same causes and the same tragic results. The backward areas are no historical accident but 'the result of misguided development', to use the words of Raoul Prebisch, the well-known economist, founder of UNCTAD and compatriot of President Alfonsín.

I will give you just two examples which demonstrate very clearly where economic policy in the developing countries and in Europe has gone wrong.

Firstly, the available wealth and potential for sound economic development, such as the presence of natural resources or good agricultural land, have been used virtually in their entirety to further interests outside the region or country. In the case of the Limburg coal mines, for example, we missed the chance of achieving economic differentiation by not processing the coal in high technology industry or stimulating subsidiary industries. Instead the coal was taken away and my region was left with subsidence and empty galleries. If this last lifeline is taken from the region there is no hope left for the young.

## Ulburghs

Secondly, we were promised miracles: new economic expansion would look after our welfare; the multinationals were cushioned by legislation to encourage expansion, subsidies for just about everything, tax exemptions. They did come, but a good many have already gone again. There is a local song which goes: Workers do not despair, your factory lives on in distant lands. Because as readily as they come, once there are no more benefits to be had they go away and the places they have left are once again an industrial waste-land.

Madam President, I am afraid that Mrs Maij-Wegen's report will continue to be wishful thinking unless we tackle the structural causes of unemployment.

The economic restructuring of backward regions will have to start from the opportunities available locally, such as coal. Until they have been used mainly for an externally-oriented economy.

The population of the backward regions needs sensible initiatives concentrating on production for their own requirements and on building up their own social defences.

Finally, the EEC must take immediate action to support the local population against the arbitrary phasing-out of the multinationals.

**Mrs d'Ancona (S).** — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the economic crisis, and the fact that there are so many without work, gives Member States with a conservative coalition, like my country, a good excuse to block the further independence of women and to regard unemployment as a problem which affects primarily men.

It is very refreshing, therefore, that the draft recommendation on positive action for women shows an understanding of how detrimental the recession is to the emancipation of women, so that positive action is more important now than ever. Because it is quite clear that equal treatment of men and women can only be really effective if men and women start on an equal footing. Women have a lot of ground to make up. This can be done by positive action or, if I may speak plainly, by giving women, as a temporary measure, preferential treatment in education or on the labour market. Measures can be taken, for example, to enable women, at last, to combine their home life with paid work outside the home. It can also be achieved by allowing women to have an equal say in the decision-making process. Because on any important issue likely to change their lives and their chances of being treated as independent individuals, women are in the final analysis mainly dependent on the judgement of men. It is rare to find women in the places where decisions are made, either in politics or in leading positions in employers' or employees' organizations. That would not in itself be so disastrous if the issues relevant to

women could be treated just as seriously in their absence, but unfortunately that is often not the case.

In the two years that my country has had a Christian Democrat/Liberal coalition there has been a thing of fine-sounding emancipation measures. But these are empty promises because what happens in reality is very different. The implementation of the third EEC directive on the equal treatment of men and women, bread-winners and non-breadwinners in unemployment insurance has not stopped the bread-winner principle being introduced into our social security system in a number of places, although it had not been before. As from 1 January, this same regulation will extend the discriminating provisions now contained in the system for married women to non-earning men. Before the Commission talks about positive action it should first do something about negative action of this sort against women.

One more example: unemployment is a had thing, but it is often not considered so very bad for married women. They are advised to find fulfilment and satisfaction in voluntary unpaid work. There is certainly still plenty of scope, especially with jobs disappearing under conservative governments in the very sectors which employ a large number of women, such as education or the social services.

But, Madam President, the best indication of the fact that the emancipation of women is not regarded as urgent, either in my country or in other Member States, is that we are speaking here today not about a directive but about a recommendation. A directive was going too far for the Commission. Nonetheless, it is to be hoped that this guideline will help to replace a policy which is so discouraging for women by a more encouraging one. We must not let ourselves be beguiled by fine words but, as my colleague Ien van den Heuvel has already said, we must find out what the Member States are actually doing. If it is found that this guideline is achieving too little, then, Madam President, there must be no hesitation in introducing a more powerful instrument, in other words, a directive.

**Mr Chanteric (PPE).** — (NL) Madam President, in the second quarterly report on the economic situation in the European Community, submitted by the European Commission in July this year, it was stated that the situation this year, taken as a whole, was rosier than last year. The growth in real terms of the gross domestic product of the European Community was expected to be between 2 and 2.5%. Another favourable element is the fact that the economies of the Member States are growing closer together and that inflation is continuing to fall.

But two other indicators continue to be bad: firstly, the budget deficits in a number of Member States where the government deficits and the excessive level of interest payments threaten to become a vicious cir-

### Chanteric

cle, and secondly, the continuing poor prospects for employment. Unemployment continues to be the problem in the European Community, the reduction of which must be a major priority.

In its most recent report, the OECD forecast that after three successive years of falling employment in Western Europe it would then start to rise, but that the rise would not be enough to absorb the increase in the working population. Measures to combat long-term unemployment are therefore essential. The number of long-term unemployed is continuing to grow. In 1983 40% of the total number of unemployed had been out of work for more than a year compared with 'only' 27% in 1979. This group must be given priority in immediate employment programmes. A rise in employment opportunities will only really benefit people who have been unemployed for a short time and the long-term unemployed are in danger of losing out.

The Maij-Weggen report and I would like to congratulate the reporter for this work — proposes an emergency plan for the long-term unemployed which should lead, among other things, to a commitment by the Member States to offer persons who have been unemployed for more than 12 months a retraining or in-service training programme or alternative work.

I have also tabled an amendment to oblige the Member States to guarantee young unemployed the right to work in jobs of local or social benefit after a maximum of two years. The unemployed in general, but especially the young unemployed, have the feeling that there is a lot of talk about their problems but little effective action. These two proposals, Madam President, will give the European policy credibility.

There is a clear link, Madam President, between combating poverty and combating long-term unemployment. Community action to combat these two evils must be carried out in conjunction. I would like to stop here, Madam President, in the hope that the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs meeting in December this year will take Parliament's proposals into account.

**Mr Tuckman (ED).** — The European Democratic Group welcomes the three reports. Long-term unemployed deteriorate with nothing to do. People without work become lethargic and a waste to themselves and their society. This is particularly bad for young people, many of whom have never had a chance to establish post-school working patterns. We like the attempt at some kind of work guarantee in the directive but are very unsure whether it is feasible. Certainly, it should be possible to provide social work to the advantage of all. There are so many things to build, to renovate, to keep tidy, so many unfortunates to help with shopping, working, filling forms, even with the simple alleviation of loneliness in the case of old people and bereavement. Not all of these tasks can be fully paying

jobs. The Community would benefit, but are the unions broadminded enough to see the opportunities and allow them to operate?

Our amendments to this directive and to the motion for a resolution are directed at two matters. We strongly accept the Albert/Ball conclusions and this Parliament's Herman report. Europe must invest more before it increases its end consumption. Secondly, we do not see the reduction of working hours as the answer to today's problems. Hours have come down a lot in this century, and that is very welcome. However, the notion that reduced hours share out a given amount of work more widely is probably mistaken. It could result in extra overtime pay for the lucky majority with no benefit to job-seekers. If shorter hours are coupled with the same pay as for the original longer time, we would need a higher price from customers for our goods and services. But we are in worldwide competition for markets, especially with Japan and the US.

We are also worried about further burdens on the social security budget of Member States. The idea of providing increased pay after a year's unemployment is, of course, attractive. The longer you are out of work the more likely you are to have used up your savings. However, the budget consequences are substantial. What Europe needs is the kind of drive and enterprise which our overseas competitors have. They created 15 million jobs at a time when we shamefully lost three million. The thrust of the report and motion for a resolution is right and we shall support it.

We also like the report on poverty. It is a useful step forward, particularly in changing the emphasis from research to action. There comes a time when you must take a risk and commit yourself, even though the matter is not fully researched. Nothing ever is. We do not live long enough to wait. Our one amendment is meant as a marker. We want to show the difference between that absolute poverty — happily not much in evidence in Europe today — when health is endangered and the relative poverty from which so many suffer. To be without food, shelter and heat is a very different matter from the poverty which is measured as a percentage of average income.

I now come to the Van den Heuvel motion for a resolution. The prejudice against women in today's Europe is surprising, you will agree, Madam President. It is tenacious and largely unjustified as well as irrational. However, when ten Member States nominate 14 Commissioners in 1984 — this very year — and not one is a woman, then what can you expect in walks of life for which politician and statesman are the shining examples of progress? Where are the progressive attitudes of Kohl, Mitterrand, Craxi, Schlüter, Thatcher, Papandreou and the other four?

**Mrs J. Hoffmann (COM).** — (FR) The most recent statistics confirm that unemployment in on the

**Hoffmann**

increase throughout the Community, and there are more and more women having to face life without a job, and for longer and longer periods at a time. Given the scale of the problem, I think that the positive action for women which, as the rapporteur rightly stresses, is very specific and limited, is certainly not going to solve much at all. Having said that, it is not the intention of the French Members of the Communist and Allies Group to reject any initiatives which may achieve progress and enable us to take a step forward, however small, in the fight against unemployment among women. But I believe that nothing could be worse, at the very time when we are discussing the report on combating long-term unemployment, than to give women, young people and the unemployed in general the impression that measures of this sort will in themselves solve their problems.

How can we fail to question the actual scope of actions such as this when all the economic forecasts, particularly those issued by the OECD, are so gloomy? The forecasts are also accompanied by recommendations or advice for Member States on being more flexible when dealing with employment and wages, and on reducing national public sector deficits. Reading the Commission document and Mrs Majj-Weggen's report, we cannot fail to notice the eagerness with which this advice is being followed, since there are plans for coordinated action at Community level to ensure greater flexibility on the labour market and the redistribution of work. But in my opinion this is, once again, bad advice, and the purveyors of such advice will not be the ones who have to take the consequences. This plan clearly will not provide the men and women of the Community with the jobs they need; on the contrary, it will only serve to make existing inequalities worse. The Community cannot make progress in solving the unemployment problem — and the problem of female unemployment in particular — without a policy of growth and industrial cooperation based on what the people of each country have to offer and need to be given. No one can deny that we will have to modernize or strengthen certain sectors, but this does not automatically have to result in job losses. Arguments such as this are simply intended to hide the real causes of unemployment which mainly lie in the policies pursued by the employers and capitalists, policies which we alone have condemned. There are certainly no ready-made solutions for creating jobs. That is why we are making every effort in our own country to unite and bring together all workers who want to help to find solutions which suit the economic and social situation in their companies and in their area.

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — (DA) Madam President, I am concerned about why the President-in-Office felt called upon to stress what he as a socialist felt should be done to solve the unemployment problem. This is not the right way to go about things. The President-in-Office speaks on behalf of the ten Member States,

and we have a variety of political outlooks in our different countries. No one party, not even a socialist party, has a miracle cure for the unemployment problem. We all earnestly and sincerely want to solve the unemployment problem and find work for the millions of unemployed, to this end we must, do something for the long-term unemployed. I regret very much that this subject has to be rushed through, but the reason is that the Irish Presidency wants it to be ready for the Council meeting in December; this is why the Committee on Social Affairs was given so little time to consider the subject and has unfortunately been able to do so only very superficially.

I regret this enormously, because there really are a number of points which require thorough investigation. We have looked into the Danish system and regard it as an example which could be followed in the other countries. I should just like to point out that — as I have so often said in the Committee on Social Affairs — we must always keep our knowledge up to date. What we are now trying to do in Denmark, according to liberal principles, is precisely to train our young people, to train and educate the unemployed so that they are in a position to acquire the qualifications required of them in the modern world. At a time when new technology is really playing a part and making new demands on us all, we must do something about qualifications. It is therefore very important for us to concentrate on providing opportunities for training now so that people are in a position to meet the demands quite rightly made on them. The Committee has not had the time or the opportunity to go into this in the short time available. I therefore sincerely hope that we will have a chance to get to the bottom of the problem, because we must make sure that we do not, whatever happens, act in a short sighted way. If we do, the result will be what experience in Denmark has shown: if the measures to help the long-term unemployed are only, short-term, we have the 'cuckoo' effect, where other people are pushed out of their normal jobs. This does not help anyone. The object is to provide work for all.

**Mr Fitzgerald (RDE).** — Madam President, I too would like to thank the rapporteurs for the speedy and efficient way in which they have carried out their work in relation to poverty, positive action for women and the long-term unemployed, though I would perhaps agree with those who say that the work was rather hurried and that not enough time was given to all three.

The inevitable consequence of the persistent rise in unemployment in the Community, particularly in my own country and in my own city and county of Cork, is the major problem of the long-term unemployed. It is particularly significant also that we are discussing the parallel growth of poverty. For many of the long-term unemployed the final and bitter reality is to be caught in the poverty trap, which does not discrimi-

### Fitzgerald

nate between young and old. I call for your support for our amendments on the homeless and on the elderly. Longterm unemployment reduces families to the minimum level of social assistance. Their living standards fall and the provision of clothing, food and housing, the basic requirements of life, becomes a nightmare.

I might say at this stage that I fully understand the reason for the absence of the President-in-Office of the Council this afternoon. Having served in that very role myself during the last Irish Presidency, I am aware that he has to be away in Brussels preparing for tomorrow's meeting of the Standing Committee on Unemployment.

However, I believe it is a major scandal that even at this stage all we are working on are Commission estimates of the number of long-term unemployed! This morning we heard the President-in-Office use a figure that was not the same as that used by Mrs Maij-Wegen. That, I think, illustrates the seriousness of the scandal and the urgency of ensuring that harmonized statistics on the long-term unemployed are agreed without delay. I am all in favour of achieving a genuine and active employment market policy. However, the creation of yet another Community institute, as is proposed, for the study of employment market policy needs to be seriously questioned. I certainly would have grave reservations. I suggest that the existing institutions are perfectly capable of carrying out the necessary work. If not, they should be restructured so as to make them so. Such a brief could be given to the European Foundation in Dublin, for example, or could perhaps be undertaken by the Commission.

The economic price of long-term unemployment is reflected in increased social security costs, falling incomes and loss of professional skills. For the most vulnerable — low-skilled workers, young people and women — the prospects are indeed grim. Under the dead-end policies of the present Irish Government, the only way out for many is emigration. I deplore the fact that to date measures at both Community and national level have been piecemeal. National governments, the social partners and the Community must take both individual and cooperative actions that will tackle long-term unemployment on a lasting basis. The fastest growing group of long-term unemployed, those who have been out of work for more than two years, must be treated as priority cases in any intermediate short-term emergency plan that is to be drawn up. In addition, any short-term emergency plan must relate to the long-term unemployed who are located in highly depressed local economies where there is little demand for any kind of work. My own city and county of Cork, which has been devastated by closures of some of my country's major industries, now represents a highly depressed local economy in need of major assistance.

I am concerned about the inevitable deterioration and loss of skills, the loss of confidence, the humiliation,

the fatalistic acceptance of the situation that the entire workforce is having to face in relation to long-term unemployment. Our greatest asset is our people. Every effort must be made to overcome the problem of the increasing number of people caught in the poverty trap and to provide work for the long-term unemployed.

**Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC).** — (FR) Madam President, President Alfonsin was right when he said this morning that a lack of economic prosperity puts democracy in danger. What counts now in Argentina, clearly, but also in Europe where there are 13 million unemployed, 40% of which are under 25, and where the number of unemployed is increasing year by year, are no longer fine words, research programmes and promises, but action.

Madam President, governments in Europe whatever their politics are on the whole happy just to cope with the crisis without introducing policies to enable us to face the future in this post-industrial age with equanimity.

But this is a time of emergency. Just as food aid is urgently required for the starving people in the southern hemisphere, a major, widespread reduction in unemployment is also urgently required and must put be into effect without delay.

We must introduce at European level what we called for in Belgium, a reduction in working hours across the board to thirty-two or even thirty hours per week. But side by side with this we must also introduce income sharing, by which we also mean — and this is important — sharing investment income. In this connection a first useful step could be a standard withholding tax throughout the Community.

Of course, the Community's main weapon in fighting unemployment, the European Social Fund, should be given adequate finances, as we have said on a number of occasions. But as you know this is far from being the case.

I think an explanation for this can be found in the draft budget submitted by the Council for 1985. The social Fund is allocated BF 65 000 million, whereas BF 83 000 million are allocated for storing powdered milk for animals!

The gap is not only considerable, it is absurd. How can the people of Europe be expected to understand it? How can they be expected to accept it?

As well as taking the necessary specific steps, we must make every effort to achieve structural redeployment. A job is not an end in itself, but represents useful work, useful for society and stimulating for the individual. Think of energy saving, housing improvements and education — which I particularly wish to mention — these are all areas where investment is being cut back

**Roelants du Vivier**

drastically, yet they are precisely where Europe's future lies.

Individuals must cease having to rely on State benefits and become responsible for their own destinies.

That means giving individuals more choice particularly as regards working time, but, for the sake of solidarity with those unemployed at present, not exceeding the recommended maximum number of hours.

The reports by Mrs Maij-Weggen and Mr Megahy reiterate the deep injustices which threaten our society: long-term unemployment and chronic poverty are the visible expression of an economic system which is merely marking time.

We are now faced with a choice between a two-tier society in which some of the population receive sizeable wages and monopolize all the working hours available, while a large minority has no paid work, or a unified society in which the redistribution of work and income gives every man and woman — as we have stressed so often today — the chance of self-fulfilment to which he or she is entitled.

It is, obviously, the united society which we want to promote, and any factors which might help to realize it will, equally obviously have our support, Madam President.

## IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

*Vice-President*

**Mrs Dury (S).** — (FR) Madam President, when we talk about the problem of unemployment we do so in collective terms. It is true that it is a collective phenomenon, but we must also bear in mind that it is a personal human problem.

The reality of long-term unemployment varies greatly from country to country. We immediately think in terms of youth unemployment, which is a very real problem, but what we must not forget is that long-term unemployment is also caused by job losses, either when factories close or when there are cut-backs. These in short, are the social consequences of the crisis.

Taking an example in Belgium, Levi's in South Luxembourg has just closed down. In an area where this is the only firm, the closure is obviously going to mean long-term unemployment.

The report by Mrs Maij-Weggen, considers two aspects of the problem. It claims that social security is one of the main causes of the rigidity of the labour

market. I would reject that statement. As far as I am concerned social security is a liberating factor.

If we did not have our present social security system, I do not think we could hope to see any successful industrial redeployment. If we did not have our present social security system, it is hard to imagine how workers could have geographical mobility. And if we did not have our present social security system, I cannot see how we could combat the problems posed by the new technologies. In my opinion, social security, far from causing rigidity on the labour market, in fact promotes flexibility.

Furthermore, when people talk about unemployment they say that training automatically brings jobs. But when we realize, as I said a short while ago, that unemployment is mainly due to job losses, we perhaps ought to consider this alleged link between training and jobs in relative terms. There are highly qualified as well as less qualified people among the unemployed — they come from all categories of workers. And if we are to introduce occupational training schemes for the unemployed, the schemes too must be in line with their requirements.

What I mean is this: many unemployed people will not even be able to undertake occupational training because they do not have basic training.

That is why I have tabled an amendment saying that we must make allowance for what we might call the 'new illiterate', in other words people who have left their jobs, who are unemployed and isolated, and who are losing even the basic education and training which they have received.

I am determined to tell the Council — which has no representative at the moment, but I shall communicate Parliament's wishes to it if I have Parliament's support — that when it is formulating policies, particularly the programme for long-term unemployment, it must also decide on the resources to be made available for them. The draft 1985 budget is far from satisfactory particularly as regards social expenditure and the Social Fund. Listening to the Minister describing action for the unemployed this morning. I wished that the Council had shown a certain measure of consistency. When we talk about having the political will to combat unemployment we must also allocate resources for that purpose. I hope that the Council will accept the European Parliament's amendments on the Social Fund.

**Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou (PPE).** — (GR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party believes that the positive measures in favour of equality of opportunities between men and women have played a decisive role so far, if not in actually achieving equality of treatment, at least in creating a favourable climate for the promotion of women's rights. Moreover, since equal-

**Giannakou-Koutsikou**

ity of treatment is essential for democracy and social progress, the actual promotion of equal opportunities can be of major importance for the future of the Community and of Europe. With this in mind, the Group of the European People's Party believes that, while it would be preferable to have a directive aimed at achieving the above-mentioned climate more rapidly, a draft recommendation such as this one does offer opportunities and may very well be effective. The main thing is that the positive measures must form an integral part of Parliament's action and all the Community institutions must look into the problem and adopt measures, even if they are late, to promote equality of opportunity. The needs to be met are many and varied, so that some form of close monitoring is called for if we are to make progress. We consider that the political decision has been taken, and all that remains to be done now is to adopt the correct procedure. Lastly, this will exert much more pressure than the continuous discussions on something which it is essential to promote if we are to create a well-ordered Europe. If we start from the basic democratic principle that everyone must be able to find work in which they can demonstrate their capabilities to the maximum without being discriminated against by sex, we must establish clearly that we are not asking for any kind of preferential treatment for women, but genuinely equal opportunities in education, in society and in the conditions of work and personal development. What we are asking for, in other words, is for half the population of the Community to be given an opportunity to demonstrate their ability without hindrance. This is also the point of women's freedom to choose whether to work, to devote themselves to their family or to do part-time work. It is a fact that the economic crisis hits women first, not just because of the current thinking in society, but also because of women's inability to gain access to positions of responsibility for obvious family reasons. It is well-known that, as far as assuming responsibility is concerned, the family is a classic example of giving increased responsibility to women, and I only wish this could happen in other fields as well.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party believes that:

- a) Anything that improves the position of women is to be welcomed as a positive step, but we would draw Parliament's attention to the delay with which the Community's positive action is being taken.
  - b) We accept the Commission's statements, although they require speed and coordinated action and not further delays.
  - c) We accept in principle Mrs Van den Heuvel's report as amended by the Committee on Women's Rights, while reserving the right to maintain our position on the new amendments which have been tabled.
  - d) We welcome the extension of the positive action to all sectors and will strive to speed up the procedure for implementation of equality at the workplace.
- e) We would draw Parliament's attention to the role which it can play, not only by adopting specific decisions but also by always keeping the subject in the public eye.
  - f) We feel that the matter must not be left to the whims of the Member States if we are to achieve the desired result. It is doubtful whether the Member States, in their efforts to tackle their economic and social problems, will attach the proper importance to the matter, despite the fact that it has major social implications and will in fact become acute in future.

The European Parliament and the Commission must constantly keep this matter before the governments of the Member States. They must call for specific measures and for the establishment of a specific list of priorities. If we do not manage to achieve this with this recommendation, then we really do need a directive which will provide a binding legal framework for the Member States.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, what we are talking about today is something that affects not simply women, but half the population of the Community. We are talking about approximately 140 million people, not women. This Parliament is the expression of the political will of our peoples to proceed along the road of democracy and prosperity. Along this road, all citizens of the Community must be equal. If this is not the case, what is the value of the Community and of a united democratic Europe?

We as Members of the European Parliament must always remain on the alert, not just with regard to new measures and new opportunities, but also to ensure that what has been achieved, on behalf not of women but of genuine democracy, does not go under in the general economic crisis.

**Mrs Daly (ED).** — Madam President, the European Democratic Group welcomes the proposal from the Commission on the promotion of positive action for women. We see this as a significant and necessary step to enable women to enjoy true, not just national, equality of opportunity.

We cannot turn a blind eye to the remaining barriers which exist to equal treatment for men and women at work. My group is fully committed to equality of opportunity in employment and believes that the fullest possible use must be made of the talents of workers of both sexes. No form of discrimination should persist.

While the adoption of a binding legal agreement has been suggested, we feel that it would be at this stage premature. Often legal instruments provide an excuse

**Daly**

to do nothing or the minimum necessary. Parliament can and should play an active role in monitoring the success of the operation of this recommendation. I feel we should concentrate on changing the climate. Many of the obstacles to achieving equal opportunities are due to social conditioning and out-of-date ideas on the division of roles in society between men and women.

No measures to assist women will be effective unless women are aware of the laws defining their rights. I therefore hope that the Commission will do all it can to ensure that information on this subject is made available to the media on as wide and effective a basis as possible. I particularly welcome Amendments Nos 3 and 4 from the Committee on Women's Rights.

As this is my maiden speech, Madam President, and my background was in the trade union movement, I do want to emphasize the important part trade unions can play in changing attitudes. In my country a very high proportion of women at work are married, and all too often trade union meetings take place in the evenings after working hours when many of these women feel they must go home to look after their families. My message to trade union leaders today is to stop talking about women having equality. Make it possible for them to meet with you and together work out ways of achieving it by seeking some of the social provisions needed to eliminate the barriers.

Europe cannot afford the economic waste involved if women do not seize the opportunities offered by new jobs and new industries. If young women now take up the opportunities available for them to progress in new directions and avail themselves of the training schemes founded by the Community, as I hope and believe they will, then we have the prospect before us of a more balanced society, greater economic prosperity and true equality of opportunity for women throughout their working lives.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) Madam President, the fact that in the Community today there are 4.3 million people who have been out of work for more than a year is as tragic, in our opinion, as the measures proposed by the Commission to combat long-term unemployment (training, retraining, vocational guidance etc.) are inadequate. However, we shall support any measure, however limited, which goes in the right direction. But we are afraid that these measures do not, and this can be seen more clearly from the motion for a resolution by Parliament's Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

Paragraph B and the criticism of the public deficits reveal that there is a refusal to activate productively the public sector, a move which could contribute to the creation of new jobs. Hidden behind the call, in paragraph D, for a further extension of flexible working time there may be an attack on the social improve-

ments which working people in the EEC have managed to obtain. Paragraph E contains fulsome praise for the employment policy of the USA, but its results, such as increased poverty and the crisis affecting small and medium-sized farmers, are rather doubtful, and it is a policy based on exporting unemployment, including to the EEC, by means of high interest rates and the flight of capital to the USA. The text also contains the well-known ideas about temporary and part-time employment. We do not think that on the basis of this kind of economic policy we can achieve positive results in combating long-term unemployment. We consider that, on the contrary, it will create the conditions for increasing such unemployment. We do, however, agree with the following two points.

Firstly, that in all the Member States everyone in long-term unemployment should be granted benefit of unlimited duration to ensure an acceptable standard of living for the present day, and we propose that it should also be granted to young people entering the labour market for the first time.

Secondly, that vocational training programmes should be instituted.

Lastly, we should like to express our disagreement with paragraph 12, in which it is proposed simply to increase unemployment benefit and not the full salary or wages of the unemployed who are engaged in community work, since we consider that the implementation of such a proposal will lead indirectly to a reduction in income or even to the sacking of those who are normally employed to do this kind of work.

**Mr Flanagan (RDE).** — Madam President, by nature this sort of debate is inclined to be repetitive, but it cannot do any harm to stress once again that unemployment is the major problem facing the European Community, including — as Mr Fitzgerald pointed out — our country, Ireland. Despite all the reports and recommendations that have emanated from the Commission and from this Parliament, there are still no succinct, coherent, practical proposals before the Council of Ministers, and the greatest urgency now is that these should be put together and presented to the Council with the declared intention of hounding them until they take action. For too long they have been concerned with a seemingly never-ending wrangle over money, and therefore there has not been and, I think, there still is not any possibility, despite their meeting tomorrow, that they will play their part in preparing these succinct, coherent, concrete proposals for tackling that major problem — one which the citizens of the Community who sent us here deserve to be seeing us as a Community tackle with a will. We have not even agreed on a real internal market, which involves, inevitably, the progressive and total dismantling of customs barriers. It is time we did so.

In regard to the two debates — the economic and social debates — they are interrelated and I could not

**Flanagan**

agree more with what Commissioner Richard said, namely, that the two Commissioners should meet forthwith, because the problem is two-sided: they are dealing with two sides of what is basically the same problem. Again, the ordinary citizen of the Community must see us to be taking action. It must be visible to them that we are taking action on succinct, understandable, concrete proposals.

In the meantime national governments could be doing a great deal more. I have one more sentence only to utter, and that concerns the harsh effects of taxation stultifying enterprise and, particularly as regards the elderly, making them suffer. They who should be the objects of our care and our attention are harrassed by heartless laws and even more heartless officials.

**Mrs Crawley (S).** — Madam President, it is said that St Augustine used to pray every night. He led a very full social life and every night he used to pray: Lord, make me pure but not until tomorrow. In a sense the Council, in requesting that this positive action programme be a recommendation and not a directive, are being latter-day St Augustines. Their intentions are good, but they do not have the commitment to the women's cause to turn those intentions into a positive programme of action in the form of a directive.

This recommendation on positive action for women sets out on a monumental task of moving and shaking the existing state of inequality in Member States where, for all the legal equality provisions which have been enacted over the years, there are still vast barren tracts of prejudice, bigotry and injustice towards women. For example, in my own country women's take-home pay is still on average 65 % of men's take-home pay. Women in my own country for the vast majority are found in low-achieving, low-paid professions. Women in my own country are hardly ever found in the upper echelons of the medical profession, the judiciary, accountancy, and are hardly ever found in the decision-making positions of the new industries, of the information technologies, of engineering and science. In place of this recommendation we would have preferred a directive. In fact, the more cynical among us would have said that a recommendation is as useful as a concrete parachute to women. However, we persist, and we have made it our goal to initiate in Member States programmes of positive action in both the private and public sector that will be focused, interlocking and coordinated. It is only through coordinated positive action that there will be created a formula which will transform well-intentioned dry, legal equality measures into living examples of millions of women claiming their rightful share of economic independence, security and respect.

As women we have no illusions about the size of our chosen task in this recommendation. To encourage male-owned and male-dominated firms and companies to take action in favour of women through collective

agreements, legislative and financial incentives and increased technical assistance will be the political equivalent of rolling a colossal stone up a very slippery, steep mountain. This Parliament must eventually give us the strength and energy to put our shoulders to that stone in the form of a directive on positive action for women.

The support machinery in the form of child care and family assistance to enable women to take up and maintain employment must be vastly improved, administered and financed in the Member States. It is a mark of shame that my own government, led by a woman, has proposed a tax on workplace nurseries, the effect of which will be that many families will not be able to afford to send their children to those nurseries and many women will therefore not be able to take up work opportunities. This is one example from a vast array of governmental obstacles that have been used to oppress women in every walk of life.

Another example of the sorry state of work and vocational training opportunities for women in my country is the systematic knee-capping of local authorities through the vindictive rate-capping system. This often results in a total lack of funds being available to match European social funding for women's special measures. These structural abuses of women in my own country and throughout the Community must harden our resolve to ensure the implementation of a long overdue programme of positive action throughout the Community. This Parliament has the responsibility of being a gigantic megaphone to awaken governments, industry, and trade unions in both public and private sectors and women themselves to the necessity of positive action for women.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Banotti (PPE).** — Madam President, in discussing the recommendation for positive action for women I am very happy, as an Irish woman, to have our own Minister presiding over this sitting. He is a Minister from one of the only two governments in Europe which have taken the trouble to appoint a specific government department to deal with women's affairs, and also an employment equality agency with strong statutory powers to enforce equal opportunity in the workplace.

Indeed, had there not been also a most active and well-planned campaign and commitment on the part of some of our political parties to encourage and help women to present themselves as candidates for electoral office, many of us would still be a long way from this distinguished Chamber.

I would like to address myself specifically to Article 4 in the document calling for a major campaign of information in the media, in the workplace and in education.

**Banotti**

Mrs Crawley has very graphically and eloquently enumerated for this Chamber many of the areas in which discrimination and lack of caring and information in the workplace are militating against women.

But I would like to address my remarks to the positive achievements of women and ask that this campaign of information emphasize many of these. The history and mythology of all our countries are packed with heroes. All small boys have heroes to emulate. No matter what sphere of activity they aspire to, there is always a model waiting there to inspire them.

Let us, through this positive action information programme, inform our daughters and our sons of our heroines. In many instances these heroines have been written out of our history. Let the positive action information campaign highlight the achievements not just of the historical past but also of the many women who are contributing and succeeding in the present. These heroines and achievers can be found in all walks of life: in the quiet, silent private areas, as well as in the factories, the hospitals, the trade unions and, indeed, in the parliaments. Which of us, Madam President, does not also aspire to hold the distinguished office that you yourself now hold?

We would also support in our group the call for vocational guidance for those beginning work, and particularly for those returning to work after a long period of absence.

We in Europe face a situation in the not too distant future when because of declining populations — with the exception, of course, of my own country — there will be a diminution in the workforce. As a matter of purely pragmatic policy, it behoves all Member States to have available to their countries the skills, the talents and the energies of both their young and their not so young women. The Minister this morning said that we are in the midst of major structural changes in our society. There is no need for us here to emphasize what experience has already shown in the industrial field, namely, that the talents and maturity of women who have returned to work in mid-life and, in many cases, past mid-life have been a most valuable asset to these industries. But in order to harness these valuable talents we must put both our money and our time where our commitment is. These women will need to be encouraged to take risks outside the traditional roles.

This programme must not become a respectable cloak to cover inaction. 53% of the voters in Europe are women. They know their political power and their political strength now, and informed surveys have shown that in the past election the women came out to vote considerably more than the men, so the Commission would need to take very careful political note that these women are not to be stopped now; their time has

come and we must give our full commitment to ensuring that their talents are harnessed.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Trupia (COM).** — *(IT)* Madam President, development of positive action is important in encouraging *de facto* equality between men and women.

Against a background of an additional plentiful — and I might add unprecedented — supply of women to the labour market in all European countries, a testimony to the existence of a great and strong drive for equality and autonomy among women, what we are witnessing today is in reality a continuation of inequality and a considerable increase in the number of unemployed women, a phenomenon which reflects the unemployment situation in general.

The introduction of new technologies often results in women's further exile to the fringe of economic activity and in discrimination, rather than in new opportunities, unless it is accompanied by initiatives aimed at providing professional training and retraining and also at removing indirect discrimination which adversely affects women outside the production sector.

In spite of laws and directives the gap between the drive for equality and actual reality is widening, aggravated in many European countries by the introduction of restrictive policies on social spending and by attacks on recent achievements of equality, by the emergence of cultures which advocate compulsory return — and I stress compulsory — of women to an exclusively domestic role.

In the light of all of this we consider a recommendation to be completely inadequate and a directive to be more suitable. Incontrovertible evidence for this is that, notwithstanding the positive actions proposed in the 1982-85 plan of action, approved by the Council, in some countries such as mine — Italy — not one real step has been taken towards implementing them. In fact, the same equality law in force in our country is interpreted in a manner contradictory both to the spirit of the law and the plan of action.

I would like to remind you that this very House declared itself in favour of a directive on this matter in January 1981.

We are therefore in agreement with that section of Mrs Van den Heuvel's report which stresses the inadequacy of the recommendation. We agree on other amendments proposed in the report and in particular with the proposal, which we consider to be fundamental, that systematic and — we believe — annual checks on the implementation of the recommendation should be carried out.

We hope that Parliament and the Council will want to render the document more clear-cut and effective by

**Trupia**

approving the amendments proposed by the Committee on Women's Rights and above all by showing a willingness to work in these times, difficult also for women, towards establishing equality. And it can do this, for example, by immediately discussing and adopting those directives — some of which are very important and refer to working hours, parental leave and other matters — which have been neglected far too long. These directives, if enforced, may become additional tools for improving the lot of women and the equality situation.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mrs Salisch (S).** — *(DE)* Madam President, since 1980 we have had over 4.3 million long-term unemployed in the Community, 2.1 million of which have been without work for more than two years. They were the fastest growing group among the unemployed in many countries. Thus we have now identified another specific problem group, along with young people, women and the handicapped.

In 1982 the 'Jumbo-Council' called on the Commission to look into this particular problem. Two years later we have the results and two things are evident: firstly, we are still a long way off covering all those affected by long-term unemployment. In this I agree with the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, who pointed out that we — and the Commission too in this case — urgently need new statistics in order to be sure that we have grasped the full magnitude of the problem or problems with which we are dealing. Secondly it is the structural problems of the labour market which are making this whole question of long-term unemployment so unmanageable, and the increased and improved use of new technologies will serve to aggravate the problem even further. This had already been discussed many times by Parliament, but of course we can still support the Commission's plan of action. On the other hand — and here I go along with what Mrs Depuy said — the Council must understand that it is its inactivity which is constantly aggravating the mass unemployment problem.

Moreover, the decline in standard of living of the unemployed and particularly the long-term unemployed is seriously exacerbated by cut-backs in social welfare. This is directly connected to what Mr Magahy spoke of in his report, namely the increase in poverty and in some cases the threat to economic survival itself in the Member States of this rich Community. But whoever believes that it is possible to dig into the coffers of the European Community, especially into the European Social Fund, in order to — this may sound bitter and rather cynical — set up a restructuring programme for the long-term unemployed, is definitely mistaken, because he will be confronted once more with the cynicism of a Council which continually identifies problem areas for attention, but at the same time refuses the necessary means for action.

I appreciated the President-in-Office's speech very much. I do not wish to take issue with him personally but I agree with the rapporteur's criticisms: it is possible to set out to tackle long-term unemployment, but up till now the Council has not done its social policy homework. It has not managed to develop co-ordinated economic and social policies designed to protect jobs and unless it eventually does so, a new emergency programme for 4.3 million long-term unemployed will also prove useless. It is not a question of occupational therapy for Ministers, but rather of an active policy which will deliver Europe from the crisis.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mrs Lenz (PPE).** — *(DE)* Madam President, positive action for women sounds to many people suspiciously like preferential treatment. We have also heard that the Commission's initiatives, warmly welcomed by the Committee on Women's Rights, has met with much distrust in the governments of the Member States. As the previous speakers said, we do not consider it to be particularly clear-cut but we approve of the general tenor.

However, I am also speaking on my own behalf because in the changing labour situation women are in a very difficult position — as was also made clear in today's debate on long-term unemployment. In the face of the many demands made by the State and society on them as citizens, employees, mothers and responsible participants in the political process, they are often confronted with questions which they cannot answer. We must help them in their search for the way to real equality. I think all groups in this House agree on that. It is precisely in a society which demands free and voluntary participation and freedom of choice that equal opportunities and openings must exist to ensure that there is genuine freedom of choice. In the coming years we must be careful to ensure — it is because of this that we welcome the weaker alternative of a Council recommendation — that the rather meagre measures proposed are actually carried out.

Furthermore, I would like to propose a positive measure, namely that we draw special attention to all those who set about this task seriously, supporting women in their efforts to avail themselves of their opportunities. I would like to recommend this course of action to the Commission, to the administration of the European Parliament and to all our groups, who sometimes steer well clear of this problem. My own home town, Bonn, is one of the few cities in North Rhine-Westphalia whose municipal authorities have set up an equality bureau — an example of positive action to which we gladly give our support. I call upon business the public services and the two sides of industry — the employers and unions — to grasp the opportunity and to show that our demands can also be a positive opportunity for them. If we do not want directives or compulsory measures, then willingness to do something for the

**Lenz**

cause of women must become apparent in the various sectors of society.

We are not asking for preferential treatment, but nor do we want discrimination; we are asking for a fair crack of the whip. That is why we support positive action!

*(Applause from the centre)*

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — *(GR)* Madam President, we are bound to state that it is not the unemployed who are responsible for unemployment and that, consequently, the burden of solving the problem should fall not on their shoulders but on the shoulders of society. Furthermore, we must reject an attitude which has a hint of philanthropy about it, we must reject the alibi of good intentions which remain empty phrases, especially as regards women, and we must look at the problem from the point of view of effective social measures such as benefits and the creation of jobs by the public sector and by initiatives of the Social Fund — measures which have their price, but it is a price we cannot afford not to pay. And we need to draw attention to a phenomenon which must be investigated, i.e. alongside the new poverty there has appeared the opposite phenomenon of the long-term accumulation of wealth, which leads to an incredible waste of social resources, the very resources we need.

Madam President, with regard to the temporary measures proposed by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment — for which we shall vote despite their inadequacy — we should like to stress most particularly the measures for reorganizing working hours. According to newspaper reports, an experiment has been carried out in printing firms in the Netherlands, and the outcome was that employment increased by 2.4% without any reduction in workers' pay. We would add our own plea that, before proposals and recommendations begin to flood in, the Council should enter into a binding commitment to carry out specific measures in order to arrive at specific guidelines as regards the problems of women and the fight against unemployment, which is developing into the greatest scourge of the Community.

We must also draw your attention, ladies and gentlemen, to the fact that in this age of automation unemployment will be constantly on the increase and that sooner or later measures will have to be taken to bring about a fundamental reorganization of the present relations of production, a significant reduction in working hours and a redistribution of income. This is the direction in which we shall have to go, since otherwise the volcano which is seething with 15 million unemployed will erupt — and the struggle of the British miners is merely a mild foretaste of it.

**Mrs Gadioux (S).** — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to see that a consensus

has been reached on such important matters as informing and making the public at large aware of the need to promote equal opportunities for women in working life.

For the last three years now we in France have been conducting one information campaign after another in schools so that young girls can, with the help of careers staff, be fully aware of the situation when choosing subjects for their future career.

Mobile exhibitions such as the one on 'Women in non-traditional careers' have been, and continue to be, highly successful. All the media have been involved in a far-reaching campaign to promote awareness, and the law on equality at work has been enacted. This is an innovatory law which should give us encouragement since it obliges firms in which women are experiencing specific problems, such as receiving lower wages than a man doing the same job, to draw up plans for equal treatment with the staff committee and both management and unions on an annual basis. The higher council for equality at work has just been set up and is responsible for ensuring universal observance of the law.

We can never stress too much the benefits which women can derive from occupational training programmes. The reason why they encounter great difficulties in taking up an active working life is often because they have only general basic training, or indeed no training at all. This being the case, and given the widespread introduction of new technologies in fields where there is a large female workforce, women are very vulnerable. A special effort should be made in each Member State to give women equal access with men to training programmes for professional qualifications with, where necessary, introductory integration programmes geared to their problems. Information on the content of these training programmes should be widely advertised and special accommodation arrangements should be made if the women do not live in the area where the training programme is taking place.

I have found that, where such arrangements have been introduced and where the course has been advertised, women have been very motivated and have been able to reintegrate with considerably less difficulty.

We must draw up a directive calling on those Member States which have not yet done so to establish a legal framework to enable major advances to be made in this field. I myself would like to see regular, in-depth analyses of the positive action taken in each Member State.

**Mr McCartin (PPE).** — Madam President, on behalf of my group I must address myself to the proposals for specific Community action to combat poverty. I realize that in the four minutes available to me it is not,

**McCartin**

unfortunately, possible to engage in philosophical or ideological debate about the root causes of the problem that we have before us.

Obviously the problem in our society is brought about by the interaction of factors caused by the strength of some and the weaknesses of others, by the selfishness and uncaring attitude of people in every strata of our society — not only in the boardrooms where vast resources can be pushed around with a nod but on the shopfloor where strategic advantage or numerical superiority can obtain for some benefits or advantages that should be shared with others.

It is, however, the duty of us who wield political power to identify the causes and nullify the effects, which comprise severe hardship and deprivation, whether they be regional, sectoral or individual. The new poor referred to by many in this debate already are by and large the unemployed and their dependants. This problem can only be solved by prudent economic policies applied with the long-term interests of people at heart.

My group is not excited by the prospect of the poverty relief which can be achieved by the application of 2 million units of account to the problem. Even if that figure were 10 million units of account, we still could not expect it to have a serious effect on the hardship and suffering of those who are described in our societies as the poor. The idea that direct action which will reduce hardship can be financed from Community funds, even in the foreseeable future, is not on, considering our present budgetary problems. What is on is that by wisely including a research element in whatever action is possible, we can learn more about it and identify the elements that can best be corrected by Community action. We might be able to confirm what I have long believed, namely, that the present system of social assistance and benefit throughout the Community is not only very expensive to administer but is outdated and does not cater to the needs of the new poor in our society.

The State engages in many instances in giving social assistance to people who should not be the responsibility of the State, people such as those who had secure and well-paid jobs and have retired with homes and savings. There are many who get State aid as a legal right under the present system who do not need it, while others, particularly the young unemployed with family responsibilities, have not had their real needs taken into account. Considering the state of public finances in most Member States, considering the need for economic investment to create further employment, further taxation to increase social budgets is not a real prospect. Therefore we need to ensure that available funds are spent efficiently and on behalf of those people in greatest need. I look forward to the research which is being carried out to identify how best those objectives can be achieved.

I should like also to refer to another aspect of the problem, namely, regional poverty which exists in this Community. If one compares the peripheral areas of the Community, such as the West of Ireland, Southern Italy and Greece, with the richer, central industrialized areas of the Community, it is easy to see that an unemployed person receiving State benefit in the central regions of the Community can in fact enjoy a higher income than that enjoyed by average workers in peripheral regions — particularly people on small holdings. I think this is a problem the Community ought to address itself to, particularly in view of the fact that common policies have created a situation in which the principal needs of individuals — food, energy resources, housing, etc. — now cost much the same throughout the Community.

This regional aspect of the problem must be looked at. If this is to become a real Community expressing the same solidarity at international level that we expect at national and local level, then this regional aspect of poverty in the Community will also have to be examined.

**Mr Vgenopoulos (S).** — (GR) Madam President, unemployment is a human, social and economic problem, and this three-dimensional aspect applies particularly to long-term unemployment. In my country there is a saying which goes 'idleness is the mother of every evil', and this applies even more to the idleness of long-term unemployment. It is well known that work is the most basic means of integrating a person into society, and without it there can be no social peace. It has been proved that the long-term unemployed are responsible for the highest increase in the crime rate, with all the unpleasant social consequences this involves. Unfortunately, since it still looks as though long-term unemployment will continue to rise, measures to combat it must be radical. However, we must not delude ourselves into thinking that by recognizing the problem and making proposals we shall be able to give the long-term unemployed hope for a better tomorrow. It is ludicrous to discuss the contribution of the Social Fund to solving the problem of 12 million unemployed in the Community with a budget of something like 1 500 million ECU. Only by doubling the resources of the Social Fund will we be able to create the necessary conditions for taking serious action to relieve the unemployed. It is doubtful that the Social Fund could be effective in combating long-term unemployment, mainly because of its inflexibility in concentrating benefits on those under 25 years old.

Those born in earlier years are also in a difficult situation. In Greece one out of two long-term unemployed is between 30 and 44 years old, and we are all aware that the family burden of this group is made all the more unbearable by the burden of unemployment. Furthermore, the less developed regions, which are mainly agricultural, have a higher rate of long-term unemployment, which goes back to previous hidden

## Vgenopoulos

underemployment. Furthermore, the Commission also recognizes this in its statement, and so I believe that there will have to be greater flexibility in the support given to employment programmes for those over 25 years old.

Madam President, I should like to make a comment on the content of the Commission's proposals. The Commission limits the description 'long-term unemployed' to those who have been registered as unemployed for at least one year without interruption. This 12-month limit is a great problem for Greece, as well as for other countries, since the maximum time during which benefit can be paid to those who have registered as unemployed with the employment offices is six months. So I think that here also there will have to be flexibility in laying down the time limit. Furthermore, this does not prevent any Member State from giving priority to those who have been unemployed for longer than the 12-month period or from grading the conditions for granting benefits. As regards special Community action to combat poverty, I should like to express my satisfaction that all the regions of Greece are included in the particularly disadvantaged areas and, consequently, will enjoy increased financial aid from the Community at the rate of 70% of the cost of the programmes. I am concerned, however, at the distribution of appropriations earmarked for special Community action, since 85% is being devoted to urban regions and only 15% to agricultural ones.

Furthermore, I consider that the amount to be given to migrant workers returning to their home countries is very small. The 3% proposed by the Commission in its list of priorities is too small for the peripheral countries of the Community, which supplied workers to the strong economies of Europe at a time when the latter needed them, whereas now the countries of origin are obliged to shoulder the burden of reintegrating these migrant workers into their own labour force.

There is no time for me to deal with the subject of women. We fully agree with the report by Mrs Van den Heuvel. With the reservations I have mentioned, we shall vote for all three reports.

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S).** — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to concentrate on Mrs Maij-Weggen's report on long-term unemployment and Mrs Van den Heuvel's report on positive action for women.

In the space of four years, between 1980 and December 1983, 20 339 women in Belgium were totally excluded from the right to unemployment benefit and a further 12 000 were temporarily or partially excluded. The data for this year are not yet known. The crime that these women had committed was that they were victims of unemployment. They were guilty of long-term unemployment. This is how it is in Member States with a centre-right wing government. The

unemployed are punished because they are unemployed and the poor because they are poor.

Long-term unemployed women are victims of an accumulation of discriminations of the present and the past. Their schooling was geared to the typical 'women's' jobs so that they were destined to do clichéd 'women's work', in jobs which are dying out and industries which are disappearing. They are also hit by a number of unwritten laws on the employment market. In many sectors there is what amounts to a celibacy clause whereby women or women with children can no longer be recruited. Then there is — also unwritten — the age limit. In the retail trade, for example, which employs a very large number of women, the upper age limit is 25. The stewardesses in Belgium's national airline have for 15 years been fighting to avoid automatic dismissal which threatens them at the age of 35. Women are being pushed further and further to the periphery of the employment market, to part-time work, seasonal work, temporary work and finally to black labour.

Reading point 71 of the Commission document and listening to the proposals from the speakers from the extreme right here and from conservatives, there would appear to be only one solution. Women must resign themselves to voluntary work, community work and charity work. No thank you Mr Commissioner. Women are doing enough voluntary work as it is. Women are doing enough community work for nothing in their own homes and in society! The time has come to think about new positive measures. The time has come to give women *properly* paid work in interesting sectors to repair past and present injustices and to make up for all the discrimination.

Previous speakers have already made their disappointment with this recommendation plain. We want positive action!

*(Applause from the Socialist Group)*

**Mr Christiansen (S).** — (DA) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is absurd and unacceptable for Parliament, whose reputation among the workers of our countries leaves a lot to be desired, to put it mildly, not to take more time here in the House, in other words in public, to thrash out the problem of the increase in long-term unemployment — an appalling aspect of the disastrous unemployment situation. We need more time to look critically at what we can do about the inadequate and uncoordinated effort on the part of the Council and our governments to combat this alarming trend. It is not exactly encouraging, either, to see so few people at our debate today.

The Commission's report shows a continuous increase in long-term unemployment, particularly among young people and women, and at the same time a steady reduction in their standard of living. It is social

### Christiansen

slaughter to condemn 5 to 6 million of our fellow citizens to the life they have to lead, if they are unemployed for a year or more — and a good 2 million are unemployed for two years or more. There has been an unacceptable deterioration in the social standards achieved over the years, not least because of the workers' own skills and political muscle.

The Commission's report is good on the whole, and I can recommend it with the amendments tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs. As an emergency plan it is progressive and socially orientated, and it is important to me to have this recognized. The Communities are not always renowned for progressiveness or social awareness. We in Parliament should therefore, or are indeed duty bound to, take these considerations as a basis to persuade the Council and our national parliaments and governments to follow the Commission and Parliament.

Even Denmark is letting us down now, and we must protest about this today. The Commission's report praises Denmark, and Denmark is more or less held up as being exemplary so far in the fight against unemployment. I welcome this but this is as far as it goes. The action taken is a result of the efforts of my party when it was in government. But praise is no longer due. While we have been sitting here, the Danish conservative reactionary minority government has brought about a compromise in the Danish Parliament which will cripple the job-creation scheme mentioned in the report and at the same time reduce the standard of living of the unemployed by taking away their unemployment benefit in order to give them an inferior type of social aid. This is what is really going on in Copenhagen at this very minute, and that is what Mrs Tove Nielsen refers to as keeping up to date according to principles. I am very curious to see, Madam President, what hypocrisy my parliamentary colleagues from the Danish governing parties will come up with in the vote.

**Mr Welsh (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.** — Madam President, it has been a long debate and I think it would probably be unwise for me to prolong it very much longer.

First of all, as Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, I would like to express my appreciation to rapporteurs Megahy and Maij-Weggen and draftsman Larive-Groenendaal for the excellent and efficient way in which they have produced their work. As a result of the expeditious way in which these reports have been prepared, Parliament's opinion will be available to Commission and Council in good time for the Social Affairs Council in December. The Commission has ample time to take on board the amendments that Parliament is proposing and we shall, of course, expect the President-in-Office to take them on board as well. That was the point of his visit.

So, as a result of the work of its rapporteurs, Parliament is playing an important and constructive role in the institutional dialogue, and I think that is very important indeed.

I would like to thank Mr Quinn. I am sorry he could not stay for the whole debate, but I quite understand why he could not. I would like to say that I have personally appreciated the cooperation we have received from the Irish presidency in coordinating our work. In that respect, at least, I hold up the Irish presidency as an example for others to follow. I thought Mr Quinn's speech was extremely interesting. I must say I did not agree with everything he said, especially the implication that the only people who cared about unemployment were Socialists. I can assure him that that is not true. As an Englishman and a Conservative, I am just as concerned about unemployment as Mr Quinn.

I also thank Mr Richard, who has doughtily sat through the entire debate and listened with his usual attentiveness to the many interesting contributions, and we shall be very interested to hear what he has to say about these reports. To help him, I would like to draw one or two themes from the debates that we have heard.

Firstly, it is very clear from the contributions of all the people who have spoken that Parliament wants to see some concrete action. The amendments that have been presented by the rapporteurs are all designed to improve, to toughen and to make more precise the proposals that the Commission has set down. I ask myself, if this poverty programme is passed by the Council in December — and surely it must be — are we sure that the Commission will have the commitment to actually put it in hand? In that respect I would like to ask Mr Richard how he responds to the draft amendments by Mr Megahy which are designed to make that report more effective and, I believe, would strengthen the Commission's hand in dealing with the Council. I think he should tell us, if these amendments are passed by the House tomorrow, whether or not the Commission is minded to accept them and, if not, why not.

As regards the question of the long-term unemployed, this is the most threatening and difficult problem of this generation. But I ask myself, if this draft resolution is accepted by the Council in December, what happens then? Does it really achieve anything? Is it not the sort of fig leaf that we know that ministers can agree to — because there is actually very little in it that you can disagree with — only to go back to their respective ministries thinking, thank God we have done something at Community level on unemployment! And leave it there.

I would like to know, again from Commissioner Richard, what positive actions he foresees flowing from this particular resolution. Let us suppose it is adopted. What is going to be the legislative pro-

## Welsh

gramme that follows? What should Parliament be looking for over the next months to see if the Council has first of all done what is necessary in passing the resolution and, secondly, to see whether the Commission is responding to what the Council and Parliament have jointly requested? Where is the action or, as a currently famous American said, 'Where is the beef?'

I hope that in the coming months the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment will deliberate on the future structures of employment. Throughout this debate we have been talking in terms that are rooted in the past: employment means working 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, 48 weeks a year, from 17 to 65, probably working for the same person in the same sort of job. If that is what we mean by employment, then I suspect that we are never going to see full employment again under those terms. But that is not necessarily a threat, it is a challenge. Because if we look around us and observe what is already happening with the new technologies, we see that we have to produce a labour force and structures of employment which will be able to take advantage of those new technological advances. If we can do that, not only can we give hope to those who are unemployed and worried about it but we can give them a better and a freer life. I hope, Commissioner Richard, you will now be able to tell us that you support all these magnificent amendments.

**President.** — I shall cast off for a few moments the reserve normally adopted by the Chair to tell you, Mr Richard, that I join with all my colleagues, particularly the ladies among them, in listening with great attention to what you have to say in reply.

**Mr Richard, Member of Commission.** — Madam President, may I start off by saying that I echo the opinions expressed by Mr Welsh in his commendation of the work of the rapporteurs and the drafters of these reports. I think they have done their work quickly and I think they have done it well.

Secondly, may I say, however, that I think it is a little unfortunate that three subjects of this sort have been linked in one debate in the way in which we have done it today. I am not complaining about it, I am merely saying I think it is unfortunate. The result, I think, has been that we have had a debate which has been somewhat mingled as far as the issues are concerned. It is very difficult to extract themes. People have been pursuing different issues in different ways at different times. This is not to say that I have not found the debate useful. I have found it extremely valuable and, indeed, having listened to no less than 39 contributions in this debate, I can say that I found that almost every single contribution that was made from the floor had something in it of value in having it expressed in the way in which it was.

It does mean, however, that inevitably what I now have to say to the House is bound to fall into three

separate categories. I have got to say something, indeed I am specifically invited to say quite a lot, about the poverty report. I am asked to prophesy as to the future as far as long-term unemployment is concerned, and I do indeed have something to say as far as positive action for women is concerned. Let me therefore, if I may, start with the poverty report and with Mr Megahy's document.

Now, can I first of all thank and congratulate the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for the excellent work that it has accomplished in such a short time in the matter of the Commission's proposals for a new anti-poverty programme. As Parliament is aware, the slightly difficult budget situation — Parliament will appreciate that one is diplomatic in these matters from time to time, so let me say it again so that Parliament gets the full flavour of the sentence, the slightly difficult budget situation — is such that the Commission's consultations of all those concerned with poverty are not even terminated yet. Actually, only one of the three discussions with government experts on the practical aspects of implementing the proposed programmes has taken place. The other two have been fixed, one for next week and one for the end of November.

The series of consultations with organizations working for and with the poor, which ended in mid-September, has however made it possible to present a basic document in line with Parliament's resolution and the Council's conclusions on the report of the Commission on the first anti-poverty programme. If the Commission had delayed the presentation of its proposals, before all the practical aspects of the programme had been ironed out, such a programme could not have been launched before 1986, which would have been some six years after the end of the first anti-poverty programme. This would not only have been far too long, but it would also have been contrary to the wishes of Parliament, which in 1982 called for the establishment of an exploratory and innovatory new programme and voted funds for its preparation. That is why I and the Commission are appreciative of the work of the committee, which has resulted in no less than 48 proposed amendments, most of which are useful — some are very useful — and are, in fact, the kind currently being made by the social affairs group of the Council.

I do not propose, Madam President, in the time that is available to me this afternoon, to go through no less than 48 amendments. What I will do, I think, is perhaps extract the ones upon which there seems to be some difference between Parliament's view and the Commission's, if Parliament passes those amendments, and give our view on them.

Now, most of them, as I say, tally closely with the Commission's own philosophy on the implementation of the new programme. Some spell out in the legal document itself some of the ideas which the Commis-

**Richard**

sion had expressed, either in the explanatory memorandum or in the financial note. I would, however, submit to the House that the words 'at least 80% of the overall budget' in Mr Megahy's Amendment No 6 might need to be reviewed in view of the fact that the overall budget's modest size still has to take care of the establishment of a clearing house, the process of evaluation and coordination and the statistical research, all of which cannot, in our view, come to less than a total of 7 m units of account, which would leave exactly 28 m units of account, that is 80% precisely, for the project. I agree there is a need for emphasis on action, but I think 75% is a more realistic figure and gives us a buffer — but not a very large one — which, I imagine, is what Parliament would wish to see emerging from that particular point.

We also have a different view as regards — Parliament will not be surprised to hear this — decision-making procedures. Your resolution called for a programme across national projects, based upon common or integrated themes. We consider our proposal based on such themes has fully responded to that wish. However, these themes have many dimensions, and if the cross-national aspect of the whole exercise is to be preserved, sub-themes need to be identified. This is now being done with the help of government experts. We promise to communicate the resulting paper to Parliament for information, but we think it really would be over-cumbersome to have to have machinery for approval at every step, so to speak, as seems to be suggested in Amendment No 12. The Commission will, of course, ensure that Parliament is informed of all decisions concerning important matters under this programme.

Finally, may I say a word about the inclusion of paragraph 4 in the motion for a resolution. I think the Commission's original document did in fact inadvertently omit the word 'action' in the expression 'action research'. This was in the English version only and it was put right in the corrigendum. The word 'action' is not omitted in the description of the proposed programme under Article 646 of the preliminary draft budget for 1985, but perhaps Mr Megahy wants to make it clear that the expression 'funding for projects' ought to read 'funding of action research projects', with which I have no problem.

So, Madam President, I think Parliament will agree that on the whole I have given a reasonable welcome to Mr Megahy's report. On the 80%, I hope he can come down to 75% or something which the Commission could accept, and I think it would be in line with what Parliament wants to try and achieve. As far as the decision-making process is concerned, we have no problem in informing Parliament and consulting Parliament, but we have got to devise a form of mechanism, a way of doing it, which is not so cumbersome that it holds up the implementation of the programme itself.

May I, therefore, now turn to long-term unemployment. Again, can I start off by thanking Parliament and the rapporteur for the attention that Parliament is giving to this issue and, indeed, for the support that it is giving to what the Commission seems to be trying to do.

We have, Madam President, produced a communication on this subject in response to a request — as Mrs Salisch pointed out — made by the Joint Council of Finance and Employment Ministers in November 1982. I hope that the Council will be able to adopt the draft resolution during the Irish Presidency in an undiluted form. It is here that the support of Parliament is, if I may say so, particularly welcome. What we have tried to do in the communication is to underline both the gravity of the problem and to suggest actions to remedy it, both in the short to medium term and in the longer term.

Let me say a word about long-term unemployment itself. I do not think I need to spend much time on it because virtually everybody who has spoken in this debate, from whichever part of the House they come, seems to have been united in regarding it as an evil which governments and the Community should be trying to do something to get rid of.

But the social and economic costs of long-term unemployment are enormous. The Commission finds that most families affected by it suffer drastic cutbacks in their living standards. Many of them are reduced to the poverty line. And as for the effects upon individuals, many become dispirited and depressed and many have given up hope now of ever finding a job again. The economic costs, however, are no less serious. Apart from the short-term costs, there are longer term losses to the Community as the results of past education and training rest unused and deteriorate.

Our communication, Madam President, puts forward a range of proposals aimed at combating this problem. They include preventive action to prevent people being thrown out onto the labour market with no help or guidance about how to get back into work and the need for improved information in order to identify those who have been unemployed for, say, a year and then to trigger policy actions in their favour and on their behalf. Such actions should, we suggest, include programmes of temporary work incorporating an element of education and training. As for action to help those who nevertheless remain unemployed, the Commission believes — and let there be no mistake about this, please, in certain quarters of this House — that in addition to an equitable level of income support — and we *are* committed to an equitable level of income support for the long-term unemployed, as some Members of the House this afternoon have raised the point — there should be other forms of social support, for example, the establishment of local centres for the unemployed.

**Richard**

May I assure Parliament that the Commission will vigorously pursue its efforts to ensure the implementation of existing policy commitments which relate directly or indirectly to long-term unemployment. As for financial help, many of the Community's financial instruments and institutions can also give valuable indirect help in combating long-term unemployment by stimulating economic and employment growth in areas most affected by structural change.

We also propose a number of new actions. These include — and again this has been raised by a number of Members today — working with Member States to improve the collection of adequate statistics on an agreed Community basis. At the moment it is difficult to have an adequate and sensible basis of comparison between the Member States on what constitutes long-term unemployment. If we could at least get an agreement on that, it should enable us — and this is the importance of it — then to use long-term unemployment as a criterion for allocating financial support, notably from the European Social Fund. To those in this debate who have called for an enlargement in the size of the Fund and specific use of it in various fields, I can only say that, as far as the Commission is concerned, you are, of course, pushing at an open door.

Those are some of the concrete proposals we have made. Here may I first say how much I appreciate the way Parliament has expressed its concern about the social and economic damage caused by long-term unemployment and how much I welcome the support given by Parliament for urgent action. In particular, I welcome the proposals for special actions for those people who have been unemployed for a year. I also welcome the proposal for a guaranteed social minimum income. In the Commission's communication we saw how important it was to trigger policies after one year's unemployment. Parliament's support on this is particularly welcome, since it is crucial that we convince the Council of the need to implement that principle. At the moment we have not succeeded in convincing the Council of the need to implement that principle. Equally, I welcome the proposal on the minimum social benefit which could assist the long-term unemployed. Many of our social security systems have been shown to be inadequate. We must therefore act to build an adequate safety net if we are as a minimum to avoid creating additional problems of poverty in the Community at the same time.

However, we also need to go beyond these immediate problems and seek to open up the debate on the wider economic and social issues related to long-term unemployment. As Mr Welsh just said, we need a fundamental reappraisal for employment policy in Europe. We must recognize that paid employment is in itself now an objective and an increasingly important one in our society. Either we must seek to ensure greater and more equitable access to such employment or we must turn the issue on its head and seek to loosen the link between employment and income.

In this respect I must express perhaps a slight disappointment with Parliament's resolution which has not picked up that point. A Community institute on employment has been proposed. It is no secret — and Parliament knows it — that we feel the job is best done within the Commission where the relationship with other policies, notably economic policy, social transfers and training and education policies, can be maintained. However, the fact that you made the proposal does seem to me to suggest that perhaps Parliament has not appreciated the need to rethink the links between employment and income, a need which is likely to become more rather than less pressing in the years that are to come. However, that is perhaps in some ways a question more of emphasis than of difference of principle.

I would like to end what I have to say on long-term unemployment by restating how much I welcome Parliament's support and how I hope we can now move forward in developing policies which can effectively combat unemployment in general and long-term unemployment in particular.

I was also asked a somewhat presumptuous question, if I may say so — presumptuous not from the point of view of the man asking the question but presumptuous on the part of the Commission in trying to answer it — as to what Parliament should do in relation to long-term unemployment and this resolution on it, on the assumption that the Council passes it in December. I can only say to Parliament that it should be vigilant. By being vigilant, what I mean is that Parliament should first of all monitor what the Commission does in relation to it, noting what we have said we will do and what we actually do do in relation to it. Perhaps more important than that, I think it is incumbent upon Parliament to try to keep the Member States individually and collectively up to scratch as far as their commitment to this particular resolution is concerned.

May I finally turn to the document on the promotion of positive action for women. I apologize for taking so long, but I am replying to three debates in one and I hope Parliament will forgive me if I take perhaps another three or four minutes.

Again may I start by expressing the gratitude of the Commission for the report, thanking Mrs Van den Heuvel and Mrs Larive-Groenendaal for drawing up the report and the opinion and also thanking Parliament for all that has been said today. A Community instrument on positive action was, as you know, foreseen in the Community action programme on the promotion of equal opportunity for women, but the concept of positive action was provided for in Community legislation way back in 1976 in Article 2(4) of the equal treatment directive. Our aim is therefore to establish a proper policy framework at national level, by legislation if possible, to develop positive action in favour of women. We seek at the same time to encourage the social partners to adopt positive action pro-

**Richard**

grammes and also to enable the Commission to act as a clearing house gathering and disseminating information on developments in Member States and assessing the progress made.

The Council expressed the political will to promote positive action when it adopted the resolution of 12 July 1982 approving the general objectives of the action programme. So far so good. Needless to say, however, when it came to the crunch of negotiations on a Community instrument on positive action, albeit only on a recommendation, the Council working group has consistently steered towards a weakening of the original text proposed by the Commission. At the same time I think we can be fairly confident that the recommendation will be adopted by the Council under the Irish presidency before the end of the year. Parliament's support is therefore important, since it strengthens the hand of those, including the Commission, who are seeking to maintain a text strong enough to be worthy of being a Council recommendation.

I realize, because it has been indicated time and time again in this debate, that the nature of the instrument is something that a number of parliamentarians have doubts about. The Committee on Women's Rights is suggesting a binding legal instrument, a directive instead of a recommendation. The Commission is of the opinion that binding Community legislation would not be appropriate at this stage. A less binding, more flexible instrument is, for the time being, more suitable in an area where precise detailed rules might not only be difficult to enforce but would also, in our view, have a counter-productive effect. We are, after all, still at the stage of helping to change attitudes and inspire new thought and creativity about positive action. We see this recommendation, moreover, in the context of a number of other Community actions to promote positive action itself. Binding legislation might be envisaged at a later stage to consolidate progress and to promote convergence throughout the Community.

The Commission has similar difficulties, I am afraid, in accepting the idea of a quota system as suggested by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. The idea that a minimum percentage of places should be reserved for women in all occupations and sectors of working life where they are at present under-represented and at all levels of responsibility would also, in our view, be counter-productive at this stage. We first have to give Member States and the social partners the chance to use a whole range of different forms of positive action to improve the participation of women in working life.

Similarly, we doubt whether it would be a good idea to choose only one specified field each year, such as women and the new technologies, and to concentrate activities on that one specific area. I think it is too differentiated an approach. I think it could well lead to a too restrictive attitude in other areas, where special efforts are also required. In our view, a positive action

policy programme, if it is to be successful, should consist of a global strategy. This is indeed one of the main aims of the draft recommendation.

If I have appeared somewhat negative about those three points, Madam President, it is not because I do not share your objective, which is to move as far and as fast as possible. However, I really have to say that I do not think it would serve any purpose to strengthen the Commission's proposal at this stage, i.e. precisely when we are in the middle of trying to save the proposal from dilution at the hands of a somewhat atavistic Council. Some of our rather mildly formulated ideas, such as codes of good practice for employers, are also under threat, and I am anxious to preserve and save them. The constructive suggestions of Parliament should nevertheless go on record, as they clearly will. They will certainly be taken into account by the Commission as guidelines for its future work in this field.

I think that I have covered most of the points or at least most of the themes that have been raised in the course of this long and most interesting debate. It has, I think, underlined yet again the importance that Parliament attaches to these great issues of employment policy and equality of opportunity between the different sections of our population. For all its difficulties in other respects, it has been a day in which Parliament has, I think, on the whole acquitted itself well, if I may respectfully say so.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

### 7. *Economic recovery*

**President.** — The next time is the joint debate on:

— the oral question with debate (Doc. 2-610/84) by Mr P. Beazley and others to the Council:

Subject: Plan for European economic recovery

1. Has the Council considered this programme for recovery put forward by the European Parliament?
2. What steps has the Council taken to implement Parliament's proposals, and what plans does it have in this regard during the period of the Irish Presidency?
3. With which of Parliament's recommendations does the Council find itself in disagreement and why?

— the oral question with debate (Doc. 2-704/84) by Mr von Wogau and others, on behalf on the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) to the Commission:

## President

Subject: Proposals for reviving the European economy

- Noting with great satisfaction the noticeable reduction in identity checks at the Franco-German and Belgian/German internal borders of the Community based on the decisions taken in Fontainebleau as regards 'the People's Europe';
- greatly concerned by the bureaucratic, fiscal, administrative and health-regulation obstacles to the intra-Community transport of goods and delays caused to processing because of a lack of staff, problems which have once again been highlighted by the blockage of the Italian border crossing at Chiasso;
- having regard to the additional costs to the European economy of the failure to achieve an internal Community market which places it at a disadvantage in international competition and means that the people of Europe have to pay an additional sum estimated at DM 30 000 m, which could be saved by swiftly eliminating superfluous delays in processing goods in intra-Community transport;
- having regard to the increasing importance of the ECU, including its use as a European unit of account, as a stable currency for contracts and in private use, together with the need in a unified domestic market to facilitate payment transactions by using a common currency;

we would ask the Commission to answer the following questions:

### (a) *The People's Europe*

1. What proposals for a People's Europe does the Commission intend to put forward to enable people to see real progress in the European Community?
2. How and when does the Commission intend to issue a European passport in the Member States and to create a European driving licence for the citizens of Europe as concrete evidence of 'a People's Europe'?
3. In particular what steps has the Commission taken to remove internal frontiers within the Community along the lines of the Benelux Treaty or the Franco-German example?
4. At what crossing points at internal borders is electronic surveillance equipment currently being installed or already operating to provide even more controls on individuals and how does the Commission intend to abolish or prevent these new obstacles at borders?
5. What steps is the Commission taking to demonstrate to the citizens of the Community that they belong to a community as shown by

their ability to use a common European currency; what progress has been made in talks with the Member States concerning private use of the ECU and how does the Commission view in this context the readjustment of the shares in the basket of currencies which make up the ECU?

6. What consequences and lessons has the Commission drawn from the proposals of the European Parliament on implementing the European internal market?<sup>1</sup>

### (b) *Creating employment*

1. What measures has the Commission taken in response to the proposal and various suggestions and instructions from Parliament, adopted in its 'Plan for European economic recovery',<sup>2</sup> and how in particular does it intend to cut back the costs of the non-Europe described therein and free European industry from the unnecessary costs resulting from:
  - delays in processing at frontiers,
  - the lack of European-wide tendering procedures in the field of high technology,
  - incompatibility of technical standards,
  - the lack of mutual recognition of test certificates,

and maintain the competitiveness of European industry at international level.

2. What measures has the Commission taken to allow European service industries, in particular in the fields of transport, insurance and banking, to benefit from the advantages of a large European internal market?
3. What has the Commission done to implement the proposals from the European Parliament<sup>1</sup> on the creation of Community capital markets and the liberalization of capital transactions so as to make available to all European companies, in particular small and medium-sized innovatory new companies which create new employment, financing facilities and provide the optimum investment for risk capital?

### (c) *Reduction in unnecessary bureaucracy*

1. What proposals does the Commission intend to make to the specialist ministries to reduce superfluous and counter-productive regulations and allow European business, in particular small and medium-sized industry to concentrate their efforts on their industrial activities and thus help to create new employ-

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 77, 19. 3. 1984.

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 117, 30. 4. 1984.

**President**

ment rather than having to cope with ever-more red tape?

2. What steps has the Commission proposed to implement a European policy on standards?
  3. What progress has been made with the Commission's proposals on a Community trademark, on which the European Parliament has also issued a recommendation, and what proposals is the Commission making as regards the European patent?
  4. Has the Commission taken any new measures to prevent any further widening of the gap between the different rates of value-added tax in the Community and in particular to achieve further harmonization in the field of special consumer taxes?
  5. What methods and proposals has the Commission adopted to harmonize customs regulations, to encourage cooperation between customs authorities and to create a common customs authority to enable more efficient processing at all internal and external frontiers of the Community and in particular to prevent regional distortions of competition, such as those in Bavaria which is obliged to route some two-thirds of its total export of goods through the bottleneck of the Italian customs on the Brenner Pass?
- the oral question with debate (Doc. 2-816/84) by Mrs Tove Nielsen and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Commission:

Subject: Programme submitted by the Commission for consolidating the internal market

In view of the number and importance of the proposals contained in the programme for consolidating the internal market submitted by the Commission last June, can the Commission say how it intends to induce the Council to adopt this package of measures for the end of 1984 and 1985?

Can it say which areas it considers to be priorities? In particular, with regard to the legal environment for enterprises, can it assure Parliament that measures as important as those concerning the European economic interest grouping will eventually be adopted in accordance with the scheduled timetable?

Can it also give assurances that the measures designed to secure the free movement of capital mentioned in the consolidation programme (measures concerning collective investment undertakings for transferable securities) will be adopted in 1984 and 1985?

Furthermore, can the Commission say how it will take into account the principles set out in the

European Parliament's report on the need to establish the European internal market?

Can the Commission provide information concerning the number and the type of cases brought in respect of technical barriers to trade by economic operators? What individual and global measures does the Commission intend to take to put an end to the persistent violations of Community law?

— the oral question with debate (Doc. 2-817/84) by Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the European Democratic Alliance, to the Commission:

Subject: Plan for European economic recovery

Europe must regain a high level of growth by means of large-scale productive investment in potential growth sectors in order to combat unemployment effectively. However, this policy cannot succeed without the creation of a genuine internal market, progressively freed from constraints of all types so as to allow the effects of a Europe-wide market to operate fully.

What measures does the Commission intend to take to promote the establishment of a vast internal market?

**Sir Fred Catherwood (ED).** — Madam President, last March the old Parliament voted a well-considered resolution on European economic recovery, and this is the first time we can raise the issue again in the new Parliament.

Those of us who have put this question down believe that it is the most urgent question now facing the Community. It is urgent because the latest OECD figures show that unemployment has gone on rising and will continue to do so unless decisive action is taken which can only be taken by the Community acting together. It is urgent because rising unemployment with no end in sight brings dangerous social instability and also makes it increasingly difficult to carry through the changes in industrial structure on which our future will depend. However, it is especially urgent because we are beginning to find that once public attention becomes fixed on the conflicts aroused by the fear of unemployment, the political support for the necessary changes drains away.

Madam President, it is especially urgent for the Community because if the economic *rationale* of Community action disappears because we are seen to be impotent as a Community, then it will be impossible also to make the political breakthrough needed to overcome the multiplicity of national vetoes and to carry the Community forward either on the political front or on the economic front.

So almost every other question we face in this Parliament really depends on effective economic recovery.

### Sir Fred Catherwood

We are now fortunately at the key stage in the calendar of the Community. We now have a newly-elected Parliament, in January we shall have a new Commission, and in Fontainebleau we found a new Community spirit and put many of the disputes behind us. So not only must we take advantage of the calendar moving decisively now, but past experience — and this, I think, is perhaps the main thing that I want to say — teaches us that the Community really cannot go forward with small measures or in slow stages. That is because each small measure visibly diminishes national sovereignty without giving any equally visible Community gain. A long succession, year after year, of small measures arousing hostility against the Community leads to the position where nobody really believes in or supports Community action.

Community action needs to give each country much more through collective action than it takes away from the separate instruments of national protection. To go slowly, directive by directive, is to encourage maximum opposition from each well-orchestrated lobby which briefs its national press and TV and dominates the media for months after it discovers the directive. The next month it will be another directive and another argument. That is not a cautious approach. A piecemeal approach is not a cautious approach. It is really to kill the Community by slow stages, draining away the support that we need for action. So it is no longer adequate in the Community's third decade to defend the Community against articulate, well-organized vested interests by appealing to general Community aims and spirit. Community action now has to be big enough and bold enough to be seen and believed in as a credible force for change. We have to be able to argue that proposed action really will create a Community *masse de manoeuvre* big enough to get the huge flywheel of inter-Community trade spinning. We must be seen to be producing in a package the force needed to get Community trade going again and all our economies moving with it.

We have to show also that the reserves behind the European Monetary System, and its currency coverage, and its capital market, are sufficient to retain our European savings in Europe without our having to raise interest rates to protect them. To do that, we do not want measures that are so small that they will get through a Council influenced by a nervous and defensive public opinion. We need instead measures that are clearly big enough and bold enough to convince public opinion that the action taken, for which they are giving up something, will actually be effective in getting our economies moving so that we can put the Council under pressure from the voters themselves and the Council will be told to get on with it.

For instance, the case for full British membership of the European Monetary System is overwhelming, not just for the full development of the system but also for Britain. And yet we need a package big enough to overcome the residual reluctance of the British

Government. The case for a common European capital market which can compete with New York is also overwhelming, but we need a package big enough to convince the Federal Republic of Germany to open up fully its capital markets and to persuade the French Republic to abolish exchange controls. The case for common safety standards is overwhelming, but we need a package big enough to set a timetable and a method of agreement by which 10 national standards concede to a common one within a year. The case for free sales in a common market of all that we produce in each country is overwhelming, but we still need to see the effective operation of the new Community commercial policy and the approval of the remaining 50 directives, especially on motor vehicles and building materials, and the replacement of national type-approval measures with a European type-approval also within a very limited period of time. We need a deal that is sufficiently big to put over against all the vested interests that hold those things up.

The case for free movement of goods in a common market is overwhelming, but we still need a single administrative document at frontiers. When we have it, we need to use that document for exchange of information between customs computers so that trucks do not have to stop at customs posts. We need also the collection of value-added tax away from frontiers so that they do not have to stop for that either, and then we can abolish the frontier posts and save 8 to 9 billion ECU.

If we put the whole package together, then, but only then, we will have the impetus from a common market in capital and merchandise, the biggest in the world, which is, by its very existence and by the promotion of trade that it will produce from within itself, capable on its own of getting our economies going, getting our people back to work and, as the biggest trading group in the world, getting Third World exports going again and solving their awful economic crisis, including the problems President Alfonsin outlined so vividly this morning.

We should also remind ourselves that if those problems that President Alfonsin outlined this morning are not resolved, then we could well have the most colossal financial crash on top of an economic crisis. So it is not only that we need to get going for the things that we need to achieve, we need to get going lest a lot worse happen to us. If we have an effective package, something to offer, something which can be seen to get trade going again, then we have something to offer our peoples which only the Community can give, to which each Member State has got to contribute its bit but from which each Member State can receive back in jobs and its own revenue infinitely more than it could ever gain by the national defences that it brings up on a ratio of 20 to 1 or 30 to 1. That is the impetus that we actually need.

So, what I am proposing — and again this is the main thrust of what I am saying — is that with a new Parlia-

**Sir Fred Catherwood**

ment and a new Commission and the spirit of Fontainebleau, instead of a haphazard and scattered attack on the obstacles in our way, we need to concentrate our forces for a breakthrough, a package which faces the Community with the final decision to make a common market and gives it and every citizen all the gains that flow from that. Nothing less than this *force de frappe* will do.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR***Vice-President*

**Mr von Wogau (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament pointed out again and again in past legislative periods that an open internal market on a European scale is an essential condition for improving the competitiveness and revitalizing the European economy.

The tenacity with which the Parliament pursued this goal has in the meantime yielded its first fruits. The Commission and the Council have begun — if very hesitantly — to carry out some of the demands made by Parliament. Bilateral moves are underway too — for example, the initial steps taken to lessen border controls between France and Germany.

Particularly around the time of the European elections — although it was too late to influence the turnout — there was a decided impression that at last things were moving. However, coverage by the media over the past weeks and months tends to give the opposite impression. Here the subject is dealt with merely from a security point of view and there are serious reservations about lessening the border controls further. What they deliberately forget to point out is that the discussion on opening the borders between the Community countries has started to improved cooperation between the police authorities of the Member States; this will lead not to a deterioration but rather to an improvement in security in border regions.

One thing we MEPs are sure of but which also surprises us is this: heads of State and governments announce their intention to abolish personal checks and the following day officials of these countries who are subject to instructions tell us that this is illusory and simply impossible. If we leave it to national authorities to decide on the possibility of further development of the Community we may as well write off European policy straight away. This is scandalous and as Europeans we should not tolerate it!

Occasionally we hear from interested parties that goods checks between Member States have already

been reduced to the absolute minimum necessary. But anyone who wants a true picture of what is going on should listen sometime to a European art dealer describe what he has to go through when he owns a picture in one Member State and wants to exhibit in another.

*(Applause)*

First of all, he must apply for an export licence at the Central Customs Office. It takes on average three weeks to come through. Approval for works of art which are more than 20 years old or have a value of over 10 000 French francs must be obtained subsequently from the Art Commission, which of course meets only on Wednesday afternoons. If the vehicle collecting the pictures is transporting others at the same time the matter cannot be settled at one go. On the contrary, he must go to the customs house first of all for the import rigmarole. Only then may he reload, after which he drives to the same customs office once again to settle the export formalities.

*(Laughter)*

Of course, a forwarding agent must be called upon for these complicated proceedings. For example, for three pictures whose value is equivalent to DM 46 000 he charges the following: — now, first listen to this — customs free — this is not a duty but rather a customs fee: FF 128, despatch: FF 910, clearance charges: FF 305, chamber of commerce costs: FF 193, drawing up two export documents: FF 555, presentation at customs: FF 425, insurance during storage: FF 563.40, fixed costs: FF 175. This amounts to a total cost of FF 3 629.48 or DM 1 210.

*(Laughter)*

Add to this — we are not finished yet — the German customs fee of DM 125 and the import turnover tax of DM 3 220 which has to be paid in all cases. And not even one picture has been sold yet! What is more, if they are not sold within one year they must be returned to the land of origin with all the implied formalities and costs. The art dealers comment: 'That can go on year after year until you lose all interest in European art dealings'.

*(Laughter)*

It is precisely individual examples like this which show just how far we are from the goal of an open European common market. Such examples also show the delays, the hassle and costs involved and explain why European firms still have to spend approximately DM 30 000 million per year to negotiate inter-Community borders.

The examples also demonstrate why the European Parliament will not lessen its efforts to press for the elimination of red tape at the borders between the

von Wogau

Member States. They make us realize how much these hindrances discourage small- and medium-sized firms from exploiting the possibilities of the European market and they provide us with one explanation as to why in the final analysis we in Europe have not succeeded in creating even one new job in the last decade.

The Herman report, approved by a large majority in the European Parliament, demonstrates quite clearly that the creation of an open European internal market, particularly in the area of advanced technologies, must be the decisive contribution of the Community to the recovery of the European economy.

But what are the unemployed in our countries to think when they see that not only has this opportunity not been exploited, but that the heads of State and government have been squabbling continually for years at the highest level over contributions which are only a fraction of the amount frittered away at the borders of the Member States. For this reason we welcome wholeheartedly the programme which the Commission is now submitting, the aim of which is to bring about important progress by 1 January 1986 towards the realization of the internal European market. Our goal, proposed in the motion for a resolution at the end of this debate, goes beyond this, however. We want the abolition of all personal and goods checks between the Member States of the European Community by 1 January 1989.

*(Applause)*

No one should fool himself that this will be easy to achieve and that the introduction of a European passport will solve everything. Rather, we must standardize laws in the Community countries regarding passports, visas and foreigners. We must improve cooperation between police authorities and the security at our external borders. We mustn't limit ourselves to harmonizing the systems for VAT and various consumption duties, we should strive to approximate the rates of tax. If we want to create a common market for future technologies we need common European standards, mutual recognition of test certificates, further development of European patents and creation of the European trade mark, but especially the putting out to tender on the European level of advanced technology projects. Above all, we must see that our national bureaucracies dispense with some cherished notions which are hindering further development of the Community.

In the first legislative period of this Parliament we worked out our objectives and took the first steps towards carrying them out. In the next five years we must succeed in implementing them so that — at least in this area — the aims of the founders of the European Community will finally be realized.

*(Applause)*

**Mr De Vries (L).** — *(NL)* Mr President, Europe's greatest strength is also Europe's greatest weakness. With 270 million consumers our market knows no equal in the world. And yet Europe is worse hit by the recession than Japan. America is still creating millions of jobs, while ours are disappearing. We all know why. If a product is made in Chicago for a customer in New Orleans, it simply has to be put on a lorry. If a product is made in Amsterdam for a customer in Paris, it is held up at the borders.

And this problem does not arise just at the borders between the Netherlands and Belgium or between Belgium and France. Our tax systems are not harmonized; the values of our currencies fluctuate; our safety requirements are not the same; our health regulations are different; our company laws are different. Under Article 115 of our EEC Treaty, each Member State has its own policy on imports from third countries. Free European market? Any lorry driver will put you right on that!

Europe can compete with America in space technology. The Ariane project is evidence of that. European nuclear physicists working together on the CERN programme win Nobel prizes. And yet this same Europe is dipping wooden sticks into petrol tanks at the borders to measure the quantity of fuel in lorries' tanks.

And still Mr President, Europe's greatest weakness is also Europe's greatest strength. If we could persuade our governments to give European industry the room to manoeuvre it needs there is no earthly reason why we should lose tomorrow's employment battle to America and Japan. But the barriers for goods traffic crossing frontiers cost European industry and thus the consumer more than 30 000 million guilders a year. It would be a tremendous boost to our economy if we could reduce these costs.

Mr President, a great deal has been said by Members of this House about how much money is squandered by the European Community. Our British Socialist colleagues made a special point of this, concentrating on a few glaring incidents and other minor details. But what do we see today at such a crucial debate, where something could be done about the 30 000 million wasted for industry? That the British socialist benches are empty! I find that very sad, Mr President. It depends where your political priorities lie. Permits, visas, registration forms, statistical documents, certificates of origin, clearance procedures, national technical standards, everywhere there are regulations which have been worked out by national civil servants mainly for national civil servants. Europe cannot move for national red tape. But as politicians we should win Europe back from these national civil servants. The first priority of both Parliament and the Commission should, for the next five years, be to release the domestic market from trade barriers. My party, Mr President, proposes the following 10 main points. To

**De Vries**

facilitate goods transport, fuel checks at the border must be abolished. VAT should be settled not at the border but at the product's place of destination. There should be a single common company tax system. Technical safety and health standards and requirements must be harmonized at European level. Direct taxation on industry must be harmonized. There are a number of Commission decisions on this which have been waiting since 1969 for a Council decision. It must be possible to establish European limited companies. Proposals for European trade mark law should be accepted by the Council. Insurance companies should be allowed to offer their services freely throughout the Community. There must be liberalization of the movement of capital. And finally, under Article 155 of the EEC Treaty, the Commission should have broader powers of implementation with regard to industrial products. Mr President, it is often said that the European Community has little influence on the development of this part of the world. There is an element of truth in this. But when it comes to economic recovery, there is one very important instrument at our disposal. We know from the election period alone the issue which is foremost in the minds of the European citizen: work and unemployment. 13 million Europeans without work, 4 1/2 million young people without work and the number of long-term unemployed — this we have already debated at length — is soaring. We cannot offer guarantees of full employment. But that doesn't mean we are powerless. I find it appalling, Mr President, that our governments are not making proper use of one of the most important means the Community has, that is freeing the market. It is this Parliament's job to show up this inaction.

In conclusion, the European Commission — and Commissioner Narjes in particular — has an ally in the Liberal Party. The new Commission can also count upon our support, provided that it makes the domestic market its priority. It is high time that the dead wood was cut from the tangle of trade barriers.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Juppé (RDE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Community's economic difficulties can be summed up in a single question: why is Europe, unlike the United States, Japan and the new industrial countries in the Pacific, incapable of creating new jobs to compensate for the adjustments which have to be made in over-staffed sectors?

The answer normally given is that there is not enough growth. This is correct, but there is more to it than that. We have to carry out a more thorough analysis of the real reasons for stagnation in Europe. And we for our part believe that the chronic disease our economies and, incidentally our society in general, are suffering from is inflexibility. Inflexibility and barriers to trade. Those who have already spoken have made this amply clear, especially with regard to high technology

production, but other sectors, too. Inflexibility and too much importance attached to tax and administrative standards. Inflexibility, lack of imagination and unwillingness to take risks in the running of the capital markets and ways of financing innovation. Inflexibility and conservatism even in social legislation, which is no longer able to meet the spectrum of individual needs, especially as far as working time is concerned. Inflexibility and lack of courage in mentalities and attitudes towards work itself, and remuneration of work. Europe's economic recovery therefore, in our view, can only be brought about through a new type of flexibility and adaptability.

How do we go about this? We should have at least four priorities. First of all the creation, and I shall not revert to what has already been said by almost all the speakers before me, of a real Community market for high technology products in particular. We know what action is necessary but it is not always taken. Our Parliament must bring more pressure to bear to get things moving in this direction. But this is not enough.

Our second priority is to relieve the burdens and constraints which are holding back companies, whether large, small or medium-sized. All administrative plans to beat unemployment are bound to fail, as we have seen in various places. Only by developing companies can jobs be created. Moreover, these companies must be allowed to build up their profit margins again and adapt to the new demand situation according to the signals coming from the market. This is the way our Community, and our Parliament, should be talking too.

The third priority is to promote within each company the types of social schemes which will allow an increase in employee participation in the ownership and a direct say in the running of the company. This is one of the conditions for improving productivity.

Fourthly, in the light of what I have just said, we must redefine the role of the governments which, almost everywhere in Europe, have increasingly monopolized production tasks, whereas their real duty should be to preserve a general balance, sustain competition and concentrate their action on research into the promising fields of the future.

I would like to conclude by saying that, apart from the technical measures proposed by various speakers, which our group supports as far as the main market is concerned, the Community must also create the impression that there is a need for a real psychological and moral turnaround: a return to precisely those values on which the construction of Europe was founded, in other words freedom, responsibility and hard work.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — Mr President, I should like to say at the outset how inter-

**Barry**

esting I found the contribution made by the four questioners today and how much I felt myself to be in tune with their sentiments. The Council has also noted with great interest the important work carried out by the European Parliament in connection with the plan for European economic recovery. I think the very favourable reaction to the plan both within the institutions and amongst the general public clearly indicates that the European Parliament has succeeded in identifying a major cause of concern for society and the urgent need to find satisfactory solutions to our problems. It is now for other institutions to make their contribution to the discussion initiated by Parliament. The Commission will shortly submit its draft economic report for 1985 — may be Commissioner Narjes will in a minute have something to say about that — and the Council will adopt a position on this report towards the end of the year and lay down the economic policy guidelines for the following year. I know that the Commission is particularly interested in this joint discussion, and I am sure we can look forward to important information from them concerning their intentions as regards the plan for European economic recovery. Meanwhile, Members of Parliament will earlier today have heard Mr Quinn convey some far-reaching and challenging proposals for the re-stimulation and restructuring of our economies, with the particular aim of alleviating the scourge of unemployment and particularly long-term unemployment, so eloquently referred to by one of the speakers today.

These are questions to which the Taoiseach, when he addressed this Parliament in July, also gave high priority as matters to be tackled during the Irish presidency. I am convinced that the discussions which will be held in both Parliament and the Council on the Commission's proposals will enable our economic problems to be analysed in greater depth and the most appropriate solutions to be found. It has been said, I think, by all four speakers today that unless we can solve these problems, the crisis — something that has been unknown in human history — will have extremely grave social consequences not just for the peoples of this Community but for the peoples of the world. I am sure that Commissioner Narjes will respond much more fully to the questions which were addressed to Parliament today.

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — On a point of order, Mr President. As one of the movers of the question that the Council has just answered, could I ask the President-in-Office one simple question: What has the Council done about the Herman resolution on economic recovery?

**President.** — That is not a point of order.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — It was a point of order, because I think the President-in-Office misunderstood what was on the agenda. He said at the end that the

Commission would answer the questions put down, but the question in the name of myself, Mr Welsh and others is addressed to the Council. It is not up to the Commission to answer it, it is up to the Council to answer it. Could he please do so?

**President.** — The President-in-Office of the Council has given his reply to the House.

*(Interruption: 'It was a very poor reply'.)*

The House can have its own views in connection with the reply and use its own judgment.

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — (DE) Mr President, first of all I would like to say a word of thanks to all initiators, the committees involved and groups for making it possible to hold this comprehensive debate today. In particular I would also like to thank all speakers for making it absolutely clear that the second directly elected European Parliament intends not just to continue the activities started by the first one but to work vigorously, energetically and dynamically to carry them further.

Internal market policy first of all means implementation of a fundamental part of the Treaties of Rome which came into force almost 27 years ago and much of which has still not been fulfilled. It was the Commission's task to put the internal market back into the front line of European political work where it belongs. At first, in the growth years, then during the oil crisis and the years in which the Community institutions were busy with the enlargement negotiations and the ensuing disputes, the internal market was pushed dangerously into the background and, since it was politically uninteresting because of its technical character, it was politically downgraded. In fact, all the Councils of Ministers gave scant attention to the implementation of the Treaties. The extent to which this is true can be seen in some areas from a comparison between the declarations of intent of, for example, the Hague Summit of 1969 and the actual situation in 1981 when the current Commission took office. Only when symptoms of decline occurred after 1980/81 — and by this I mean the wave of internal protectionism within the Community caused by the germ of national industrial policies after the second oil crisis — was it possible to turn the tide and restore the implementation of the Treaties to the forefront of European political work with the aid of the European Parliament.

Since then, internal protectionism has been on the defensive again, and the institutional links for the implementation of the Treaties have been restrengthened by the creation of internal market Councils, although these links could be improved further. I agree with all those who have drawn attention, in their motions and in their speeches today, to the economic importance of the internal market. The latter is

### Narjes

obvious in view of the often quoted costs caused by the mere existence of frontiers — and I am grateful to Mr Von Wogau for his really good example taken from the art trade — as a result of incompatible communications structures in the Community and the existence of different currency areas. They can and must all be eliminated. Therefore I repeat: our specific goal is not to improve conditions at frontiers but to remove frontiers, and to do so soon.

(Applause)

Because of their highly negative effects, frontiers also have an economic influence on investment activities in the Community, and on the type and size of investments. Frontiers generate insecurity and scepticism, or even mistrust, because investors are continually afraid of their misuse. Frontiers militate against production structures involving international division of labour. As I have already said in the past, if one or more companies in a triple-frontier area or other favourable border location wished to introduce, for example, the *Canban System* of production logistics, which is common in Japan and has done a great deal to help improve productivity there, they would have to do without it as long as the frontiers existed because no one can calculate to the nearest hour if there is no knowing what uncertainty or obstacle the mere existence of frontiers presents. This is a specific example of the sort of thing that is made impossible by frontiers.

The problem also includes frontiers between social security systems or tax systems which affect not only the frontier workers but, above all, scientists, engineers and qualified staff whom many investors need to employ in the places where the best investment can be made. By depriving us — and I stress this again — of an internal market of continental proportions — in other words the basic market — frontiers reduce our worldwide competitiveness, especially in the field of high technology. Our competitiveness also suffers from the fact that sales are mainly based on national supply channels and not on the European market or European competition. Supply to the national market is still generally regarded as the normal case. Think of the sectors of defence, telecommunications, transport and many others. These frontiers, too, which cut across public supplies, are important cost factors and major elements preventing us from making full use of the European dimension for our growth and for the fight against unemployment.

The Commission's action on these various points is public knowledge; I can only give you a rough summary of it. As regards public contracts, we are working both horizontally and vertically: vertically, ultimately, in our proposals on telecommunications in order to get rid of a mentality which can only be dispelled by the same sort of spirit as that in which Sir Fred Catherwood and Mr Juppé spoke.

We are dealing with decision-makers with a 19th century mentality and 20th century equipment who

believe they can comfortably prepare us for the 21st century, and who do not even notice that it is a problem if one can only use a car telephone in one country, or if one cannot use Telefax and other modern communication techniques in any other country because the systems are not compatible — and who do not even appear to be in any hurry to put an end to these deplorable situations which they themselves have created.

(Applause)

This will be a major area of work for the next Commission. 15 to 20% of the national product is affected. This task will make great demands on the governments' ability to have their way. I would like to say that this ability is not something to be sniffed at but, from what I have seen in the past four years, the crucial factor determining the realization of the internal market and indeed the implementation of the Treaties of Rome.

The implementation and application of Community law is becoming increasingly problematic. The more Member States there are, the more important I regard agreement — and no provision is made for this in the Treaties of Rome — on what should and must happen if a Member State, for example, refuses to comply with major aspects of Treaties, or at any rate prevents the Community from functioning properly and is not prepared to keep the fundamental balance between Member States' rights and duties, but is more intent on upsetting it.

Other similar topics will also be of major concern to the next Commission and the European Parliament during its term of office.

A successful internal market also entails a reliable legal framework for the economy. That is indispensable if investors are to have dependable indicators, if trade is to be allowed to plan ahead properly and if banks, insurance companies, service industries and public authorities are to be able to calculate which procedures will be straightforward and which will involve surprises and uncertainties. This reliability of the legal framework, I would like to make clear, can only be achieved if use is made of the legal instruments of Community law.

International law, however good the intentions of the Member States may be, cannot meet these conditions in the long term. Anyone who believes he can make do with agreements is unfamiliar with the internal market, because international agreements can be changed by subsequent national legislation and do not come under the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice, the only body guaranteeing the preservation of uniform law within the Community and, consequently, predictable conditions for the economy.

We have no intention of proposing a perfect set of laws but the indispensable minimum package of Com-

## Narjes

munity legislation should be created soon to provide a convincing and predictable basis. This includes not just patent law but trade mark law as well, the negotiations for which we hope will be completed by the end of 1985; it also includes copyright law, European company law and basic elements of European tax law.

There has been talk of a Europe of citizens. The elimination of frontiers gives citizens the only visible sign of, and tangible participation in, the achievements of the Community. We are pleased that some Member States have made a start in moving forward more quickly on a bilateral basis and doing more than, unfortunately, the Community of Ten has so far been able to do because of the special situations of individual Member States. States separated from each other by long national frontiers should not be afraid of creating models for the elimination of shared frontiers which are so effective that others are encouraged to follow their example.

The argument of lack of security which has been cited is losing ground. On the contrary, the circumstances in which terrorism is being fought prove that it is much better to extend a search over the whole of Europe than to confine it to within national frontiers and that our call for the creation of a Europol to supplement Interpol is not just intended as a stopgap but is a highly logical move in practical terms in the fight against crime. Furthermore, according to press reports, the relaxing of customs formalities at the frontiers, for example between France and Germany and between the Benelux countries and Germany, has not led to a reduction in the number of goods seized or persons traced, which was previously always cited as one of the main fears preventing progress.

These are all points we would like to introduce before the Committee of the Europe of the Citizens, a committee which we expect to provide help but which unfortunately has not yet held a single working meeting because it has not been able to decide on a chairman.

Many questions on individual problems of the internal market have been raised. Our general answer at this point in time is the consolidation programme, an ambitious programme which, when it has been completed, is bound to result in some of the psychological success which Sir Fred Catherwood rightly said we urgently needed. A programme which makes great demands of the Council of Ministers' power of decision. We have been given six Councils in order to fulfil this programme: two under each presidency.

We also have the major package of agricultural measures, and we hope very much that the agricultural ministers will make their decisions, in this sector at least, punctually, comprehensively and without any national reservations. Some 30 to 35 guidelines are currently awaiting their decisions. If they are all adopted, there will be no more protectionist obstacles

in the form of technical pretexts in the foodstuffs and agricultural trade sector.

However, we shall also have to ask the Council on Economic and Financial Affairs and other Councils to do their bit in dealing with this programme and the parts they are responsible for. As the programme takes shape, some items of the Treaties which are difficult to implement will become more and more evident and it will become more and more difficult and politically impossible to avoid taking a decision.

I am thinking not merely of elements in the services sector but above all of transport policy and its difficulties; I am also thinking of the coordination of tax rates, since there is indeed a need for progress in the excise duty and VAT sectors — the notorious measuring of diesel fuel in tanks is simply due to the fact that in one Member State diesel fuel has 4 pfennigs per litre of tax on it and in others 44 pfennigs per litre, with the result that a lorry and trailer from the 4 pfennig country can have a cost advantage of up to DM 50 000 per year over the lorry and the trailer from the 44 pfennig country. In this case, the Member States must try to meet in the middle to reduce discrepancies of this type and allow the resultant frontier obstacles to be eliminated.

I am thinking of all the things that are said about the capital market — which is a crucial precondition for the Community's overall success. However — and here I would like to pursue an idea mentioned in Mr Von Wogau's motion — I am also thinking that as soon as the consolidation programme has been completed and has been clearly outlined the time will have come to think about a final deadline for eliminating frontiers.

I would not like to give you 1 January 1989 as a firm deadline from the outset, but I think it is a probable and possible deadline. The idea of forcing the elimination of frontiers by setting a firm deadline, and this is probably the only way of making any progress, is in my view an indispensable means of completing this internal market once and for all. This then means that, for example, the 14th Directive, the setting up of the VAT rating system, must have been completed by then. This directive has encountered resistance from national bureaucracies like no other legislation, because they are very much aware of its strategic importance to the European Community.

Speakers have repeatedly raised the question of what economic policy is to be implemented in the Community today and tomorrow for the large internal market. In this regard I would like to point out, and here I agree with what the President-in-Office of the Council has said, that the Commission's annual economic report will be submitted to this House in the next few days and that this report does contain a series of stimulating and probably controversial but also courageous ideas on how these problems we are facing can

**Narjes**

be dealt with not just by way of convergence but also via policy on tax, interest rates and wages and salaries, via demand and its development, supply and its improvement, consolidation of public budgets and the fight against inflation.

Furthermore, we should not forget that, whatever economic policy is applied, we have every reason for exercising basic European self-criticism. Some of the questions associated with this were: why has the United States in the past 15 years achieved such success in employment policy compared with the sterile situation in Europe? Why does adaptation take so long in Europe and why are adaptation processes so slow that we have not even got over those of the past decade, although we know very well that if we carry on like this, we will be unable to cope with the next wave of already foreseeable adaptation as things stand. These processes also include those which may evolve from the rapid development of international interdependence and the integration of the Community in this interdependence. This self-criticism must be conducted without reproaches: it must be without malice, but also without any sympathy for any opinion or custom likely to be a cause of what we call Eurosclerosis. One symptom of Eurosclerosis has been mentioned several times already today: the incapacity of the governments of the Member States to fulfil this Treaty. But there are others, too, in the activities of associations, entrepreneurs, governments etc. and, for example, in the problem mentioned by Mr Juppé, of whether it is right to make so many entrepreneurial decisions into political or even national decisions. Observations show that the adaptation processes take the longest where the political influence on company decisions is the greatest. Something will have to be done about this as well.

I would like to thank you once more for your cooperation on this subject over the past four years. Together we have created hope for the future again. Without our work in the last four years the prospects we see before us today would not exist.

I would like to renew the call for consistent and sustained efforts aimed at the weakest point in the European decision-making process: the Council of Ministers. I would remind you that every single member of this Council of Ministers belongs to a party which is represented in this House, and that the first move should also be made within the parties.

**President.** — I would like to inform the House that I have received, pursuant to Rule 42(5), the following motions for resolutions, with request for an early vote, to wind up the debate on these Oral Questions:

— by Mr Klepsch and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, by Mr Rogalla, on behalf of the Socialist Group, by Sir Fred Catherwood and others, on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 2-819/84)

— by Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 2-855/84)

— by Mr De Vries and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 2-856/84)

— by Mr de la Malène and Mr Malaud, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance (Doc. 2-857/84).

The vote on these requests will be taken at the end of the debate.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) On a point of order, Mr President, I should like to ask a question which, however, there is no point in asking until I know what your decision is regarding the continuation of this debate.

**President.** — The point of order interfered with the announcement that I was about to make that this debate will be continued tomorrow afternoon after the votes.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Mr President, in that case I should like to ask you as a point of order whether you consider it in keeping with the equality of opportunity in this House to allow a debate which is so important for the internal market to come to an end without at least giving an opportunity to a representative of the largest group in Parliament to speak in the presence of the President-in-Office of the Council and the Commissioner. I do not believe this is usual practice in this House and would therefore urge you to inform the Bureau as soon as possible of my protest and my question, that is unless you now decide that at least one representative of the Socialist Group may speak.

**President.** — Mr Rogalla, I appreciate what you say in this regard, but the House has ordered that questions to the Council start at 6.30 p.m. It is that time now and I am committed to that.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Further to Mr Rogalla's point, we can accept that the debate is going to continue tomorrow because it says so on the agenda, but can we be assured also that the President-in-Office of the Council and Commissioner Narjes will be there to listen to the rest of the debate and to sum it up? We have already made the point that our question is to Council, and it is absurd to have a debate on a question to Council unless the President-in-Office is going to be there to reply to it. Can we have that assurance?

**President.** — I cannot offer any assurance on behalf of either the Commission or Council in this regard — the President-in-Office of the Council has already replied to the question. I know that there were protests as to

**President**

its adequacy, and I note what Mr Rogalla has said and will convey his views to the Bureau, but now I must rule that this debate be adjourned and will be continued tomorrow afternoon after the votes.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

*Vice-President*

8. *Question Time*

**President.** — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 2-790/84).

We begin with the questions to the Council.

Question No 56, by Mr Marshall (H-143/84):

Subject: Court orders

On 17 March 1984 two wards of court, Nicholas and Nazil Yusuf, were abducted from 6a Beatrice Road, London N 4 and taken to Greece. Their father, Mr Dervish Yusuf, has had great difficulty in having court orders executed. Can we have an assurance that the next meeting of the Council of relevant Ministers will discuss the principles involved in this case and ensure that such orders are executed throughout the Community?

**Mr Barry, *President-in-Office of the Council.*** — The matter raised in this question is not within the jurisdiction of the Council.

**Mr Marshall (ED).** — While this particular family has now been reunited, this is part of a much wider problem which one would like to see the Council take on board. The problem is that court orders are unenforceable in other countries, and this has led to an increase in the number of tug-of-love cases where children are snatched, bundled half way across Europe, and the wishes of courts are frustrated. Will the Council do nothing to try to stop children being the victims of individuals who seek to defy the rulings of national courts, and will they realize that we are all part of the same community and that these custody orders ought to be enforceable in more than one Member State?

**Mr Barry.** — The problem of improving administrative cooperation between the central authorities of the Member States appeared on the agenda of the working group on law cooperation which met in Paris in June of this year and will probably again be on the agenda of that group at the meeting scheduled for

next month in Dublin. I am sure that the points raised here by Mr Marshall could be conveyed to that group to see if it would put the matter on its agenda.

**President.** — Question No 57, by Mrs Lemass (H-183/84):

Subject: Drug controls

Does the Council agree that one of the most serious problems facing Ireland and the Community is drug addiction, especially in urban areas, particularly since most drug addicts are under 25 and are unemployed with resultant soaring crime rates and if so what action does the Council intend to take to combat the drug problem?

**Mr Barry, *President-in-Office of the Council.*** — As I said in my written reply to Oral Question No H-147/84 by Mrs Squarcialupi, the Council is perfectly aware of the magnitude of drug-related problems and their consequences. The European Council at Fontainebleau stressed the gravity of this problem. The current Council presidency intends to do everything it can to follow up these conclusions as rapidly and effectively as possible, in particular on the basis of a communication which the Commission has said it intends to submit and on which the European Parliament has been consulted.

**Mrs Lemass (RDE).** — I do not find that answer very satisfactory. Maybe the Council is able to resolve this matter, but the President-in-Office has not given a very good reply in my opinion. This is an extremely serious problem, and I think radical new measures have to be implemented if the problem of drugs in Europe and throughout the world is to be solved.

I wonder if the Council would consider taking a different and radical type of approach. Would it be possible to try to contact the different countries where the raw materials that produce drugs are grown? Would it be possible to try to approach the people who make their living from growing the plants and seeds that constitute the raw materials of drugs? Would it be possible to tackle the problem in that way? In my opinion, most other things have been tried. Yet we still have the problem of our young people dying from drug overdoses. It is a vast problem in my country at the moment and indeed, I believe, throughout Europe.

I would implore the Council to try to find new and radical ways of tackling this appalling drug problem that we have throughout the world and not be paying lip service to it, as I believe it is doing at the moment.

**Mr Barry.** — I am sorry that the honourable Member thinks that only lip service is being paid to this by the Heads of State or Government meeting at Fontainebleau, by the Council of Ministers over which I pre-

**Barry**

side and by the present presidency. I can assure you that that is not so. We are deeply conscious at all levels of the serious damage being done to the health and happiness of many young people and to the happiness of their families. We are also concerned that anything that is within our power to do shall be done.

Not uniquely but unusually, the present presidency has convened a meeting of Ministers for Health precisely on this problem. They will be meeting within the next month to discuss the problem. It has also been discussed a number of times under the heading of political cooperation, and the solutions suggested by the Member who put down the question have, of course, been thought of. However, it must also be very evident to the Member that the countries where the drugs are produced are not under the control of the European Community. It would need the cooperation — sometimes forthcoming, at other times not — of these countries before the drug producers could be put out of business.

I do not think there is much point in Parliament, Commission and Council accusing one another of not responding adequately to this very grave problem. It is in the three institutions' interest to work together and not to accuse one another of dragging their feet or not being concerned about the problem. This is a negative approach that is unworthy of this Parliament and, indeed, is unworthy of any Member of this Parliament. I would hope that in future we could see a positive cooperative approach to this very serious problem that affects not just the Member's country but all the countries of Europe. I would hope that the kind of positive approach indicated by the constructive attitude of the presidency in calling a meeting of Health Ministers to discuss precisely this problem in the next month could be followed through at all levels of the three institutions of this Community.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) I should like to ask the President of the Council whether or not he agrees that it is not very satisfying if the Council uses formulas such as 'the Council will do everything it can' in its answers. However, to go into your positive approach, I should like to ask whether you are aware of the responsibility you bear in view of the fact that the second *ad hoc* committee set up at Fontainebleau, which is to deal with the drug problem, among other things, has not yet met? Can you tell me when this important *ad hoc* committee is to meet or perhaps explain why it has still not met some three months after the decisions were made at Fontainebleau?

**Mr Barry.** — I think that the second committee that has been referred to as having been set up at Fontainebleau will certainly be considering where improvements can be made, because this problem does concern the peoples of Europe. The reason why the committee has not met is that not all the countries had nominated

their member of this committee. The last nomination was received 10 days ago and the committee will be meeting very shortly.

**Mr Marshall (ED).** — Would the President-in-Office of the Council accept that he seems to be long on clichés and short on action?

**Mr Barry.** — To that I would give precisely the same reply as I gave to the first supplementary question. I think that kind of flippant response is unworthy of this Parliament.

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')

**Mr Van Miert (S).** — (NL) On this question of drug trafficking, would the President of the Council urge his colleagues to get together and do something about the abuse of diplomatic bags, since in my own country — to give just one example — various cases have recently come to light in which a member of the Zaire embassy in Luxembourg was smuggling large quantities of drugs by means of the diplomatic bag, and many similar cases are known in other countries. I would have thought that this was a field in which it would indeed be possible to take some joint action. Can the President give me his assurance that some steps will be taken in this respect?

**President.** — This question is closed. There are two speakers who will not be called, i.e. Mr Hutton and Mr Pearce, since a supplementary question has already been put by a member of the British contingent.

**Mr Pearce (ED).** — On a point of order, Mr President, yet again the different occupants of your chair are taking different views about the conduct of Question Time. Yesterday another occupant of your chair took more than one question from a language section of a particular group. It really is impossible for Members to know how to conduct themselves when the attitude of the Chair seems to depend on the whim of the President. May I also say that a question like this seems to affect some sections of the House more particularly than others. In view of the fact that you have only taken three supplementary questions, I really would implore you to let me put the supplementary question which I wish to put. May I put that question, please?

**President.** — Mr Pearce, as you well know, the British have insisted that Question Time should be conducted as far as possible along the lines of the House of Commons and this is what some of us at least try to achieve when we chair Question Time. According to the rules of procedure, the President is responsible for conducting Question Time and he calls Members to speak in

**President**

the order he wishes. If one Member or another has no confidence in the President he can choose not to vote for him when the next President is elected.

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — On a point of order, Mr President, may I suggest for your consideration that it is not irrelevant that the occupancy of this Chamber during Question Time is something over 50% English-speaking on almost every occasion we meet? Perhaps this proportionality might be reflected in any decision that you reach on how many Members are allowed to put supplementary questions.

**President.** — I will give some consideration to this question as you request. This is all I can do, but it will take time and I will not come to any conclusions by the end of this Question Time.

**Mr Van Miert (S).** — (NL) Mr President, I have not received an answer to the supplementary question I put just now since we were interrupted by a discussion of the procedure to be followed in connection with supplementary questions. I had put a supplementary question concerning the use of the diplomatic bag for drug trafficking and have not yet received a reply.

**Mr Barry.** — I share the concern expressed by the honourable Member. Of course, diplomatic bags are the prerogative of the individual government whose diplomats use them, and it would be inappropriate that another government should be allowed to see what was inside them. It is quite obvious why that should not be. At the same time, I share very much his concern and I think it is up to every government that avails of these facilities under the Vienna Convention to ensure that they are not used for any other purpose than that set out in the Vienna Convention. If there is any way of ensuring that governments do not use them for any other purposes, then I should be very happy to cooperate or, indeed, to ask the Council to consider ways of doing that.

**President.** — Question No 58, by Mr Lalor (H-196/84):

Subject: Reclassification of disadvantaged areas

What assurances can the President of the Council give that the Council will reach a decision on the reclassification of Ireland's disadvantaged areas before the end of 1984 bearing in mind that the Council was able to reach a decision rapidly on applications made by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Italy earlier this year under the same scheme, and furthermore, will the President-in-Office of the Council ensure that any submissions from the Irish authorities are sufficiently documented so as to ensure no further unneces-

sary delays to the long-awaited extension of the disadvantaged areas scheme?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — The honourable Member's attention is drawn to the fact that the Council has not to date received proposals from the Commission containing amendments to the Community list of Ireland's disadvantaged agricultural areas. Consequently, the Council is unable to guarantee the honourable Member that a decision on this subject will be taken before the end of 1984. It is the Commission's task to examine the requests made by the Irish authorities. If it decides to submit a proposal as it did in 1983 for the United Kingdom, Italy and the Netherlands, the Council will examine it.

**Mr Lalor (RDE).** — I must say to the President-in-Office of the Council that I was extremely disappointed with his reply. I want to ask him if he is aware that Commissioner Burke told this House yesterday that very little extra information was needed by the Commission to enable it to make a decision. So little, in fact, that, as Commissioner Burke said here in this House, he could have taken it over the telephone.

Could the President-in-Office arrange for his government to supply this extra information which has already been requested by the Commission over a month ago, on 20 September? Then could he, as President-in-Office of the Council, arrange to have the limit raised from 2½% to 4%, as asked for by the Commission 12 months ago, according to Commissioner Burke, to embrace the additional Irish areas seeking severely handicapped status?

Those are very simple additional requests to the President-in-Office of the Council, and I would be extremely grateful if he could be, like Commissioner Burke yesterday, a little more forthcoming in his replies to the supplementaries than in the actual written prepared reply.

**Mr Barry.** — On the first point raised by the honourable Member, namely, that Commissioner Burke said yesterday that it needed very little information, I think he was responding to a question by Mr Clinton, when Mr Clinton asked whether it would take a lot of work to find the sort of information the Commission requires to make a decision. Commissioner Burke replied: 'I think the information sought should not take too much time. In fact, I had hoped it would be available to me at least on the telephone today so as to enable me to answer the question more fully'.

I consider Mr Burke's reply to mean that the amount of information that would be required by the Commission could have been made available to him on the telephone, but he was not referring to the actual work itself. That is the way I understood the reply given by Commissioner Burke.

**Barry**

As regards the second point, I understand that there is a proposal from the Commission to the Council to raise the limit in this regard, and I would be very happy to ask the Council to discuss that at the earliest opportunity, hopefully with the results which the honourable Member, Mr Lalor, requires.

**Mr Taylor (ED).** — Since very often in Question Time the President-in-Office wears his Irish hat, can he tell the House how long his government will take to reply to the request by the Commission? Secondly, if the Council agree to an extension of these areas, has his government decided to fund its share of the extension?

**Mr Barry.** — The original application from the Irish Government was lodged on 2 October. The additional information sought by the Commission was requested last month. I presume it will be made available very shortly.

As regards the second part of the question raised by Mr Taylor, I think it would be inappropriate for me as President-in-Office of the Council to answer on behalf of the Irish Government on this point. I am sure the Member has other methods of obtaining the information he requires.

**Mr Glezos (S).** — (*GR*) I should like to ask a very specific question. Why is it that so far only drug users or pushers who come into contact with them have been arrested, while the organizers behind international drug trafficking have not been arrested?

**President.** — The President of the Council need not answer this question. We have already dealt with the question concerning drugs and are now discussing Question No 58, for which the next speaker I have down is Mr Scott-Hopkins. However, since Mr Taylor has already spoken, I cannot call any more English-speaking Members.

Question No 59, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (H-204/84):

Subject: European integration

Understanding between peoples is essential to genuine, deep-rooted European integration. Consequently, it seems that languages spoken within the EEC ought to be taught from nursery and primary school level.

Is the Council prepared to encourage any proposals for finding a solution and, if so, what support and means might it envisage giving to achieve such an end?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — Since the adoption of an action programme in the field of

education in February 1976, the Council of Ministers for Education, meeting within the Council, have attached particular importance to the teaching of foreign languages. The European Council, in its solemn declaration adopted in Stuttgart in June 1983, reaffirmed the importance of developing language teaching in the encouragement of European cooperation.

By their conclusions adopted on this subject in June 1984, the Council and the Ministers for Education meeting within the Council planned to give a fresh impetus to the teaching of foreign languages and agreed to promote all measures appropriate to this end. In particular they asked the Commission, using the Council of Europe's discussion as a basis, to carry out a study on the teaching of languages at an early age.

As regards the learning of foreign languages by migrant workers' children, the Council and the Ministers for Education meeting within the Council, in the context of conclusions on the education of such children which were adopted at their meeting on 4 June 1984, stated that 'the presence of languages and culture of origin in nursery schools can contribute to the formation of a child's personality and provide a solid foundation for future development. It can also stimulate a mutual understanding of the different cultures. Teaching languages and cultures of origin to primary school children can contribute significantly to the formation of a balanced personality in the child, enriches the acquisition of knowledge and assists in the development of skills'.

**Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (RDE).** — (*FR*) Mr President, I should like to thank you for your reply but at the same time add that I hope the Council of Ministers will promote meetings of the Education Ministers so that they can formulate possible practical solutions to this problem, while of course respecting the various national education systems, since this would make it possible to promote to a greater extent the exchanges of primary and nursery teachers which you mentioned.

Finally, I hope that it will not be too long before the Commission manages to achieve what Switzerland has already achieved.

**Mr Barry.** — I accept, of course, the suggestion in the honourable Member's question. I just want to say that the Council of Education Ministers, when they met in June, adopted some of the suggestions referred to here today. They said — and I quote from their document — 'The Member States agree to promote all appropriate measures to enable the maximum number of pupils to acquire, before the end of their compulsory education, a practical knowledge of two languages in addition to their mother tongue, as well as all measures which are likely to permit the maintenance of levels of knowledge of foreign languages in vocational training, higher education and adult education'.

**Barry**

They then went on to say that a number of practical suggestions had been made in this connection and that the Member States would make every endeavour to encourage the exchange of language assistants and young students of language, who have completed or are about to complete their higher education, between the Member States and the integration of such assistants in their own education system; additionally, where appropriate, to promote direct cooperation between establishments of higher education providing basic training for language teachers and in-service training for language teachers, the aim being to allow language teachers in jobs to refresh periodically their knowledge of a language and of the cultural, social and economic life of the countries of the language.

So, I think that the views of the honourable Member and the views of the Education Ministers are very much in accord. I am sure that they will be as concerned — and indeed they have shown their concern — to promote the learning of additional European languages. The facilities to do that ought to be made available to as wide a group of schoolchildren and young adults as possible.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — (GR) With regard to the problem of the children of migrant workers learning their mother tongue, there are many different solutions adopted in the Community. In Bavaria, for example, there is a more advanced and uncomplicated education system — and I am referring mainly to the Greek community schools. In all the countries the problems are most acute. Would the Minister be kind enough to give us further information to help us make up our minds?

**Mr Barry.** — The question concerns the means of teaching another language to the children of migrant workers. I am not an authority on that.

However, the Council of Ministers for Education is very plainly concerned that that subject should have a very high priority on their agenda and, indeed, on the agendas of many Member States where migrant workers seek employment. It is very clearly their intention that this will be treated as a matter of priority for the educational institutions of the countries where there are migrant workers, because the intention is that the children of those workers should be allowed to enjoy the benefits of a second language and the cultural and social benefits that flow from being fluent in the language of an adopted country.

I am sorry I cannot be more precise on the actual methods being employed. As I say, I am not an authority on this. But it may be possible for me to get further information from the Council which I will then forward to the Member concerned.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — Language teaching in primary schools in Britain is on the decline because the theory

is that children who start at eight years old have no advantage over children who start at 11 years old by the time they get to 16. I think this is wrong, but I think some research is needed and I think the Council should call for a comparative study of the practice in various Member States. They should consider financial assistance for more modern methods of teaching languages, and I should like to know whether the Council would support more finance in the budget for this particular, very important subject of language teaching.

**Mr Barry.** — What the Council did decide was that it was a matter for each Member State to decide how to finance the methods they employed. It encouraged all Member States to ensure that as wide a group of children as possible at the appropriate age level have the facilities for learning a second or, indeed, a third language if that is required. The concern of the Council of Ministers for Education in this regard is very clearly shown in the very full statement they made on this matter in June after their meeting.

**Mr Tomlinson (S).** — Would the President-in-Office address himself to something a little bit wider than just the problems of migrant workers? In relation to the desirability of learning mother-tongue languages, would he possibly address himself on behalf of the Council to the problems of citizens of Community countries who, because of the pattern of migration, are not able to communicate with their families? I am thinking particularly of the need for mother-tongue teaching of Asian children in the United Kingdom and other countries where there are Asian populations.

**Mr Barry.** — My answer was about migrant workers because that was the question I had been asked in the supplementary question. As regards the teaching of, for example, Asian children in the United Kingdom, I think, as I said in my answer to the last supplementary question, that that is a matter for the United Kingdom Government. The Council will of course encourage it to ensure that all migrant children, whether they be Community children or children from outside the Community, should be provided with every facility to learn the language of the country of their adoption.

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC).** — (NL) I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council the following question.

The fact is that the Ministers of Culture at their last meeting issued a very fine-sounding joint declaration, but we know already that it will have no tangible effects in the long run. As I see it, it would be better to propose concrete measures which would be likely to have some real effect. In my view, a possible source of concrete results would be to look into what this European Parliament, for example, has unanimously

**Vandemeulebroucke**

decided as regards concrete measures for children of migrant parents. This question has been the subject of considerable study by bodies including the Council of Europe and the European Parliament unanimously adopted a resolution on this point at the beginning of this year. My question, therefore, concerns whether this matter has already been included on the agenda for the Council of Ministers.

**Mr Barry.** — When I answered the question originally I indicated that the Ministers for Education have all agreed that they will encourage any method that will ensure that the knowledge of second and third languages is as widely available as possible throughout the Community.

**President.** — Question No 60, by Mr Ford (H-212/84):

Subject: Accession of the Spanish colonies of Ceutas and Melilla to the European Community

What has the Spanish position been during the recent negotiations regarding entry to the EEC over the status of their enclaves in Moroccan territory of Ceuta and Melilla over which Morocco claims sovereignty? Can we have comments on the anomaly which exists here between the Spanish views of their own colonies and their claim to Gibraltar?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — The Council is unable to reveal the positions adopted by a delegation during accession negotiations. The Council also stresses that it may not discuss the issues of sovereignty raised by the honourable Member in the second part of his question, since such matters are not within the competence of the Community.

**Mr Ford (S).** — Does the Council not feel that this issue should be raised within Parliament and that we should learn something about the discussions that are taking place, as the accession of such disputed territory to the Community has implications for all Member States as well as for the Community as a whole? Does the Council not feel that urgent discussion should also take place with the Government of Morocco over this issue, particularly in the light of previous Moroccan actions over disputed territory in other Spanish colonies such as the Rio d'Oro or Spanish Sahara and the threat any future unilateral action by Morocco might have with regard to Community relations with the Arab League States should Spain retaliate either through economic or military sanctions and involve the other Member States? The erratic nature of the Moroccan Government only makes this more urgent.

**Mr Barry.** — I do not think that is a matter for the Council. As I said in my reply, it would be inappropriate

for me to reveal any positions adopted in negotiations. The matter referred to by the Member is not a matter for the Council. It is a matter for the Spanish Government.

**Mr Taylor (ED).** — While certainly accepting the President-in-Office's statement that he cannot reveal the position adopted, can he at least confirm that the Council has reached a decision on the question of Spanish sovereignty over these two areas on the Moroccan coast? I am not asking what the decision is. I am just asking for confirmation that the Council has reached a decision.

Secondly, should Spain accede to the Community, will the people of these two areas on the Moroccan coast have votes in European elections?

**Mr Barry.** — No, I cannot reveal the position the Council has adopted about these two areas. As I said, the negotiations are still under way and until they are completed it would be inappropriate to say what has been agreed between the Council and the African countries.

**Mr Van Miert (S).** — (NL) Can the President confirm that these two areas will form part of the Customs Union?

**Mr Barry.** — I have to give the same reply as I gave to the original question and the supplementary questions. These are matters which cannot be revealed while the negotiations are taking place.

**President.** — Since its author is absent, Question No 61 will receive a written reply.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 62, by Mr Selva (H-226/84):

Subject: Equivalence of university diplomas

In the conclusions it issued at its meeting in Fontainebleau, the European Council called on the Council to examine the measures which could be taken before the end of the first half of 1985 to set a 'general system for ensuring the equivalence of university diplomas, in order to bring about the effective freedom of establishment within the Community'.

What steps has the Council taken to date to carry out this task?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — The situation at present is that virtually all industrial, commercial and agricultural activities have been liberalized

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Barry**

through the adoption of about 50 directives. In the field of liberal professions, freedom of establishment exists for medical doctors, dentists, veterinary surgeons and midwives. Since the declarations of Fontainebleau, substantial progress has been made on a Commission proposal on freedom of establishment in the field of pharmacy. The Council had a first exchange of views on 9 October 1984 at the Internal Market Council in Luxembourg.

**Mr Selva (PPE).** — (IT) Mr President, I should like to put two supplementary questions. Can the President tell us precisely when and in what other areas the equivalence of university diplomas will be introduced, since this strikes me as the best possible way of bringing about an effective right of establishment in the Community and opening up new scope for work within the Community and hence combating unemployment among young people.

When, furthermore — and I am returning here to a point already made by another Member — are you planning to hold a meeting of the Council of Education Ministers in view of the fact that the Fontainebleau declaration mentions appropriate measures which will permit an overall system of mutual recognition of diplomas to be introduced by the first half of 1985?

**Mr Barry.** — I think that matters such as that referred to by the honourable Member would require an awful lot of thought and study. As I said, activities have been liberalized through the adoption of 50 directives in the field of the liberal professions. Freedom of establishment exists for medical doctors, dentists, veterinary surgeons and midwives: this is a reasonably broad but not a full list of the professions that have been liberalized. As I said, in the field of pharmacy the Council had the first exchange of views earlier this month.

Of course there are other fields such as engineering or architecture which also must be studied to try to get a uniform system of education and a uniform system of degree recognition. After that will come the question of students' ability to move from country to country to find employment. That, I think, may be still some way ahead. I think that if you examine even your nearest neighbouring country, you will see the differences in training and education. Then the quality of degrees awarded by the various universities in the various countries must also be examined to try to get some uniformity into that.

I hope that it will move very fast. As I said, there is hope that something can be done in a number of fields in the first half of 1985. After Fontainebleau the Council of Ministers of Education did meet in June of this year, and I hope that another meeting will take place as soon as there is sufficient work for them to engage themselves upon.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED).** — Would the President-in-Office not agree that one of the basic tenets of the Treaty of Rome is the free movement of persons? Surely he is not going to say that we shall have it dragging on much longer until the various professional qualifications can be accepted across our borders. In many of the countries of Europe, in France, Germany and Italy, they do accept each other's qualifications. It is only the new entrants that are having the real problems. Will he really do something to move it along much quicker than the sort of timetable that he is talking about? Will he really get on with this before his presidency finishes?

**Mr Barry.** — I would be very anxious to get on with this as quickly as the Member suggests, but it is not I who am making these difficulties. The difficulties are there and they are very real difficulties for the professional bodies concerned. I think that the Council's job, at any level it operates at, is to try to remove the fears some Member States may have and also to get a uniform system that can be accepted in all of the 10 Member States and not just in some of them, whether it be in five or six countries or perhaps only two countries. I would be as anxious to move as quickly as the Member wishes, but I think that some of these professional bodies consider the problems to be real, whatever we may think of them as laymen.

**President.** — Since its author is absent, Question No 63 will receive a written reply.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 64 by Mr Hutton (H-115/84):

Subject: *Ad hoc* Committee on Citizens' Europe

In how many Member States will the European passport in fact be available on 1 January 1985, as desired by the European Council at Fontainebleau; will the *ad hoc* committee base itself on existing resolutions of Parliament on matters relating to a citizens' Europe, and will the Council consult the European Parliament on all matters within the ambit of the *ad hoc* committee on which the European Parliament has not adopted a position?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — According to the information supplied by them, five Member States of the European Communities will issue the uniform passport as from 1 January 1985. The setting up of the *ad hoc* Committee on a Citizens' Europe arises from the conclusions of the European Council meeting in Fontainebleau. The Council as such is not participating in the committee, but I shall be happy to bring the second part of the Member's question to the attention of the committee.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Mr Hutton (ED).** — Would the President-in-Office of the Council confirm that it was three-and-a-half years ago, in March 1981, that the Council agreed on the principle of a uniform style of European passport? Would he in his presidency now make an all-out effort to have the new-style passport available in *all* Member States on 1 January 1985, since this is not a political but a bureaucratic matter?

**Mr Barry.** — I would be very happy to adopt that suggestion. There are five countries, as I said in my original reply, that are going to issue the passport as from 1 January 1985 — Italy, Denmark, France, Ireland and Luxembourg. I would be happy to convey to the other five countries the request made here by the Member who asked the supplementary question.

**Mr Pearce (ED).** — Will the President-in-Office agree that the *ad hoc* Committee on a Citizens' Europe, which is the subject of this question, would get further if it addressed itself to problems that affect ordinary citizens like the taking of drugs in the present situation, and can I take it that his announcement earlier about calling a meeting of Health Ministers amounts to a major new Community onslaught on this problem that should be advertised and stated in a rather more bold and forthright manner than that in which the Minister replied to the previous question?

**Mr Barry.** — I accept, of course, what the Member says, and perhaps we are being unduly modest in the way in which we are putting over this matter. But I am sure that the results and the conclusions of that Council will be adequately publicized, and I hope they will have the effect which the honourable Member wishes and will bring home to the public the major onslaught that has been made by the Council on this very serious problem.

As regards the *ad hoc* committee set up by the Fontainebleau Summit, one of the problems that will be considered by that committee is, in fact, drugs and the abuse of drugs; that is one part of the terms of reference under which they have been set up.

**Mr Van Miert (S).** — (NL) Since Belgium is not one of the five countries which intends to introduce this passport on 1 January next year, can the President tell me in the meantime when it is likely to do so? Has the Minister of Internal Affairs informed him when his government intends to introduce this passport?

**Mr Barry.** — I understand the Belgian Government is making every effort to produce the standard passport around the scheduled date of 1 January 1985. Technical difficulties may delay this somewhat — I think only for a very short period of time — but they may not make the date of 1 January.

**President.** — Since its author is absent, Question No 65 will receive a written reply.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 66, by Mr Newton Dunn (H-253/84):

Subject: Majority voting at the Transport Council

At the meeting of 24 September 1984 of the European Parliament's Committee on Transport, the President-in-Office of the Council said: 'If majority voting is the way to achieve progress, the Irish presidency will not hesitate to use majority votes'.

Will the Council presidency reconfirm that this will be their policy at the imminent December meeting of the Transport Council?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — In the interests of making progress in the development of the common transport policy, the presidency confirms that it does not at this stage rule out any option, including, where appropriate, the use of majority voting.

**Mr Newton Dunn (ED).** — Mr President, will you confirm that that policy will not only apply to the Transport Council but to all other Councils meeting under the Irish presidency?

**Mr Barry.** — I have no hesitation at all in confirming that.

**Mrs Piermont (ARC).** — (DE) My microphone was not working. I am the author of Question No 63 and I wonder why it was simply passed over and we are suddenly dealing with Question No 66.

**President.** — Mrs Piermont was not present when we came to Question No 63, and if the author of a question is absent we must move on to the next question.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) With regard to the question by Mrs Piermont, I should like to say how very right you are in saying that when a Member is absent his question is passed over, but there is the precedent that this rule is being applied by the Chair with some leniency during this part-session since there are many new Members present.

Therefore, since we are progressing well under your good chairmanship, I should like to ask you if we can deal with Mrs Piermont's Question No 63.

**President.** — Normally — and I would also point this out for Mrs Piermont's benefit — the question is answered in writing if the Member is not present. Mrs

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**President**

Piermont will therefore receive a written reply from the President-in-Office of the Council. I hope this is to your satisfaction, Mr Alavanos.

**Mr Hutton (ED).** — The European Council at Stuttgart made it clear that the use of abstentions would be favoured when majority voting was required. Would the presidency confirm that it would encourage that practice also in the Councils under its control?

**Mr Barry.** — This is something that the Fontainebleau Council said they would favour though it has not been examined in depth yet. The Council has taken no decision on it, but it has done so on the matter of majority voting. We are concerned at the moment, as I have said a number of times, at the lack of progress because Councils cannot seem to bring themselves to make decisions and are thus inhibiting the forward movement of the Community. Any method we can find whereby we can get the Council to start the Community moving forward again, we will adopt.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — (GR) I am wondering if I have understood correctly. If not, I would ask you to excuse me. But the way in which the answer is worded gives the impression that the President-in-Office is deciding on his own about a solution to one of the problems about which we are strongly divided: the question of majority or unanimity. It appears from his answer that the President-in-Office considers that the Irish Presidency will not hesitate to use the majority system. Are there no limits? Everyone knows that there is no agreement on this. Either I have not understood or there is an unclear point which will have to be explained.

**Mr Barry.** — Obviously, the presidency could not decide to do that unilaterally. It could only use majority voting where it was appropriate and where it is laid down in the rules that it can be done. We could not do it unilaterally, just because we decided to do it.

**President.** — Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 67 and 68 will receive written replies.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 69, by Mr Chambeiron (H-265/84):

Subject: Anticipation of Tokyo Round tariff reductions

On 19 December 1984, the Council decided in principle to bring forward a series of tariff reductions agreed during the Tokyo Round to 1 January 1985 (instead of 1 January 1986). The implementation of this decision, which has not yet been confirmed, would mean a loss in customs revenue

of about 185 million ECU for the budget year 1985.

Does the Council not think it advisable to decide against confirming this decision, at a time when it appears that 1985 budget funds will be quite inadequate to meet requirements?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — When taking its decision on 19 December 1983, the Council was fully aware of the budgetary implications. It considered, however, that in this particular case the budgetary aspects could not play a decisive role, since this measure needed to be seen as one of a range of measures intended to encourage worldwide free trade and combat protectionist tendencies in accordance with the conclusions of the Williamsburg Economic Summit.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — (FR) Mr President, I must say the answer given by the President-in-Office of the Council would have left me dumbfounded if I had not become inured to this sort of thing during my long parliamentary experience. However, I still think it is incredible that the President of the Council should give an answer of this kind when we are in the process of discussing how we will manage to finance the budgets for both 1984 and 1985.

We are told that we are doing without budgetary revenue in the interests of worldwide free trade. But Europe is not just free trade. If I have understood the President of the Council correctly, what he is proposing is not Europe but a sort of ever-open door for free trade. I shall take due note of this answer but I am certain it will not satisfy those of us who expected something different.

**Mr Barry.** — I understand the reason that prompts the comment. However, I must say that the decision taken on 23 December had a number of conditions attached to it. One of the conditions was that most of the Community's trading partners must decide to speed up tariff cuts — for instance, the EFTA and Japan. The US will not be able to do so in the absence of necessary legislation. EFTA and Japan took the decision to cut the tariffs on condition that the other major trading blocs do the same. The United States have not done so yet because they will not be able to introduce the necessary legislation until early next year.

Under those conditions, the Council reluctantly decided yesterday that the tariff reductions due to be made on 1 January 1986 should be advanced to 1 July 1985 on the understanding that the major trading partners, including the United States, took similar action according to the agreement reached in the OECD. In the meantime reductions due on 1 January 1986 should be advanced to 1 January 1985 for certain products of particular interest to developing countries.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Barry**

I understand the concern that prompted the comment, as I said, but I think that part of the motivation for this Community is the encouragement of free trade throughout the world. Even though we may have temporary budgetary difficulties ourselves, the Council considers that it is in the interests not just of this trading bloc but indeed of the whole world that we should at every opportunity accelerate the removal of tariffs and impediments to the freer movement of goods throughout the world in general and not just in the Community. While recognizing that the budgetary problems would cause some confusion, it was still determined that in the interests of world trade the Council should go ahead with this cut made in the decision in December and again yesterday.

**President.** — Question No 70, by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (H-270/84)

Subject: Quotas on the level of domestic dairy production

What steps has the Council of Agricultural Ministers taken to ensure that each Member State fulfils its obligation to enforce quotas on the level of its domestic dairy production? What action does it intend to take against the governments of member countries such as France, who are not fulfilling their obligations in this matter?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council.** — The Council is very interested in how implementation of the dairy quota system is progressing, it being understood that, as the honourable Member knows, it is primarily the Commission's job to ensure that Community legislation is implemented. At its meetings of 17 and 18 September and 22 and 23 October 1984 the Council held an initial review on the basis of a Commission report on the operations of the abovementioned arrangements six months after their introduction. During this review the Commission representative stressed that each Member State was required to administer the system according to the legislation in force and should ensure that it was implemented on schedule. It was stated that the Commission was prepared to examine the various problems being encountered by the Member States in implementing these rules. Acting within its powers and in accordance with the management committee procedure, the Commission adopted a regulation amending, in view of the problem which had arisen in the Member States regarding implementation of the quota system, the Commission implementing regulation, Regulation 1371/84, by providing for a 50% reduction in the advances which were to be collected on 15 November 1984 for all Member States except Italy and Greece and authorizing Member States to postpone by one month the collection of advances due by producers who have applied for an extra quota for specific reasons and whose applications have not yet been examined by the competent authorities.

In addition, with regard to the requests put by various delegations to the Council bodies with regard to the adjustment of the regulations adopted by the Council, the Commission has, for the time being and bearing in mind the fact that in a number of Member States implementation of the new arrangements is still in its initial stages, not proposed any amendment to the rules adopted by the Council on 31 March 1984.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED).** — Does the President-in-Office accept that what he has just told us is, as far as I am concerned, news, i.e. that the Commission is recommending a 50% cut and also postponing by one month? Does he not realize, however, that there has been a great deal of hardship for an awful lot of farmers in my country — not in his, of course, as they have done exactly the opposite — who had to reduce their herds and are now finding that things are not going as they were originally told they would?

Will he accept that it is the Council that has really got to take the responsibility for this by making certain that those rules that they made are actually followed fairly by everybody throughout the Community? Will he accept that there is a growing feeling in my country that it is grossly unfair the way that these quota regulations are being applied throughout the Community?

**Mr Barry.** — I think that in many countries, not just in the honourable Member's country, many of the farmers and the farming bodies would say that the regulations themselves are unfair in that they prevent farmers producing up to their maximum capability. Indeed, it is one of the long arguments that was used during the whole debate on this matter over last winter. The position in different countries is such that it is difficult to make fair comparisons between them. I do accept, of course, the point he made, and the purport of it was that the Community was producing more milk and butter than it could consume or indeed export and that too much was going into intervention. It was for that reason that the Council decided that there should be rules brought in to try to curb the production of these products.

To repeat my earlier reply, which perhaps the honourable Member did not fully catch, acting within its powers and in accordance with the management committee procedures, the Commission adopted on 16 October 1984 a regulation amending, in view of the problems which had arisen in the Member States regarding the implementation of the quota system, the Commission implementing regulation, (EEC) No 1371/84, by providing for a 50% reduction in the advances which were to be collected on 15 November 1984 — that is slightly different to what the Member said — and authorizing Member States to postpone by one month the collection of advances due by producers who have applied for the extra quota for specific reasons and whose applications have not yet been examined by the competent authorities.

**Barry**

In the case of new regulations of such a dramatic nature as were introduced in the dairy sector of the Community's farming industry this year, I think there is a certain amount of teething troubles before they are actually uniformly in place in all member countries. I believe it is true to say that, in fact, they are having the effect of cutting back production in most, if not all, Member States. I share the Member's concern for the individual farmers in individual countries who are affected by this measure. They are not, as he says, just confined to his own country. They are also to be found in my country. The Council felt that it was necessary that something should be done to ensure that we did not go on producing these large quantities of milk and butter which we had neither the ability to consume nor the ability to export.

**Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED).** — Is the President-in-Office aware that many British farmers suspect that little or nothing has been done to implement quotas, particularly in France, and will the President-in-Office confirm that the Community does ultimately have very powerful sanctions available to it in the possible withholding of agricultural subsidies? Will he confirm that if any country does not, in fact, prove at the end of the year that it is willing to impose these quotas, those sanctions will be used?

**Mr Barry.** — If the rules are not being obeyed, then that fact will be very quickly brought to the attention of the Commission, whose responsibility it is to implement them. It will ensure that they are implemented or otherwise take the appropriate action.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) If we continue, I should simply like to draw attention to the fact that we must keep the remaining half hour for the questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

**President.** — Yes, and if you let us we can get on with it.

At the author's request, Question No 71 is postponed until a subsequent Question Time.

We continue with the questions to the Foreign Ministers.

Question No 72, by Mr Marshall (H-142/84):

Subject: Aryeh Tukachinsky

Mr Aryeh Tukachinsky is one of the many Russian Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel. His wife has been allowed to emigrate and their daughter was born there. Can we have an assurance that the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation will discuss this tragic case and bring pressure to bear on the Russians?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — As has previously been indicated, the problem of the reunification of families is one in which the Ten take a continual interest within the framework of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

In following the development of the situation in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, they will bear in mind the case mentioned by the honourable parliamentarian.

**Mr Marshall (ED).** — In view of a past supplementary, can I welcome that particular answer? Since Mrs Tukachinsky emigrated from Russia, one of her children has died. What sort of regime is it which prevents a husband from comforting his wife at such a moment, stops a daughter getting to know her father and separates husbands from wives?

It is clear that the only hope for those two who want to leave the Soviet Union is pressure from the West. I wish the President-in-Office all good fortune in whatever pressure he seeks to bring to bear on the inhumane regime in Russia, which seeks to restrict exit visas and divide families.

**Mr Barry.** — I take the points made by the honourable Member. The Council acting in political cooperation is very concerned about matters such as this. But I think it feels that it is more appropriate to pursue them on a global basis acting as the Political Cooperation Council. Of course, that is not to prevent any individual State taking up any individual case with the countries concerned.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) I understand the President-in-Office's interest in human rights, but unfortunately it does not extend to the Member States of the EEC. I should like to ask him the following question relating to his reply to Mr Marshall's question, a reply which I felt was somewhat vague.

How is the authority of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to be protected from certain questions or allegations, like that by Mr Marshall, which may be irresponsible or false? I say this bearing in mind the well-known case of the Soviet journalist from *Literaturnaya Gazeta* who was shown in the United Kingdom as a dissident and two months later in a press interview in Moscow alleged that he had been kidnapped by the British secret service.

**Mr Barry.** — I am not familiar with the details of the case mentioned by the honourable Member who originally put down the question. I would therefore not be free to comment on the supplementary questions just asked. There are cases where families have been broken up, and we are concerned in political cooperation about these cases. We would wish to see the Hel-

**Barry**

sinki Act being honoured in practice as well as in rhetoric.

**President.** — Question No 73, by Mr Wurtz (H-189/84):

Subject: The human rights situation in Turkey

Since the Turkish elections, the continued use of torture has been attested by a number of international organizations such as Amnesty International in its report on torture and by Pax Christi in its latest report to the UN Human Rights Commission.

The DISK trials which began over 30 months ago are still in progress, sentences have been passed on members of peace movements and 57 intellectuals have recently been charged as a result of signing the appeal launched in March 1984 by Turkish intellectuals, artists and well-known figures and called 'Observations and wishes concerning the democratic regime in Turkey'.

Do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation not feel the time has come for the EEC to repudiate such violations of human rights and to reaffirm that the continuation of such acts is incompatible with the resumption of the association between the two parties?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — The Ten share the honourable Member's concern over the human rights situation in Turkey, about which they have on several occasions expressed their concern. The Ten regret the continued imprisonment and trial of the peace committee and the disciplinary proceedings against 56 Turkish intellectuals.

The Ten will continue to follow closely the evolution of the situation with regard to human rights in Turkey. While they note there have been signs of some positive developments in the direction of more democratic conditions, they expect this government to move towards restoring respect for basic human rights and freedoms in that country.

**Mr Wurtz (COM).** — (FR) Mr President, following closely is one thing, repudiation is another. Furthermore, you are asked to comment on the appropriateness of resuming the association with Turkey or freezing such relations.

I do not think, therefore, that you have replied to my question. What I would like is a precise answer, particularly since, as you know, the life of a certain man is in danger at this very moment and the fact that this is in Turkey is no reason for the Community to ignore it. I should therefore be grateful if you could give me a precise answer to my twofold question.

**Mr Barry.** — I cannot really add to what I said in my original reply. The Ten are concerned. They keep in very close touch with what is going on in Turkey. They have noted some positive developments that have taken place and they will be concerned to see that the present elected government moves quickly towards restoring respect for human rights and freedoms in that country. At this stage they are not prepared to go any further in establishing further contacts with the Turkish Government. That is as far as I can go on this matter tonight.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) The President's answer really surprises me, especially in connection with his answer to the previous question, and I should like to repeat the last and fundamental point of Mr Wurtz's question, which concerns the resumption of the association between the two parties. I should specifically like to ask the President-in-Office why budget item 9632 covering special aid to Turkey has been raised for 1985 from 5 million to 6 626 000 ECU.

I should also like to ask the President-in-Office whether, when he talks about probable positive developments regarding Turkey, he means among other things the sale to Turkey of the airbus, which, as today's *Financial Times* states, will be used as part of an attempt by Turkey to deblock the financial protocol, mainly by exploiting the position of West Germany in the EEC.

**Mr Barry.** — All aid to Turkey has been blocked since the Third Protocol ran out in 1981. I think that answers the question.

**Mr Taylor (ED).** — Is the President-in-Office aware that the Turkish people enjoy greater human rights than the Turkish minority who live in Western Thrace in Greece? Is he aware that many Members of the House are delighted at the decision by Turkey to give preference to the European airbus rather than to the American Boeing airplane, that we welcome this decision by Turkey to move closer towards Europe rather than be solely reliant on the USA and that we look forward to the reopening of the Association Agreement and the Financial Protocol with Turkey?

**Mr Barry.** — Under my political cooperation hat, I do not think it is appropriate to answer that question. It would be more appropriate to answer as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. I have nothing to add to my reply of a minute ago.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) I should like to raise both a personal and a procedural point. Since the last speaker gave an interpretation of what I said which was incorrect, and so that the wrong impression is not given, I should like to repeat that my own concern and

**Alavanos**

the concern of all Communists and of all progressive people in Europe is not whether the airbus or the Boeing has been sold but whether the sale of the airbus will be used as an excuse for the European Community to give even more backing to the Turkish junta and to the cruel oppression, persecution and criminal acts being carried out against the Turkish people.

**President.** — Mr Alavanos, I do not see that this has anything to do with the Rules of Procedure, nor will I ask the President of the Council to answer this question.

Question No 74, by Mr Kyrkos (H-206/84):

Subject: Statements by the US Department of Defense

How do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to respond to the US Department of Defense reserving to the President of the USA the right to make the first nuclear strike in Europe without even the approval of Congress, in view of the fact that this statement is clearly exacerbating the dangers threatening to turn Europe into a nuclear war theatre contrary to the wishes of its inhabitants?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — Defence matters are not discussed within European political cooperation.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — (*GR*) One moment we say that defence matters are discussed and the next moment we say that they are not discussed. In putting my question I gave an opportunity to the Foreign Ministers to deal with a matter which has aroused concern both in America and in Europe. It is not a defence matter in the military sense but a matter of the widest political interest.

So either they are disregarding a question by a representative of the European Parliament or they are refusing to deal at all with a matter which actually concerns the future of Europe. The question is extremely important and I would ask the President-in-Office to give me a specific answer. I tabled my question a month and a half ago and I have still not received an answer.

**Mr Barry.** — I cannot answer the honourable Member's question because it is clearly a defence matter and defence matters are not discussed in European political cooperation.

**Mr Blumenfeld (PPE).** — (*DE*) Mr President, even though from the point of view of the rules of procedure, I cannot go along with your answer and attitude, I should nevertheless like to ask you to consider

recommending the questioner to look properly into the facts of the matter before putting a question rather than indulging in propaganda of this kind.

**Mr Barry.** — I have nothing to say on that.

**Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED).** — Would the President-in-Office not agree that it would be a very good thing if he could give us an answer to the questions we are asking him on defence?

**Mr Barry.** — I can only answer here as President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, and only questions that relate to that are suitable for me to answer. I cannot answer any other questions. That is quite obvious.

**President.** — Question No 75, by Mr Chambeiron (H-209/84):

Subject: Use of atomic weapons during the Falklands War

It was recently reported in the British press that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom considered using atomic weapons against Argentinian territory during the Falklands War.

In so far as these reports are true, were the governments of Community Member States that supported British policy in the South Atlantic and joined the embargo against Argentina given prior notice of the Prime Minister's intention, which would have had catastrophic consequences for world peace and for the whole of humanity if it had been carried out?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — These press reports, which have been categorically denied by the United Kingdom, have not been discussed in European political cooperation.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — (*FR*) I am grateful to the President-in-Office of the Council for telling us that these rumours have been denied since, I admit, I had not heard anything of these denials. I think, furthermore, that it will be a relief to the public at international level to hear that the idea of using atomic weapons, which allegedly came from a Head of State, was merely a rumour. This is all the more important at this time when, as we know, the public are very much aware of the dangers of nuclear weapons and is preparing to make this known by means of demonstrations to be held during the UN week.

**Mr Barry.** — I can only repeat what I said earlier on, that these press reports have not been discussed in European political cooperation.

**Mr Marshall (ED).** — Can I thank the President-in-Office for that particular answer, and can I urge him never to discuss matters like this based on inaccurate stories in irresponsible British newspapers?

**Mr Barry.** — Naturally the Council Ministers only discuss things about which they have adequate knowledge, and we would certainly ensure that anything that was long on clichés would not be discussed.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Since a number of EEC States did actually in unguarded moments support the mistaken policies of the United Kingdom Government over the Falklands, is it not in fact part of the Minister's remit to give a full answer on this?

The United Kingdom Government has a sad record of evasion over the actions in the Falklands. For example, the British Minister for Defence at first denied that the *Belgrano* was actually steaming away from the exclusion zone. Then, following persistent questioning in the House of Commons, a great deal of additional information was brought out. In fact, the United Kingdom Government has neither confirmed nor denied the story that nuclear depth charges were loaded on board the HMS Sheffield.

In the light of all these facts, would it not be highly irresponsible of the United Kingdom Government to have anything at all to do with nuclear weapons in grave situations such as these? Can the President-in-Office comment on the possibility of making representations to the United Kingdom Government so that such circumstances never arise again?

**Mr Barry.** — As I have said a number of times, these press reports, which have been denied by the United Kingdom, have not been discussed in political cooperation and I can confirm to the questioner that the Falklands are not under discussion at the moment in European political cooperation.

**Mr Maher (L).** — Does the President-in-Office not agree that the suggested use of atomic weapons in the Falklands War is completely irrelevant, because the facts are that they were not used? Would he not agree also that there was enough death and destruction by the use of conventional weapons without any use of atomic weapons, and that that is something that he ought to deplore?

**Mr Barry.** — I do not think it would be appropriate at this stage in Question Time to go into the pros and cons and the rights and wrongs of the conflict that took place in the South Atlantic 2 ½ years ago. I certainly do not propose to do so on this occasion tonight.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — (GR) A moment ago I asked to speak on an important point of order. I do not wish to interrupt the debate now, but I would ask you to allow me to speak before you close today's sitting.

**President.** — Thank you, I shall take due note of this point.

Since its author is absent, Question No 76 will receive a written reply.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 77, by Mr Alavanos (H-221/84):

Subject: Chemical weapons

There is serious concern at the continued development and storage of chemical weapons a large number of which are being stored in member countries of the Community (4 000 tonnes in the Federal Republic of Germany) whose use in the event of armed conflict, according to press reports, would lead to the death of 40 million people. Moreover, in peace time the transport and storage of these weapons can involve numerous dangers as a result of escaping toxic gases.

What measures do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to take to ban the development, production and storage of chemical weapons and destroy those in existence?

**Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — The specific question of the storage of chemical weapons in Member States of the Community is a defence matter and as such lies outside the scope of European political cooperation. The statement delivered on behalf of the Ten at the plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly on 25 September 1984 recalled in the following terms the considerable importance which the Ten attach to the conclusion of the Convention to outlaw chemical weapons. 'We attach particular importance to the successful conclusion of negotiations taking place at the conference on a convention to prohibit chemical weapons. Member States of the European Community have contributed actively to this work. In this connection we welcome positive developments which have taken place this year. The United States has tabled a draft convention to outlaw these weapons and the Soviet Union has accepted the principle of on-site inspection of destruction of stocks of chemical weapons. Although important differences remain to be resolved, the Ten hope that it will be possible to move towards a conclusion at an early date of the convention to eliminate chemical weapons.'

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) I should like the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers to reply

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Alavanos**

to a supplementary question, and I would ask him to pay more attention, since a moment ago a 'question-statement' was made by a Member who maintained that the Turkish people have more rights than those enjoyed by the Muslim minority in Western Thrace. I think that the President-in-Office should have been particularly categorical on such matters and should have given precise supplementary replies. Apart from this, I should like to say that besides the question of defence, on which the President-in-Office made a number of interesting points, there is a specific urgent matter not only of environmental protection but even of our very survival. So I ask you what will become of the weapons stored in West Germany which are threatening and may wipe out whole populations in Western Europe.

**Mr Barry.** — As far as I understand the Member's question, the Ten consider it a matter of the highest priority to reach agreement as soon as possible on a total ban on chemical weapons, including effective and reliable arrangements to guarantee strategic plans. I think that all 10 Member States would be concerned to see that their use is banned all over the world and that present stocks are eliminated. Parliament will recall, I am sure, that when it was alleged that they were used in the Iran-Iraq War some months ago, the Ten issued a very strong statement at that time and made a very definite proposal as to how they would contribute to ensure that such weapons would not be available to the combatants in that war.

**Mr Hutton (ED).** — Would the President-in-Office confirm to the House that chemical weapons are not manufactured in any of the 10 Member States of the European Community? Would he further confirm to the House that the territory of the Ten is under the gravest threat from a stock of in excess of half a million tonnes of chemical weapons held by the Warsaw Pact?

**Mr Barry.** — This is something that was not discussed in European political cooperation, because, again, this is a defence matter which European political cooperation does not discuss.

**President.** — Since their authors are not present, Questions Nos 78, 79, 80, 81 and 82 will receive written replies.<sup>1</sup>

Question Time is closed.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — (GR) Mr President, in a supplementary question which he put to the President-in-Office, Mr Taylor maintained that in Turkey there is far less oppression than that suffered by the Muslim minority in Thrace. This is an incredibly irresponsible and misleading statement, and it is strange that the President-in-Office did not wish to comment on it.

I should simply like to say, so that it is recorded in the Minutes, that, whereas the Treaty of Lausanne states that there was a flourishing Greek community of 200 000 in Turkey, there are now only 8 000 Greeks there, Mr Taylor, whereas the Muslim minority, which numbered 140 000, continues to grow without the cruel oppression of which you spoke. I repeat that this is an incredibly irresponsible and misleading statement and it should not have been made in this House.

**Mr Hutton (ED).** — Mr President, on a point of order, would you confirm to the House that there are no proposals to hold a Question Time with questions to either the Commission or the Council in the November part-session of this Parliament? If that is so, may I say that I regard that as a serious omission from the agenda, since this is one of the very few opportunities when Members have the chance to press points on both the Commission and the Council.

**Mr Taylor (ED).** — Since my name has been mentioned by a previous speaker, I think it ought to be placed on record that he did not mention one human right which the Muslim minority have in Greece and which the people of Turkey do not have. In fact, I can name many human rights which the people of Turkey have but which the Muslims in Western Thrace are denied by the present Greek Government.

**President.** — It is true that the enlarged Bureau does not plan to hold a Question Time at the November part-session. However, this obviously depends on the agenda ultimately adopted by this Parliament.<sup>2</sup>

*(The sitting was closed at 8 p.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

<sup>2</sup> Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

## ANNEX

I. *Questions to the Commission**Question No 22, by Mrs Quin (H-148/84)*

Subject: Agriculture and the environment

What new proposals does the Commission intend to make in order to ensure that the rural environment is not further damaged by over-intensive forms of agriculture and forestry within the EEC?

*Answer*

Apart from certain very specific cases, the socio-structural policy of the Community has never favoured highly intensive agriculture and therefore this policy has been beneficial to the environment. In its proposal for improving the efficiency of agricultural structures<sup>1</sup> Article 3(1) provides specifically for aids for investments in measures to protect and improve the environment. In the third action programme of the European Communities on the environment,<sup>2</sup> in a great many specific measures applied in different regions of the Community there is a specific clause obliging Member States to ensure that the proposed measures are compatible with protection of the environment.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 24, by Mrs Schleicher (H-191/84)*

Subject: Risk of cancer at the workplace

In 1981, a long-term study by the German Society for Promotion of Research predicted that the occupational risk of cancer would recede in the long run on account of increasingly stringent provisions governing safety at the workplace. On the other hand, the report by the Federal Government on occupational diseases for 1983 notes an increase in certain occupational illnesses which are associated with contact with dangerous substances at the workplace.

Does the Commission have any information available showing the evolution of occupational cancers in the countries of the European Community during the last five years?

*Answer*

A study being prepared for the Commission by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (WHO) shows that there are considerable differences between the Member States in the frequency of cancer in the various organs or sites of the body. Mortality from some cancers is increasing, for others it is falling or stable.

On the specific matter of occupational cancer, the Commission is currently working on the compilation of an inventory of cancer registers at local, regional and national level in order to assess the comparability of the data and to ensure better coordination at Community level, as foreseen by the Council resolution of 27 February 1984 on a second programme of action of the European Communities on safety and health at work (OJ C 67, 8. 3. 1984).

In addition, Council Directive 83/477/EEC on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to asbestos at work (OJ L 263, 24. 9. 1983) requires Member States to

<sup>1</sup> COM(83) 559 final, 10. 10. 1983.

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 46, 17 February 1983, pp. 1 to 17.

keep a register of cases of mesothelioma, which is a particular type of occupational cancer caused by asbestos. Member States are to comply with this directive before 1 January 1987.

Furthermore, the Commission has recently submitted to Council a proposal for a directive on the protection of workers by the proscription of specified agents and/or work activities. This proposal covers three agents all of which are considered carcinogenic.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 25, by Mr Croux (H-208/84)*

Subject: Implementation of the Esprit programme

What is the current state of implementation of this programme: is it progressing normally or is the Commission encountering problems with regard to certain Member States or other bodies and is the Commission already able to say at this stage whether the implementation of the programme is meeting its expectations and objectives?

*Answer*

The Esprit programme is proceeding quite smoothly and according to schedule. Closing date for proposals was 7 May 1984. More than 400 proposals were evaluated during May and June.

The Esprit Advisory Board and the Esprit Management Committee were consulted during June and July. As a result of this evaluation and consulting process, about 110 projects can either be started or be continued in 1984.

The contracts are now being finalized. The actual schedule foresees all contracts to be signed soon.

Although there were no major problems concerning the proper execution of the programme, it is quite natural that the large number of applicants rejected leads to some complaints from individual companies. So far we have observed no major objections by individual Member States regarding the execution of the programme or problems that could not be settled.

Although it is too early to assess the programme at this stage, the Commission's expectations regarding the start of the programme have been met.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 26, by Mr Wijsenbeek (H-234/84)*

Subject: Parallel imports of medicines

What action does the Commission consider it possible to take against France, Italy, Greece and Belgium, which maintain pricing systems, registration requirements and arrangements for reimbursing sickness insurance funds that result in medicines being sold too cheaply and parallel imports to other Member States distorting both the market and competition?

*Answer*

1. The Commission has already instituted proceedings under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty against the four Member States referred to by the honourable Member for failure

to fulfil an obligation under the Treaty. It holds the view that the regulations in force in these Member States on the prices of medicines and the reimbursement of their cost under the social security schemes infringe the Treaty's rules on the free movement of goods.

This view is based on the judgments by the European Court of Justice in relevant cases. In the *Roussel* case (judgment of 29 November 1983 in Case 181/82) the Court of Justice stated in particular that although a price control system for pharmaceutical products which is applicable to domestic products and imported products alike does not in itself constitute a measure having an effect equivalent to a quantitative restriction, it may have such an effect when the prices are fixed at a level such that the sale of imported products becomes either impossible or more difficult than that of domestic products. In its judgment in the *Duphar* case (judgment of 7 August 1984 in Case 238/82) the Court of Justice decided that under a compulsory national health-care scheme the Member States are entitled to exclude certain medicinal preparations from reimbursement or to allow reimbursement only for certain medicinal preparations on condition that the choice of the excluded preparations (in the case of a negative list) or of the permitted preparations (in the case of a positive list) involves no discrimination regarding the origin of the products and is carried out on the basis of objective and verifiable criteria, and provided that it is possible to amend the lists whenever compliance with the specified criteria so requires.

2. The Commission is also examining the legal and economic aspects of the problems arising from parallel imports of medicinal products from Member States where the price level is particularly low. As soon as the findings of this study are available, the Commission will inform the honourable Member of them in writing.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 28, by Mr Paisley (H-269/84)*

Subject: Milk producers in Northern Ireland

It is now estimated that by the end of October 4 900 milk producers in Northern Ireland will be asked to pay levy amounting to £ 5.2 million. Will the Commission undertake to have payment in Northern Ireland deferred in view of the fact that secondary quotas will not have been allocated to producers by that time?

*Answer*

The Commission recognizes that, because of the administrative difficulties which some Member States have experienced in examining the special-case applications for specific or additional reference quantities provided for by the Community regulations on the super-levy, a number of producers do not yet know the reference quantity which will be assigned to them.

For this reason, the Commission has decided to authorize Member States to extend the period for the first payment of the levy to 75 days after 30 September 1984, i.e., to mid-December, in respect of those producers who have requested specific or additional reference quantities and whose definitive reference quantity had not been communicated to them by 30 September 1984. The Commission has also decided that for all persons liable for the levy, Member States may be authorized to limit the first levy payment to 50% of the amount due for the first two quarters of application of the superlevy system, with the balance payable in the 45 days after 31 March 1984.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 29, by Mrs Castle (H-271/84)*

Subject: Exclusive purchasing agreement

What action does the Commission propose to take against the brewers who are imposing onerous new conditions on the tenants of their tied houses as a result of Regulation (EEC) No 1984/83,<sup>1</sup> such as increases in rent and other charges, examples of which have been sent to the Commission; will it reassure all such tenants that the Commission will take action to protect them in the exercise of their rights?

*Answer*

The problems referred to by the honourable Member are at present being examined by the Commission services, who have not yet reached a final conclusion.

As a general principle, the Commission cannot, in the context of the competition rules of the EEC Treaty, interfere with the contractual freedom of parties to negotiate the terms of their tenancy agreements, such as prices, rent and other charges.

However, where less favourable conditions are imposed on tenants in order to punish them for having used or threatened to use the freedom which Regulation (EEC) No 1984/83 gives them to obtain certain goods and services also from third parties, such behaviour would have to be considered as illegal under Article 8(1) b and 8(2) b of the above regulation and give rise to appropriate measures by the Commission.<sup>2</sup> Actions may also be brought directly before national courts by the parties concerned.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 30, by Mrs De March (H-272/84)*

Subject: Implementation of European cooperation agreements in the fields of electronics and computer technology

Given that even after the signature of the Esprit programme, a number of European companies in the data processing sector have persisted with the tactical option of concluding agreements with Japanese or American groups (witness the agreements between ATT and Olivetti, STET and IBM and British Telecom and IBM to name but the most recent examples), can the Commission say which European groups are still free to implement European cooperation agreements in the fields of electronics and computer technology?

*Answer*

There is no special requirement to notify the Commission of agreements concluded between European groups and American or Japanese groups. Therefore the Commission does not have full or official information on this subject.

The surveys carried out by consultancy bureaux at the Commission's request show that most European firms in the data processing and telecommunications sectors are party to cooperation agreements with non-Community firms, mainly American or Japanese.

Such agreements normally concern specific types of products or specific areas of technology and thus do not stand in the way of agreements between European firms with a view to the development and application of future technologies. In fact, the aim of the Esprit programme is to create such areas of future cooperation between European firms through research projects at the pre-competitive stage.

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 173, 30. 6. 1983, page 5.

<sup>2</sup> See point 51 of Commission Note on Regulations (EEC) No 1983/83 and (EEC) No 1984/83, OJ C 101, 13. 4. 1984.

The Commission will make available to the honourable Member the additional detailed information which it has on this subject.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 31, by Mr Hahn (H-274/84)*

Subject: Jamming of the transatlantic video conference by the French Ministry for Post and Telecommunications (PTT)

On 17 September 1984, the ITS company held a video conference, in which the signals, beamed from the United States via the Intelsat satellites, were transmitted from Brussels via the ECS satellites to Paris, London, The Hague and Stockholm. In Paris, reception was jammed by the Ministry of Post, because ITS was unwilling to hire the receiving apparatus belonging to the state-owned monopoly, TDF, and had not had its own equipment licensed by the French Ministry of Post.

Does the Commission not agree that equipment licences issued by an individual Member State should be valid throughout the Community, and what steps will it take to prevent the recurrence in the future of incidents such as the intervention by the French Ministry of Posts, which firstly constitute an inadmissible barrier to trade and secondly are liable to inhibit the development of new media at Community level?

*Answer*

The Commission is currently seeking information on the matter which has been drawn to its attention and cannot therefore pronounce itself on the factual aspects.

As regards the question of principle, the Commission shares the opinion expressed by the honourable Member that a licence issued by a Member State authorizing the use of an item of telecommunications equipment should be valid in the other Member States. This is not the case at present, since licences for terminals are issued by the competent national authorities on the basis of specifications which differ from one country to another for the same type of terminal.

The Commission has already taken steps to change this state of affairs with a view to enlarging the terminal market, a move exactly in keeping with the honourable Member's wishes. In fact, the Commission and the European Conference of Postal and Telecommunication Administrations (ECPTA) have signed a joint declaration of intention stating that the latter will carry out the technical work necessary for establishing standards for uniform application throughout the Community and of terminal licensing specifications common to all operators of Community networks. The aim is to have terminal licences mutually recognized. The ECPTA has started to work towards this goal and will continue to do so actively in accordance with priorities agreed with the Commission. The initial results are expected during the first half of 1984.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 36, by Mr Bontos (H-287/84)*

Subject: Economic agreement between Greece and Libya

Have the Community authorities been informed of the recent economic agreement between Greece and Libya, the content of which is still unknown to the Greek people?

*Answer*

The text of the agreement signed between Greece and Libya on 24 September 1984 was communicated to the Commission on the afternoon of 19 October 1984.

The Commission is currently examining the content of this agreement.

The Commission will not hesitate to take the necessary steps if there has been any breach of Community law.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 37, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-289/84)*

Subject: International Youth Year

What proposals for young persons does the Commission intend to make in 1985, which has been designated 'Youth Year'?

*Answer*

The Commission warmly welcomes the designation of 1985 as International Youth Year, with the themes of Participation, Development and Peace. Though the majority of activities will of course take place within the Member States, the Commission is developing proposals designed in particular to encourage youth exchanges within the Community and to prepare young people better for adult and working life.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 39, by Mr Adam (H-292/84)*

Subject: Coal prices

Will the Commission state the trend in the price of coal imported into the Community since January 1984?

Will the Commission give a monthly figure, show the source of supply and indicate the receiving countries?

*Answer*

As far as imported coal is concerned, the Commission services monitor price trends separately for two major categories — namely, coking-coal and power-station coal, which together account for about 85 % of total imports.

Average prices are computed and published quarterly for the Community as a whole. They are listed hereafter expressed in US dollars for a tonne of 29.3 Gigajoules (tonne of coal equivalent), cif European ports.

	<i>Coking-coal</i>	<i>Power-station coal</i>
1st quarter 1984	62.34	51.57
2nd quarter 1984	61.21	51.05
3rd quarter 1984	60.69	—

About 30 million tonnes of coal have been imported during the first half of 1984, which were received by countries as follows:

B	2.4 mt
DK	3.3 mt
D	2.8 mt
F	6.3 mt
IT	7.9 mt
NL	4.2 mt
UK	2.5 mt

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 40, by Mr Selva (H-294/84)*

Subject: Aid to Mozambique following the killing of two volunteers

Following the killing of two Italian volunteers, does the Commission agree that European aid to Mozambique should be reconsidered until the safety of European volunteers can be guaranteed?

*Answer*

The Commission firmly condemns the recent murder of two Italian volunteers in Mozambique and offers its most sincere condolences to their families and its moral support to the Italian Government.

According to assurances made to the Italian Government, the Mozambique authorities have once again undertaken to guarantee the safety of all foreign volunteers so that the cooperation programmes and projects may be carried out in satisfactory conditions of security.

The Commission assures the honourable Member that it will keep a very close watch on further developments in the situation.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 42, by Mr Romeos (H-300/84)*

Subject: Cuts in advisory committees

The Commission proposes to reduce the number of representatives participating in advisory committees from 1 January 1985. Does the Commission not take the view that these cuts will impair the process of proper consultation with the categories concerned and will be more prejudicial towards the more distant Member States since it will be virtually impossible for their representatives to bear the costs involved in taking part?

*Answer*

The Commission decided at the beginning of the year to reimburse the expenses of no more than 20 non-government experts per meeting.

This measure was adopted in conjunction with a certain number of other new rationalization and administrative measures in response to Parliament's request (resolution of 16 September 1983 on the cost to the Community budget and the effectiveness of committees of a management, advisory and consultative nature).

The measures adopted by the Commission for this purpose were communicated to Parliament in February of this year by a report on committees and groups of experts, which

Parliament welcomed by adopting on 10 April 1984 its resolution on the rationalization of the work of committees.

The Commission does not think that these economy measures can adversely affect the consultation process and the relations it has with professional and other bodies.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 45, by Mr Hutton (H-304/84)*

Subject: Contravention of the common fisheries policy

Would the Commission say what action it proposes to take against the authorities of the Netherlands following the discovery of substantial avoidance of the rules of the common fisheries policy there?

*Answer*

The Commission believes that it is necessary for all the rules of the common fisheries policy to be correctly enforced in each Member State. The Commission is reviewing how best to secure improved enforcement and will reach conclusions without delay.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 47, by Mr Kyrkos (H-316/84)*

Subject: Implementation of the Fourth Financial Protocol with Turkey

A recent meeting of the Council of Ministers reportedly discussed the possible implementation of the Fourth Financial Protocol with Turkey, which was frozen after the military regime was installed. Can the Commission state whether such a subject is under discussion and what stage has been reached?

*Answer*

The Fourth Financial Protocol for Turkey was negotiated and initialled in June 1981. However, the Commission has not sent this Protocol to the Council for conclusion and signature owing to the evolution of the political situation in Turkey.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 48, by Mr Cryer (H-317/84)*

Subject: Policies to reduce unemployment

Can the Commission state what measures it is undertaking to promote employment in the Community, and in particular whether it intends to promote the retention of coal and steel capacity in view of the massive loss of jobs particularly in the United Kingdom over the last five years in these and associated industries?

*Answer*

The Commission set out its proposals for a medium-term strategy to deal with the unemployment problem in its 'Action programme to fight unemployment', the general princi-

ples of which were adopted by the Council in its resolution of 12 July 1982 on 'Community action to combat unemployment'. This strategy is based on the recognition that macroeconomic policies, while central to the effort to restore employment growth, are alone insufficient to deal with the present unemployment problem and that additional specific action is required, particularly to deal with those sections of the labour force most affected by unemployment.

In its action programme, the Commission proposed that efforts should be concentrated in the following areas:

- (i) restructuring sectors in difficulties;
- (ii) promotion of investment to create public and private jobs;
- (iii) new enterprises and employment creation;
- (iv) local employment initiatives and cooperatives.

The Commission has since produced policy proposals regarding the development of vocational training and the impact of new technologies,<sup>1</sup> on youth employment,<sup>2</sup> local employment initiatives,<sup>3</sup> long-term unemployment,<sup>4</sup> and the reduction and reorganization of working time.<sup>5</sup> Some of these proposals have already been adopted by the Council in the form of resolutions.<sup>6</sup>

The Commission believes that all the items in this strategy constitute a package which, taken together and in a concerted manner by all Member States, will make a concrete contribution to the reduction of unemployment in the Community.

The Commission itself has been able to take concrete steps to promote job-creating investment in the areas hit by job losses in the coal and steel industries. It has done so by making available low interest-rate loans through the European Coal and Steel Community and supporting projects in steel-producing areas from the non-quota section of the Regional Development Fund. It has also devoted substantial resources to assisting workers who, through no fault of their own, have borne the brunt of redundancy in these sectors. The Commission would not be prepared, however, to countenance a policy of subsidies designed to maintain surplus capacity in the face of structural market changes. Such a policy would both be detrimental to the well-being of the economy generally and put at risk throughout the Community those jobs which can successfully be safeguarded.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 50, by Mr Huckfield (H-323/84)*

Subject: Uniform prices for motor vehicles

As the Commission document on uniform prices for motor vehicles throughout the Member States in the Community has been issued for consultation, will the Commission permit an extended time for consultation with the trade unions involved in the Member States in view of their fears that speedy implementation of this document could have the effect of plant closures and consequent unemployment?

*Answer*

1. To regard the draft Commission regulation (EEC) on the application of Article 85 (3) of the Treaty to certain categories of motor-vehicle distribution and servicing agreements

<sup>1</sup> COM(82) 637 final and COM(82) 296 final.

<sup>2</sup> COM(82) 211 final.

<sup>3</sup> COM(82) 662 final.

<sup>4</sup> COM(82) 484 final.

<sup>5</sup> COM(82) 543 final.

<sup>6</sup> OJ C 166, 25. 6. 1983, p. 1; OJ C 193, 20. 7. 1983, p. 2; OJ C 29, 4. 2. 1984, p. 1; OJ C 161, 21. 6. 1984, p. 1.

published by the Commission on 24 June 1983 (OJ C 165, 24. 6. 1983, p. 1) as a document on uniform prices for motor vehicles throughout the Community is to misunderstand it. The draft is concerned with the protection of competition at the various stages of distribution, including in the light of the consumer's interests.

2. Since the publication of the draft, interested parties have had the opportunity to put forward their views on it. Many representative bodies have made use of the opportunity, but no trade union has done so. However, the draft was also put before the Economic and Social Committee, on which representatives of trade unions sit, and which adopted a resolution on 28 September 1983 (OJ C 341, 19. 12. 1983, p. 18); and the Commission's Advisory Committee on Consumer Affairs, which also includes trade union representatives, gave its opinion on the draft on 13 December 1983 (Doc. CCC 84/83). The view of the representative bodies and committees, and the resolution of the European Parliament of 24 May 1984 (OJ C 172, 2. 7. 1984, p. 181), were reflected in the draft regulation put before the Advisory Committee on Restrictive Practices and Dominant Positions. This committee of representatives of the Member States is still considering the draft in its amended form.

3. Article 7 of the draft regulation published last year, which provided for automatic opening of the way for parallel imports whenever price differentials exceeded 12%, has since been dropped.

4. The Commission has stated on several occasions (Answers to Written Questions No 647/84 by Mrs Dury and No 580/84 by Mr Christopher Jackson) that it intends to adopt the regulation as soon as possible. The Commission considers that the relevant facts are sufficiently established.

\* ·  
\* \*

*Question No 51, by Mr Woltjer (H-326/84)*

Subject: Storage of agricultural products outside the European Community

Will the Commission say whether the reports are true that the huge surpluses of some agricultural products have forced the Commission to store some of the stocks which have been created in this way outside the Community, namely in Austria, Switzerland and Spain, and does the Commission not believe that the storage of agricultural products outside the Community should be prevented as this removes any possibility of control and that it would be better to seek measures to reduce the overall level of stocks?

*Answer*

The Commission can confirm that two Member States have, at their own request, been authorized by the Commission decision of 28 September 1984 to transport intervention beef and veal to non-Community countries for storage. The current situation on the meat market is that the quantities bought by the intervention bodies have increased considerably. These bodies are experiencing considerable difficulty in finding the necessary storage capacity in the Community. This being so, it was necessary to grant the abovementioned authorization. This authorization has no financial implications for the Community budget.

The Commission does not intend to authorize the storage outside the Community of other agricultural products for which there are currently intervention stocks. The decision concerning the beef and veal sector was exceptional and temporary. Its aim is to insure the effective application of the public purchase of whole carcasses, forequarters and hindquarters as decided by the Commission as part of the measures adopted to support the beef and veal market.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 52, by Mr Alavanos (H-328/84)*

Subject: Greek legislation on mining

The Commission has informed the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs that, relying on Article 52 of the EEC Treaty, it intends to take the question of Greek mining legislation to the European Court of Justice seeing that, under that legislation, the transfer of mining rights, the concession of use or possession, the acquisition of shares in Greek companies by foreign nationals, etc., are subject to approval by the Council of Ministers.

Is it the Commission's opinion that a Member State should be entitled to exploit its mineral wealth in sovereign fashion and, if not, why not?

*Answer*

It is true that the Commission, in accordance with Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, has brought the matter of Greek mining legislation before the Court of Justice.

Greek mining legislation contains certain provisions which give advantages to Greek nationals or undertakings over nationals from other Member States of the Community, whether legal or natural persons. It is laid down that foreigners are required to obtain authorization from the Greek Government before purchasing or selling mining property, exercising the right of usufruct or prospecting for minerals, while Greek legal or natural persons are not required to obtain such authorization.

These provisions are therefore discriminatory and constitute an infringement of Articles 7, 52 and 221 of the EEC Treaty. Since the mining of minerals is an economic activity, it falls within the field of application of the EEC Treaty.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 53, by Mr Adamou (H-331/84)*

Subject: Measures for structural improvement of Greek agriculture

The compromise proposal on wine-growing to the Council of Ministers of Agriculture also includes the taking of measures for the structural improvement of Greek agriculture. Could the Commission state whether those measures also comprise the exemption of Greece from proportional participation in the compulsory distillation process, the non-application of measures to limit wine-growing, aid for the planting of new varieties, an increase in wines with designation of origin, etc.?

*Answer*

The text put forward by the Commission was merely an attempt at a compromise in the context of the broad discussions on the adjustment of the rules applying to the wine-growing sector.

Since this attempt at a compromise was unsuccessful, it is impossible to know at this stage exactly what the outcome will be.

The Commission is therefore unable to prejudge any measures to aid Greek wine-growing nor, *a fortiori*, their content.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 54, by Mr Ephremidis (H-334/84)*

Subject: 'Restrictive measures' on imports

Seeing that the trade deficit continues to be an extremely acute problem for the Greek economy (June 1984: imports USD 766 m, exports USD 353 m, June 1983: imports USD 876 m, exports USD 453 m), and is further complicated by EEC accession regulations, could the Commission state whether it will continue and indeed extend for 1985 'restrictive measures' on imports that were taken in 1983 and 1984 but have proved totally inadequate?

*Answer*

The Greek import restrictions in 1983 and 1984 to which the honourable Member refers were authorized on the basis of Article 130 of the Treaty of Accession of Greece to the European Communities. It lays down that the Commission may approve temporary protective measures 'if difficulties arise which are serious and liable to persist in any sector of the economy or which could bring about serious deterioration in the economic situation of a given area'.

However, the Commission is unable to state a position on the specific question put by the honourable Member, since it is a matter for the Greek Government to present, if it so wishes, an application for approval of protective measures for 1985, on which the Commission will then have to decide.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 55, by Mr De Gucht (H-338/84)*

Subject: Distortion of competition as a result of a cut in gas prices in the Netherlands

On 1 October 1984, the Netherlands reduced its prices for gas consumed in the market-gardening sector by 10%, which was contrary to the agreements concluded between the Commission of the European Communities and the Dutch Government.

Can the Commission indicate how it will counter this obvious example of distortion of competition, which is detrimental to the interests of market-gardeners in various Member States (and particularly in the Belgian region of Flanders), and is it considering instituting proceedings before the European Court of Justice?

*Answer*

The Commission has been informed by the Netherlands Government that the Landbouwschap, Gasunie and Vegin had concluded a new contract on the price of natural gas for horticulture, applicable from 1 October 1984 to 1 October 1985.

The Commission immediately approached the Netherlands Minister of Agriculture with a request for more detailed information on this matter, pointing out the provisions of Articles 92 and 93 of the Treaty. The information requested has not yet been received.

As regards assessing this new contract, the Commission will do so in the light of the former contract and of any evidence provided by the Netherlands Government.

\* /  
\* \*

II. *Questions to the Council*

*Question No 61, by Mrs Lizin (H-216/84)*

Subject: Turkey

What is the Council's current position with regard to the human rights situation in Turkey and have its implications for the Financial Protocol been discussed recently?

*Answer*

The Council continues to follow the human rights situation in Turkey with close attention.

With regard to the implementation of the Financial Protocols with Turkey, I would point out that the third Financial Protocol expired on 31 October 1981 and that all the funds had been committed by the end of 1981.

The fourth Financial Protocol was negotiated and initialled in June 1981 but, for reasons which are well known, has not so far been submitted by the Commission to the Council — with the latter's approval — and has therefore not been signed.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 63, by Mrs Piermont (H-238/84)*

Subject: Accession negotiations with Spain, with particular reference to olive groves

It has been reported by Spanish ecologists that representatives of the EC have exerted strong pressure, both officially and unofficially, for Spanish olive groves to be destroyed in order to keep surplus olive oil production in the future Europe of the 12 within bounds.

Can the Commission state how many hectares of olive groves are to be uprooted in this way, which area of Spain would be affected by such measures, and how it intends to avoid their ecological consequences (such as karstification, soil erosion, the lowering of the water table, the destruction of the habitat of entire biotypes, etc.)?

*Answer*

1. The day before yesterday the Council defined the Community's position on vegetable oils and fats, including olive oils, and forwarded it to the Spanish and Portuguese delegations.
2. In the context of the agreement on olive oil reached in the Council on 17 and 18 October 1983, which primarily covered statements of principle requiring further elucidation, the Council considered *inter alia* that the Community measures limiting olive-growing areas should be applied in the same way and as quickly as possible by the applicant countries.
3. The honourable Member will understand that the results of the negotiations on this important aspect of the agriculture chapter cannot be prejudged.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 65, by Mr Marck (H-228/84)*

Subject: Publication of information by the Community

Can the Council state what measures it has taken to put into practice the proposals which the European Parliament put forward on 24 May 1984 in adopting the resolution on the compulsory publication of information by the European Community?<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 172, 2. 7. 1984.

*Answer*

1. I would point out that the Council publicizes its decisions by publishing most of them in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*. In addition, a press release on the outcome of the Council's proceedings is published at the end of each meeting.
2. Pursuant to Article 18 of the Council's rules of procedure, Council discussions are confidential.
3. However, on 1 February 1983 the Council adopted Regulation No 354/83, Article 1(1) of which provides that, subject to certain conditions, the historical archives of the Community institutions shall be open to the public after the expiry of a period of 30 years starting from the date of the creation of the document or record.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 67, by Mr Collins (H-258/84)*

Subject: Safety of holiday-makers in Spanish resorts

As the Council may be aware, considerable disquiet has arisen about the safety of holiday-makers in Spanish resorts. Muggings and even killings have been reported this summer on a scale never before experienced. Given that Spain is poised to enter the European Community, can I have the Council's assurance that it is in active discussion of these matters with the Spanish authorities and that everything is being done *via* the European Community and Spain itself to ensure the safety of holiday-makers in the future?

*Answer*

The problems referred to by the honourable Member do not fall within the competence of the Council.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 68, by Mr Maffre-Baugé (H-264/84)*

Subject: Imports of hybrid maize seed

The Commission has had to recognize that the increase in imports of hybrid maize seed was likely to jeopardize its future production in the EEC, especially in France and Italy. Consequently, on 12 April 1984, the Commission asked the Council (COM(84) 224 final) for authorization to modify the GATT tariff concession for hybrid maize seed.

On the pretext of a purely temporary decrease in these imports in 1983-84, the Commission has unilaterally decided to withdraw its proposal.

Has the Council decided to disregard this decision and ask the Commission to take protective measures against imports of hybrid maize seed, to provide a better guarantee that Community preference will be respected?

*Answer*

1. The Council would remind the honourable Member of Parliament that under Article 7(2) of Council Regulation No 2358/71, it is for the Commission to decide on appropriate measures in the event of serious disturbances caused by imports on the market for the product in question.

2. Pursuant to Article 113(3) of the Treaty the Council may authorize the Commission to open negotiations to modify the tariff concession for hybrid maize seed under Article XXVIII of GATT only on the basis of a Commission recommendation; no such recommendation now exists.

\*  
\* \*

### III. Questions to the Foreign Ministers

#### Question No 76, by Mrs Lizin (H-217/84)

Subject: Security in Europe

As security indisputably falls within the terms of reference of political cooperation (despite the statements made by the Irish President during Question Time at the part-session of the European Parliament on 12 September 1984), can the President state how many agendas have included this subject, and what results, resolutions or aspirations have been put forward in the context of a European position on security?

#### Answer

The London Report of 13 October 1981 stated *inter alia*:

'As regards the scope of European political cooperation, and having regard to the different situations of the Member States, the Foreign Ministers agree to maintain the flexible and pragmatic approach which has made it possible to discuss in political cooperation certain foreign-policy questions bearing on the political aspects of security.'

The Solemn Declaration on European Union, which was signed by the Heads of State or Government at their meeting in Stuttgart on 19 June 1983, reaffirmed a number of objectives aimed at consolidating progress towards European Union in both the economic and political fields, including *inter alia* the following:

'To strengthen and develop European political cooperation through the elaboration and adoption of joint positions and joint action, on the basis of intensified consultation in the area of foreign policy, including the coordination of the positions of Member States on the political and economic aspects of security, so as to promote and facilitate the progressive development of such positions and actions in a growing number of foreign-policy fields.'

These provisions have enabled the Ten to consult and coordinate their positions in such areas as the CSCE, including the CDE, nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament issues arising at the UN General Assembly. Such consultation takes place at various levels and in different instances within the framework of European political cooperation.

There is no provision for consultation among the Ten on questions related to the military aspects of security.

\*  
\* \*

#### Question No 78, by Mr Adamou (H-223/84)

Subject: Creation of denuclearized zones

The insane development of nuclear weapons is bringing mankind dangerously close to the outbreak of a nuclear war. In view of the fact that the creation of denuclearized zones is a

step towards establishing security and averting the danger of a nuclear war, what is the attitude of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to the appeal by the International Conference for the creation of denuclearized zones and what practical measures do they intend to take to create such zones?

*Answer*

The position of the Ten on the question of the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones was set out as follows in the statement on behalf of the Ten delivered on 18 October 1983 to the first committee of the United Nations General Assembly:

'The Ten believe that, in keeping with the provisions of the final document on the appropriate principles and conditions for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, the creation of such zones as well as zones of peace should be considered seriously. They believe that the creation of such zones in certain parts of the world could make an important contribution to disarmament and to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, provided all States concerned are prepared to subscribe to them on the basis of agreements freely entered into and in keeping with internationally recognized principles.'

In this connection I would also refer the honourable Member to the reply given to Oral Question No H-672/83, by Mr Papaefstratiou.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 79, by Mr Ephremidis (H-225/84)*

Subject: Release of 56 Turkish intellectuals

Fifty-six Turkish intellectuals, including the world-famous writer Aziz Nesin, university professors and numerous journalists, are being hauled before a military tribunal by the Turkish junta because they played a prominent part in collecting signatures and drafting the appeal for the restoration of democracy in Turkey.

What measures do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to take with a view to having the trial called off and gaining the release of the 56 Turkish intellectuals?

*Answer*

The Ten share the widespread international concern over the case of the 56 Turkish intellectuals.

The Ten have expressed their concern on several occasions over the situation in regard to basic political and human rights and freedoms in Turkey.

The Ten will continue to follow closely the evolution of the situation in regard to human rights in Turkey.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 80, by Mrs Piermont (H-239/84)*

Subject: Accession negotiations with Spain, with particular reference to membership of NATO

It has become increasingly apparent, over the last few months and weeks, that some EC States are linking Spain's accession to the European Community with its remaining inside

NATO (f.c. press reports in the 'Suddeutsche Zeitung' of 21 May 1984, the 'Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung' of 21 May and 5 September 1984, the 'Tageszeitung' of 11 September 1984 and 'La Croix' of 14 September 1984).

Do the Foreign Ministers in political cooperation consider that it is legitimate for accession to a Community established for non-military purposes (according to Article 2 of the Treaty establishing the EEC) to be made conditional on membership of a military alliance?

*Answer*

The matters referred to by the honourable Member fall outside the scope of European political cooperation.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 81, by Mr Van Miert (H-278/84)*

Subject: San José ministerial meeting

According to the final communiqué adopted at the ministerial meeting in San José, the European Community and Latin America are going to develop a new framework for political and economic cooperation. Is this statement more than a declaration of intent with merely a symbolic political significance and, if so, what practical steps have been taken to make this political and economic cooperation a reality? Furthermore, how much aid is to be granted to Latin America by the Community and is the amount sufficient for the pursuance of a coherent and credible policy towards Latin America?

*Answer*

As the honourable Member will be aware, the Presidency made a statement in the European Parliament on 9 October on the results of the San José Conference.

The aim of the Ten at the Conference was to give practical support, both political and economic, to the efforts of the countries of Central America themselves to bring peace, social justice, economic development and respect for human rights and democratic liberties to the region. The Ten were conscious throughout of the intimate connection between underdevelopment and inequitable social and economic structures on the one hand and political instability and violence on the other. It is for this reason that the final communiqué of the meeting reflects both Europe's political support for peacemaking efforts, particularly those of the Contadora Group, and Europe's firm intention to intensify economic cooperation with Central America. The communiqué records the agreement of both sides to continue the political dialogue, begun at San José, through further meetings at regular intervals in the future. Acknowledging the need to give institutional form to their economic cooperation, both sides declared themselves ready to start discussions as soon as possible with a view to negotiating an inter-regional framework cooperation agreement.

The communiqué makes clear that this continuing dialogue is of an essentially practical, and thus by no means merely symbolic, character.

The peace process in Central America requires the widest possible support from countries outside the region. The San José communiqué records the firm conviction of all the Conference participants that the problems of Central America cannot be solved by armed force but only by political solutions springing from the region itself. In this conviction the Ten and the other participants affirm their support for the Contadora process as the best opportunity to achieve a solution to the crisis and call upon the States concerned 'to continue to make every effort to bring the Contadora process rapidly to a final fruition through the signature of a comprehensive agreement which would bring peace to the region'. They also record their agreement 'on the necessity for a practical commitment to

the implementation of any such agreement by all the States of the region and all other countries which have interests there, and of the necessity for the verification and control of that implementation'. Moreover, the communiqué recognizes that the revised draft Contadora Act is a fundamental stage in the negotiating process for peace in Central America.

This clear identification by the Ten of the best present means to solve the Central American political crisis, combined with the willingness of the European countries, also expressed in the communiqué, to support the efforts of those States to which it falls to implement the provisions of any agreement, constitutes a very practical measure of political assistance for peace in Central America.

The same practical character is evident in the agreements on the economic front. The joint communiqué lists a number of areas where it would be possible to reinforce cooperation, such as agriculture and integrated rural projects, regional integration and the promotion of trade.

Equally, industrial development projects can be taken into consideration in so far as they would have a regional impact and would be likely to promote the creation of an economic sector based on small and medium-sized enterprises. In the area of economic cooperation, one can also mention the possibilities for cooperation between public and private national financing instruments in the two regions, as well as the promotion and protection of investments in Central America. All of these areas would fall within the scope of a framework cooperation agreement. The joint communiqué records the readiness of both sides to commence discussions on the negotiation of such an agreement as soon as possible.

The joint communiqué is devoted essentially to bilateral relations between the Community and the countries of Central America; it makes, therefore, no detailed mention of wider forms of cooperation. None the less, during the discussions in San José it was underlined particularly on the European side, that the Community contribution to the development of Central America could be widened and indeed play a role of catalyst, if co-financing with such other sources of finance as the World Bank, the countries of North America, Japan and the Contadora countries could be arranged.

The Community has not entered into precise commitments on increased aid to Central America. The honourable Member will note, however, that the joint communiqué states that the Community will do everything possible, within the context of its present and future programmes in support of developing countries, towards the development of the region.

\*  
\* \*

*Question No 82, by Mr Balfé (H-285/84)*

Subject: Release of Ray Hooker

Dr Ray Hooker, the Nicaraguan Minister with special responsibility for the Englishspeaking enclave of Bluefields, was kidnapped by a Contra Group directed by Mr Eden Pastora on 5 September 1984. On 14 September, Amnesty International confirmed that information from Reuters indicated that Dr Hooker was alive and being held in Costa Rica. In Dublin Castle on 19 September the President-in-Office was able to assure me that the EEC Foreign Ministers 'will make all efforts to see if the release of this prisoner can be brought about'. This statement was warmly welcomed, particularly by people in the London Borough of Lambeth, which is 'twinned' with Bluefields. Can the President-in-Office, following the meeting of Foreign Ministers in San José, Costa Rica, now make a further statement on this matter?

*Answer*

This matter has not been discussed in the framework of European political cooperation.

However, in accordance with a promise given by the President-in-Office at the Colloquy with the Political Affairs Committee of the Parliament in Dublin on 19 September, the question of the kidnapping of Dr Hooker was raised with the Costa Rican Government *en marge* of the recent conference in San José. The Costa Rican authorities informed the President-in-Office that Dr Hooker was not being held on Costa Rican territory and that, as far as they were aware, he was in Nicaragua. The Presidency was unable to ascertain anything further in regard to this case.

## SITTING OF THURSDAY, 25 OCTOBER 1984

## Contents

- |   |     |  |     |
|---|-----|--|-----|
| 1. <i>Agenda:</i><br><i>Mr Cot; Mr Wurtz; Mr Cryer; Mr Morris; Lady Elles; Mr Kyrkos . . . . .</i>  | 148 |  |     |
| 2. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i><br><i>Mr Prout; Mr Cryer; Mrs Heinrich . . . . .</i>   | 149 |  |     |
| 3. <i>Verification of credentials:</i><br><i>Mr Rogalla . . . . .</i>   | 150 |  |     |
| 4. <i>Topical and urgent debate:</i>  |     |  |     |
| • <i>British miners' strike — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-829/84) by Mr Huckfield and others:</i><br><i>Mr Huckfield; Mr West; Sir Henry Plumb; Mrs Buchan; Mr Kyrkos; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mrs Ewing; Mr Kilby; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Patterson . . . . .</i>   | 150 |  |     |
| • <i>Terrorism — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-795/84/corr.) by Mr Klepsch and others, Sir Henry Plumb and Mr de la Malène and others; (Doc. 2-822/84) by Mr Arndt and others; (Doc. 2-849/84) by Mr Ducarme and others and (Doc. 2-854/corr.) by Mr Segre and others:</i><br><i>Mr Clinton; Mrs Castle; Mr Ducarme; Mr Segre; Mr Croux; Sir Henry Plumb; Mr Lalor; Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr Habsburg; Mr Penders; Mr Tugendhat (Commission) . . . . .</i>  | 154 |  |     |
| • <i>Sentencing of Jacques Abouchar — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-831/84/rev.) by Mr Saby and others; (Doc. 2-837/84) by Mr Baudouin and Mrs Anglade; (Doc. 2-841/84) by Mr Stirbois and others; (Doc. 2-842/84) by Mr Chinaud and others; (Doc. 2-847/84) by Mr Mallet and others and (Doc. 2-851/84) by Mrs De March and others:</i><br><i>Mr Baudouin; Mr Stirbois; Mr Donnez; Mr Mallet; Mr Cbambeiron; Mr Saby; Mr Baudis; Mr Papapietro; Mr Tortora; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Deniau; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Bombard; Mr Stirbois . . . . .</i> | 158 |  |     |
|   |     | • <i>Pollution of the sea — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-793/84) by Mr Staes; (Doc. 2-815/84) by Mr Roelants du Vivier and others (Doc. 2-828/84) by Mrs Dury and Mr Arndt; (Doc. 2-830/84) by Mr Walter and others and (Doc. 2-840/84) by Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz and others:</i><br><i>Mr Staes; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mrs Dury; Mr Sherlock; Mr Walter; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf; Mrs Dury; Mr Pisani (Commission); Mr Chanterie . . . . .</i>  | 163 |
|   |     | 5. <i>Supplementary budget No 1/84 (Doc. 2-900/84):</i><br><i>Mrs Scrivener; Mr Dankert; Mr Cornelissen; Lord Dowro; Mrs Barbarella; Mr De Vries; Mr Pasty; Mr Arndt; Mr Langes; Mr Chambeiron; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Alavanos; Mr Cot . . . . .</i>   | 165 |
|   |     | 6. <i>Topical and urgent debate (continuation):</i>  |     |
|   |     | • <i>Pollution of the sea (continuation):</i><br><i>Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Späth; Mrs Ewing; Mr Chanterie; Mrs Viehoff; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Rogalla; Mr Sherlock; Mr Stewart; Mr Cryer . . . . .</i>   | 170 |
|   |     | 7. <i>Votes:</i><br><i>Mr von der Vring; Mr Bonde; Mr Prout; Mr Amadei; Mr Donnez; Mrs Dury; Mr Prout; Mr Fellermaier; Mrs Buchan; Mr Pfennig; Mr Curry; Mr Arndt; Mr Cot; Mr Simmonds; Mrs Oppenheim; Mrs Castle; Lord Douro; Mr De Vries; Mr West; Mr Pasty; Mr Bonde; Mr Ducarme; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr Barzanti; Mr Ducarme; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Tuckman; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Bonde; Mr Megahy; Mr Baudis; Mr Costanzo; Mr Bombard; Mrs Jepsen; Mr Gaibisso; Mr Seligman; Mrs Crawley; Mr Alavanos; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Megahy; Mr Patterson; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Klepsch; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Ducarme; Mrs S. Martin; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Cryer . . . . .</i> | 173 |

8. *Topical and urgent debate (continuation):*
- *Pollution of the sea (continuation):*  
Mr Ducarme; Mr Bombard; Mr Rogalla;  
Mr Ford; Mr Sherlock; Mr von der  
Vring; Mr Tugendbat (Commission); Mr  
Sherlock; Mrs Dury; Mr von der Vring;  
Mr Bombard; Mr Guermeur; Mr Sher-  
lock; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Sherlock; Mr  
Staes; Mr von der Vring; Mr Vergeer;  
Mr Ford; Mrs Dury; Mr Pearce . . . . . 183
  - *Lome III — Motions for resolutions*  
(Doc. 2-824/84) by Mrs Focke and  
others; (Doc. 2-834/84) by Mr de la Mal-  
ène (Doc. 2-848/84) by Mrs Cassanmag-  
nago Cerretti and others and (Doc.  
2-852/84) by Mr Cervetti and others:  
Mrs Focke; Mr Christensen; Mr  
d'Ormesson; Mr J. Elles . . . . . 188
  - *Humanitarian aid — Motions for resolu-  
tions (Doc. 2-825/84) by Mr Hansch and  
Mr Arndt; (Doc. 2-846/84) by Mr  
Langes and others; (Doc. 2-850/84) by  
Mr J. Elles:*  
  
Mrs Lenz; Mr J. Elles; Mr Ulburghs; Mr  
Nordmann; Mrs Focke; Mr Andrews;  
Mrs Heinrich; Mr Cassidy; Mrs Barbar-  
ella; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Vandemeule-  
brouke; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Patterson . . . 189
9. *Economic recovery (Docs. 2-610/84; 2-704/  
84; 2-816/84 and 2-817/84) (continuation):*  
  
Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Patterson; Mr  
Bonaccini; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Christen-  
sen; Mr Patterson; Mr Chaboche; Mr Smith;  
Mrs Oppenheim; Mr Rogalla; Mr P. Beazley 191

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting was opened at 10.00 a.m.)*

### 1. Agenda

**Mr Cot (S)**, *chairman of the Committee on Budgets.* — (FR) Mr President, I should like to suggest altering our timetable today to comply with something that emerged the other day — the need to vote on the supplementary budget for 1984 fairly quickly and early this afternoon if possible. In view of the outcome of the Council's discussion after conciliation, the Committee on Budget's opinion is that the debate proper on Mrs Scrivener's report could be quick at the second reading and this would mean we could vote right at the beginning of the afternoon, at 3 o'clock, which would be the best thing.

One measure I should like to suggest — although it is of course up to the President to make the arrangements — is that perhaps we interrupt this urgent debate and have a short debate on the budget at the end of the morning and make up the lost time after the voting on the supplementary budget early in the afternoon.

If we do not vote early this afternoon, the familiar problems to do with the constraints of budget votes are likely to crop up.

**President.** — Mr Cot, I assume this is a request from the Committee on Budgets, so I propose the following changes in today's agenda:

*10 a.m. to 12 noon:* topical and urgent debate;

*12 noon to 1 p.m.:* debate on the supplementary budget for 1984;

*3 p.m.:* vote on the supplementary budget for 1984, followed by the vote on the other reports.

After the votes the topical and urgent debate will continue for one hour and then the other items on the agenda will follow. If the debate on the supplementary budget lasts for less than one hour, then the urgent debates will be resumed and the time allocated to urgent debates during the afternoon will be shortened accordingly. In carrying out these changes we will keep the three hours for urgent debate.

*(Parliament adopted the proposal)*

**Mr Wurtz (COM).** — (FR) Mr President, something extremely serious has just happened — at least the news of it has just arrived. Hiddir Aslan, the young Turkish democrat, was hanged at dawn this morning.

Yesterday afternoon, the President-in-Office of the Council answered a question of mine by saying that the Council was monitoring the situation very closely, that it was in a position to say that it detected a democratic trend in that country and that our request for the Community to clearly denounce the Turkish situation by suspending Turkey's association to the Community was pointless. I propose, in view of the gravity

**Wurtz**

of this event, which confirms our every fear, that Parliament make a very firm statement about it, otherwise it will seriously compromise its credibility in other fields.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Mr Wurtz, I appreciate your desire to put that on the record. I would like to tell you that the President did send a telex to Turkey yesterday about this particular case. Of course, we regret very much the news you have just given us. I am quite sure that we will look at some way of taking up this matter with the Turkish Government.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Mr President, we do have a large number of pieces of paper and I have added to them this morning. My letter to Members of this Assembly invites them to join the demonstration next Saturday against the massive nuclear expenditure by the present Tory government in the United Kingdom on Trident nuclear weapons. If Members are unable to join the demonstration for a future on our planet . . .

*(Interruptions from the floor of the House)*

. . . there is a means by which they can write and express their support for this urgent matter.

**President.** — Mr Cryer, that was not strictly a point of order. Once again I appreciate your desire to get something on the record, but we want to get on with the topical and urgent debate.

**Mr Morris (S).** — Mr President, with respect to yourself and the rules of this House, since we are not to have a statement today on the food crisis in Ethiopia, could I ask how many people will have died there between now and Monday when Mr Pisani makes his statement on Ethiopia?

**President.** — Mr Morris, you have expressed to the House your concern and everybody's concern about the situation in Ethiopia. Although Mr Pisani is not making a statement until Monday, I want to assure you that moves are already afoot to try to make sure that more aid gets to Ethiopia. I think you have made your point now. You are not going to speed up the urgent debates, so unless you have got some proposal to make, would you sit down?

**Mr Morris (S).** — I have a proposal to make. When the millions of people in Berlin were threatened with starvation, we created an air bridge. Can I suggest respectfully to this House that you use your position as Vice-President of this House to call upon the nations of Europe to create such a bridge for the people of Ethiopia?

**President.** — Mr Morris, I believe that is already being attended to.

**Lady Elles (ED).** — Mr President, according to the agenda we should now be holding the topical and urgent debate. If Mr Morris had read the agenda, he would see that there is a debate on Ethiopia coming up. If other people are allowed to take up the time of this House, we will not get on to be able to debate the items which are on the agenda already. It is a great abuse of time and the procedures of this Parliament. I therefore request that we get on immediately with the motions for urgent debate on the agenda.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — *(GR)* I would like to submit a procedural proposal concerning the astonishing announcement made by Mr Wurtz. I wonder whether . . .

**President.** — Mr Kyrkos, this is not on the urgent debate. I have already made a comment about that tragic situation. We cannot go any further now. I would ask you to do something later on today, but we cannot deal with it now . . .

*(Interruption by Mr Kyrkos)*

Please sit down. Put something in writing to the President.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Approval of the Minutes

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

Are there any comments?

**Mr Prout (ED).** — Mr President, my group would like to exercise its right, under Rule 111(4) of the Rules of Procedure, to challenge the interpretation of Rule 116 given by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions on the extent to which requests for waiver of immunity in this Parliament are affected by Rule 116. We would like that matter voted on this afternoon.

**President.** — Mr Prout, I take note of your objection. In accordance with Rule 111(4), the matter will be submitted to Parliament this afternoon at voting time.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — Mr President, on page 13 of the Minutes it says that Mr Hutton asked whether there

<sup>1</sup> *Setting up of a Committee of Inquiry: see Minutes.*

**Cryer**

would be a Question Time at the November part-session. There does not appear to be an answer. However, those who were present in the Chamber will recall that the President indicated that there would not be a Question Time at the November part-session.

I would ask you, Mr President, under Rule 55, pursuant to which the draft agenda is drawn up in consultation with the group chairmen, to have another consultation. Question Time is a very important part of our proceedings. It is not affected by this interminable fixing of debating time which results in very little proper debate and many mannered and timed speeches. Question Time does give an opportunity for everybody in this Assembly to make an observation and to elicit information. It is very important, in my view, that you should reopen the discussion on the agenda under Rule 55.

**President.** — Mr Cryer, your comments have been noted, and when the agenda for the part-session is fixed on the Monday of the part-session, I am sure that they will want to take account of what you have had to say.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)*

**Mrs Heinrich (ARC).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I would nevertheless ask Parliament to adopt a further proposal that the death sentences in Turkey be treated as a matter for urgent debate or, if this is not possible, that Parliament should at least pass a resolution condemning further executions, on the grounds that Europe also has some responsibility in the matter.

**President.** — Mrs Heinrich, I have already made a comment on the situation and I have asked those Members concerned to take some action themselves to bring before the House, but it cannot be done right now. Now we have to get on with the topical and urgent debate. You can put something to the House at a later stage, but not now, please.

**Mrs Heinrich (ARC).** — *(DE)* But I should like my proposal to be included in the agenda.

**President.** — It cannot be done now, Mrs Heinrich, I am afraid. You will have to find some other procedure for bringing it up urgently with those Members who have already expressed their concern about it.

### 3. Verification of credentials

**President.** — I would also like to inform the House that the Committee on the Verification of Credentials at its meeting of 23 October verified the credentials of

Mrs Crawley, Mr Gazis, Mr McGowan, Mrs Martin, Mr Moravia, Mr Rigo, Mr Schinzel and Mr Vergès in accordance with Rule 6(2) of the Rules of Procedure.

Are there any comments?

**Mr Rogalla (S), chairman of the Committee on the Verification of Credentials.** — *(DE)* Mr President, as chairman of this Committee I just wanted to point out that following verification there are still 4 members of the House sitting on a provisional basis in accordance with Rule 6(3). For the rest, all credentials have been verified and found to be in order.

*(Parliament ratified the appointments)*

### 4. Topical and urgent debate

#### *British miners' strike*

**President.** — The next item is the topical and urgent debate.

We begin with the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-829/84) by Mr Huckfield and others on the miners' dispute.

**Mr Huckfield (S).** — Mr President, the reason that we have been pressing for this debate since we first came here in July is that many of us believe that this is probably the most important industrial struggle that we shall witness in the whole of our lifetime. We have a government in England which has openly declared that its only policy for the economy is the breaking of the trade union movement and the reducing of wages since it openly believes in classical economic theories which were discredited at the beginning of this century. The Conservative government has been preparing for this battle against the National Union of Mineworkers since that union helped to bring about its defeat in 1974. We have a Chancellor of the Exchequer, though his economic policy is in ruins, who has openly said that the continuation of this strike is a worthwhile investment for the government though the dispute has already cost the government and the taxpayer some UKL 4 000 million.

Mr President, the Conservative government is prepared to use all of the apparatus of the State, including the police, to smash the National Union of Mineworkers. Though the immediate cause of the dispute is the proposed closure of some 20 pits and the loss of some 20 000 jobs, the National Union of Mineworkers is fighting on behalf of the whole of the trade union and labour movement in the United Kingdom and in the Community, and that is why they should be supported.

## Huckfield

Mr President, the people who sent us here are suffering grievously. Many have been on strike for eight months, more than that have been in industrial action since 12 months ago. 7 500 arrests have been made; many miners are in prison; 5 people have died; miners' families have little food; they cannot afford gas and electricity bills to be paid or clothes for their children because the government has deliberately robbed them of UKL 50 million worth of benefits to which they are entitled. We shall keep them going with collections that we make all over Britain and, indeed, in the rest of the Community too.

But, despite all of the pressure and the provocation, this strike will not be broken by police brutality, because that class over there — and I make no apology for bringing class politics into this Chamber — represents the landowners, they *were* the coal owners, they have dreams of becoming the coal owners again.

*(The President urged the speaker to conclude)*

But Margaret Thatcher stands condemned and the workers united will never be defeated.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr West (S).** — Mr President, as a striking miner myself, as a miner for the past 30 years, as a member of the National Union of Mineworkers, I claim to speak with a knowledge and understanding of the mining industry, of miners, of miners' wives and their families and of mining communities.

This is the longest strike of its kind in the history of British trade unionism. It is unique also in the sense that it is not a strike about money, it is a strike about the protection of jobs, about the protection of entire communities, it is about opposition to a philosophy embracing an economic theory that threatens the whole fabric of our society. For the past eight months, the miners and their families have faced suppressive measures in a three-pronged attack.

First, the ruthless use by the Thatcher government of the State machine, anti-trade union legislation has denied to striking miners State benefits that they have paid for themselves during their working lives. The extent of the government's ruthlessness is typified by the denial of death grants earlier this year resulting in the burial of a miner's child in an unmarked grave.

Secondly, the abuse of the legal system by magistrates and judges, resulting in the criminalization of the most hard-working and law-abiding sections of the British working class; the denial of basic human and civil rights to an extent which questions Britain's right to remain a member of the EEC. The right of free association has gone. The right of free movement has gone. The imposition of bail conditions for minor offences such as obstruction are more severe than bail

conditions imposed upon those charged with serious criminal offences. The famous British legal system has been brought into disrepute.

Thirdly, the conversion of a regional police system into a force acting as a national force under the control of the government and senior police officers acting as an arm of the State, acting clearly outside the law with a brutality that has to be seen to be believed. Yet the strike is as solid as it was on the first day with 80% of the British miners on strike.

I say to this Assembly, particularly to the British Tories in this Assembly: the miners will not submit. We recognize that the government's attempt to smash the National Union of Mineworkers is a precursor to an attack on all the trade unions in Britain and all the working people in Britain. We have been the vanguard opposing such oppression before. We accept that role again. This strike was instigated by the British Government condoning the breaking of a written agreement signed by themselves in 1981 — the Plan for Coal. They must withdraw from that dishonourable position. With the magnificent support both at home and here on the continent from working people and trade unions, with the magnificent support of our Women's Support Group, once again represented in the gallery this morning in this Chamber. . .

*(Applause from the left)*

I say to you all: The miners of Britain united will never be defeated.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Sir Henry Plumb (ED).** — Mr President, as one who was born in a mining village, I do understand the problems of the miners, and I think one ought to mention a few facts that put this matter straight. Each of them alone would suffice to rebut the content of this Socialist proposal.

As you know, Mr President, and the Members of this House will know very well, the strike in the British coalmines has gone on for more than seven months. During this time the National Union of Mineworkers has never held a national ballot of its members. A regional ballot was held in Nottingham, where 30% of the NUM live, and in that ballot over 70% of those taking part voted against strike action.

*(Applause from the European Democratic benches)*

All of you know why this national ballot of the members has not taken place.

*(Interruptions from the Socialist benches)*

I think I know better than some of you. Secondly, this damaging and costly strike has been maintained by daily violence and intimidation.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**Sir Henry Plumb**

There have been threats of death; threats of kidnapping against hard-working miners and their families and their children, threats which are common, and many have heard the truth about that from a lady who has been here this week as a working miner's wife.

*(Applause from the European Democratic benches)*

Thousands of pickets are regularly mobilized where miners are still working, in order to attempt physically to prevent them from exercising their right to work. The NUM's leaders have never condemned this manifest and systematic violence.

*(Further interruptions)*

Thirdly, the government in the United Kingdom has made clear its commitment to a prosperous future in the British coal industry. Two million pounds per day has been invested by the government in the British coal industry during 1983. A further investment of UKL 3 000 million has been announced. So the British Government does understand and it cares about the fears of the mining communities.

*(Applause from the European Democratic benches)*

No British miner has been forced to lose his job. No British miner will ever be declared redundant against his will.

*(Mixed reactions)*

Very generous payments are available to those miners who opt for early retirement. You can check those facts. Other union leaders in the United Kingdom have said publicly that if their members had been offered such terms they would not be on strike. The extremists, Mr President, the leadership of the National Union of Mineworkers are not interested in the future of the British coal industry. Look at their insistence that uneconomic pits be kept open indefinitely! They want that UKL 3 000 million of investment to be wasted. They want the European Community's money to be wasted as well.

*(Mixed reactions)*

At the Selby coalfield alone, UKL 200 million of European Community money has been spent up to now.

Mr President, in the seven months of the strike alone, UKL 435 million have been lost, so how can they claim to have the interests of British miners at heart? The Labour government of the 1970s closed dozens of uneconomic pits with the agreement of the NUM at that particular time. So both Conservative and Labour governments have always believed that the British coal industry had a bright and a viable future. There has been a marked similarity in their policies in govern-

ment towards the industry. It is the leadership of the NUM that has changed.

Finally, Mr Scargill and his extremist colleagues have never hidden that their strike is a political one.

*(Mixed reactions)*

Mr Scargill has the open aim of destroying the democratically-elected British Government of the day; his methods are undemocratic and they are backed by violence. Negotiations form no part of his political vocabulary, and he should take a leaf out of the book of the pit deputies who settle their differences rapidly...

**President.** — Sir Henry, you have gone over your speaking time.

**Mrs Buchan (S).** — Point of order, Mr President. Far be it from me to defend a wealthy English landowner, but I think it is a bit unfair that his own colleagues are standing at the back gossiping. Will you ask people in this House, when someone is speaking, albeit a poor misled wealthy farmer, to sit down and listen to the debate properly? I refer to his own colleagues in particular. She is a Vice-President, she should not be standing in the corridor gossiping to people when her group leader is speaking.

**President.** — Thank you, Mrs Buchan, for that quite relevant observation about order in the House. If anybody else wishes to speak on a point of order, I want him to state under which rule he intends to put his point of order.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — *(GR)* Mr President, social progress has gone hand in hand with the struggles of working people. We pay tribute to the struggle of the British miners, who as the vanguard of Europe's working class, are fighting not only for their own interests, but for the most essential of rights, the right to work and to live, and at the same for the adaptation of industry and of productive relations to the conditions of the technological revolution. Everyone, nowadays even the most conservative, has nothing but praise for the workers in Chicago who opened the way to the 8-hour day. Tomorrow everyone will be talking about the British miners and the importance of their struggle. Meanwhile, however, let us relentlessly condemn the British Conservative Government which, in a spirit of class-ridden intransigence, is condemning thousands of working people to unemployment and thousands of families to a miserable existence, and which, while it is destroying the Community's future with its demand for a budgetary rebate, is guilty of squandering the 400 million pounds that it has so far cost the British economy to pursue its stubborn denial of any solution acceptable to the workers.

**Kyrkos**

We believe that in expressing solidarity with the British miners, we speak for all working people in Greece.

**Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L).** — Mr President, we should all feel sympathy for those threatened by unemployment. The British Government would have done well to show that sympathy more clearly. That said, the tactics used by the striking miners' leaders are totally unacceptable to democrats.

*(Applause from the right)*

They have refused to allow a national ballot of the miners as required by their own rules. They have used verbal intimidation, threats and violence, not only against miners who continue to work, as is their right, but even against their families. For these reasons, we shall vote against the Huckfield resolution which is an almost total distortion of the facts.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mrs Ewing (RDE).** — Mr President, I am making a statement on my own behalf and not on behalf of my group, which is not necessarily in agreement with my point of view.

I believe that there is a vast misunderstanding among most of you about what is happening in Great Britain in this particular struggle. I speak as a former miners' MP. I represented the constituency of Hamilton. I can assure you all that this is a matter of principle as far as the miners are concerned. I speak as one who has represented many thousands of them.

These are men slow to take up such a position. They are giving up offers of the most fantastic redundancy payments. They could all be quite well off if they were to accept these offers. I call that in evidence to show that these are men who have a principle at stake.

The principle at stake is the closure of so-called uneconomic pits and therefore, in effect, the destruction of the industry as a viable industry for the supply of most of our coal at home. Now, I remember the same argument about uneconomic pits when I was the Member for Hamilton. What they did was they took all the pits, they drew a middle line, they said everything below the middle line was uneconomic. Then when the ones below the middle line were closed the line was moved and those below the new line then became 'uneconomic'.

That is the argument, and the miners know it. It has even been conceded by the other side that they are not on very sure ground on what constitutes an uneconomic pit. There is a point of principle here. We have been faced with an apparent struggle between two gladiators. I wish Scargill had had a ballot, because I believe that he would have won it. I think that would

have solved that problem. I deplore that he did not have a ballot. I deplore the fact that the British Government is pretending to wash its hands of this and distance itself by appointing a puppet man, MacGregor, who even has to put a newspaper over his face when he is shown on the television. There you have a man who is standing down because he is inept.

I will be supporting the resolution, though I do not like the reference to the motivation of the police. I would have been happier if it had read 'use of excessive force by the police'.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Kilby (ED).** — Mr President, I owe my seat in this Parliament to Mr Scargill. I represent the major mining constituency of Nottinghamshire where 34 000 miners voted overwhelmingly not to strike, but to continue to work. They voted via the ballot box and from that moment they were subjected to intimidation of the most vicious kind.

Scargill's shock troops descended on the working miners to smash them into submission. They were beaten up, their cars and houses damaged, their wives, daughters and sons abused, their pets poisoned and maimed and their lives threatened. Not surprisingly they ask for police protection. Is that not what we believe in, law and order? Mr Scargill says he is fighting for the mining industry. Well, you try telling that to the working miners. Mr Scargill has twice called the miners out on strike and twice he has been defeated by the miners themselves via the ballot box. So what did he do this time? He denied them a vote and then changed the union rules. Democratic, is it not?

Mr Scargill is not interested in the views of the miners, he is only interested in his own views. He has his own plans. The party opposite did not tell you that far more mines were closed under the last Labour government than under this Conservative government.

*(Applause from the right)*

They did not tell you, but the present government is spending 2 m per day on capital projects to modernize the mining industry and make it internationally competitive. Did not this Parliament vote additional monies to do just that, to meet that objective?

Mr Scargill is bad for Britain, he is bad for the mining industry, he is bad for the miners he purports to represent, he is bad for Europe and he is bad for democracy. He says that he does not recognize that there is . . .

**President.** — Mr Kilby, you have gone over your speaking time. Anything further that you may say will not appear in the record.

**Mr Ephremidis (COM).** — (GR) Mr President, we shall support the Huckfield resolution, thus demonstrating our utmost support, sympathy and solidarity for the British miners who are now fighting for their lives and for their union and personal rights.

(Applause)

However, they are not just fighting for their own rights, but for those of all working people within the Community's territories. With our positive vote we condemn the British Conservative Government, which is using naked force to subdue the strikers and has so far been responsible for five deaths, 7 000 arrests, and has condemned tens of thousands of families to penury for seven months.

Mr President, this House applies a double standard. Whilst it now remains guiltily silent and withholds condemnation, its attitude was completely different when strikes were taking place in another country, Poland. We, Mr President, are more consistent in our principles. We do not ask for intervention, we do not recognize this Parliament's right to intervene in an internal dispute. However, we do ask the House to express its solidarity and support for people who are fighting for their lives. Anyone who does not vote in favour of the proposed resolution — and we see that there are such — clearly represents in this House interests similar to those that inspire any who are involved, in one of the Community's countries, in the Flick scandal.

(Applause)

**President.** — The debate is closed.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Mr President, there are nine amendments in my name. I tabled these amendments in order that Members should have the opportunity to read the truth about this miners' strike. However, I think that what we need now is a clear-cut decision. I therefore wish to withdraw all my amendments so that we have a clear-cut vote on the original motion for a resolution.

(Parliament rejected the motion for a resolution)

### Terrorism

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

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-795/84/corr.) by Mr Klepsch and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, Sir Henry Plumb, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, and Mr de la Malène and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance on violence and terrorism;

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-822/84) by Mr Arndt and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the attacks on members of the British Government in Brighton, the PRL (Belgian Liberals) offices in Brussels and the CVP (Flemish Christian Democrats) offices in Ghent;

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-849/84) by Mr Ducarme and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the resurgence of terrorism and the need for stronger action at European level;

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-854/84/corr.) by Mr Segre and others, on the growth of terrorist violence in Europe.

**Mr Clinton (PPE).** — Mr President, in the motions for resolutions before us today we have more than sufficient evidence to indicate that the Members of this Parliament are outraged and horrified at the appalling acts of violence now being committed throughout Western Europe.

As an Irishman I feel I have a special obligation to condemn in the strongest possible way the recent bombing of the Grand Hotel in Brighton where the British Prime Minister and so many other politicians were residing at the time. Through our British colleagues in this Parliament, I want to convey to the bereaved, the injured and to all those who must have been severely shocked our very sincere sympathy. I know that our Taoiseach, Dr FitzGerald, has already done this on behalf of the Irish Government.

We have got to face the fact that this is by no means an isolated case and that all our Member States have a very serious problem on their hands which must be tackled jointly and urgently. We must all work together to ensure that there is no safe haven for the perpetrators of such hideous crimes, but we must also work hard to establish justice based on peace and fair play. Any other sort of justice is bound to be short-lived. I am no expert on security matters, but I know, and all of us know, that serious injustices exist and have existed for a long time without much real effort to remove them. This is at least a partial cause of the problem. What I am trying to emphasize is that we are never going to find a solution by just simply locking up and punishing people who commit such crimes. I do not want to be misunderstood when I say this. I know full well that many of the people involved are simply downright criminals who have jumped on the bandwagon...

**President.** — Mr Clinton, I am afraid you have run out of time.

**Mr Clinton (PPE).** — ... but I also believe that a large proportion of these people have set out on this

**Clinton**

road because they feel they are being treated unjustly and because they have grievances, real or imaginary.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I wish to support the compromise resolution that has been drawn up, in which the Socialist Group's own original resolution has been subsumed.

What impresses me is the unanimity of the condemnation of terrorism in this Parliament, right across the political spectrum from left to right. That unanimity is in the denunciation of terrorism not only as a brutal attack upon innocent people but as an assault upon democracy itself; and I find it heartening that we are united in our determination to defend democracy.

I have some sympathy with the points that the Rainbow Group makes in some of its amendments, particularly when it says that hysteria would be the wrong response to this escalation of violence we are experiencing in Europe: it would be the wrong response because it is exactly the response which the terrorists themselves seek to create. Such hysteria and the actions which may accompany it are used by them to justify further violence.

What we must do in this tragic situation is to concentrate on two things. First, we must mobilize public opinion to denounce terrorism as an instrument of policy, and in our resolution we condemn that terrorism wherever it may be expressed in Europe. We denounce the bombings in Belgium. True, there were no lives lost there, we are glad to say, but we must not underestimate the importance of those bombings, because they are an attack on party political premises and therefore an attempt to make democratic institutions unworkable. At a time of the growth of anti-democratic and fascist movements in Europe, we condemn anything that weakens the democratic institutions which can resist that growth.

Nothing can equal the enormity of the bombing at the Grand Hotel in Brighton, in which we had something we thought we had put behind us in Britain centuries ago — an attempt to assassinate a Prime Minister and her Cabinet. The whole of the British political forces have been united in condemning that, and in expressing their sympathy with the injured.

The second thing we must do is to resolve to press ahead with political solutions. I want to pay tribute to the Irish Government for the initiatives they have taken.

I call on the British Government not to be deflected from seeking those political solutions but to redouble its efforts to find agreement with the Irish Government.

(*Applause*)

**Mr Ducarme (L).** — (*FR*) The Liberal and Democratic Group wanted to maintain its motion for a resolution because, I think, Mrs Castle, that between weakness and hysteria, there is firmness. But we have the feeling that the unanimous text that has been tabled is in fact a sign of this Parliament's weakness towards terrorism, for a number of reasons.

First, we refer to attacks against party political offices in our proposal and against private firms in St Cloud and Evere and we feel it is a sign of great weakness for Parliament to distinguish between different types of terrorism. Is there one sort of terrorism against political parties and another against people and goods? We believe there should be no distinction, particularly at a time when there is a European terrorist movement right across Europe — the Belgian hideaway of *Action Directe*, as one French newspaper put it this morning — and I mean all terrorist action in Europe at the moment. We do not wish to make a distinction of this sort and we think extreme firmness is called for.

We also regret that Parliament's motion for a compromise resolution fails to condemn marginal groups — which have to be condemned because they are a threat to democracy and that is why we are maintaining our proposal.

What we also say is that Europe has to give itself the vital means of fighting this terrorism. That is why we think it is urgent for the Council of Ministers of Justice to have this meeting to actually establish a European legal area. We also think that Parliament has to ask for this point to be brought up at the next meeting of Heads of State and Government.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the proposed compromise is certainly working along the right lines, but it doesn't seem to be firm enough. So we still insist on the vote being taken, although we know we could be beaten. But we do so as a matter of principle. We think we must, in any case, go further. The role of our Parliament is to . . .

**President.** — I am sorry, Mr Ducarme, but your speaking time is over.

**Mr Segre (COM).** — (*IT*) Mr President, we shall vote in favour of the motion for a joint resolution against terrorism, because it seems to us politically important that the European Parliament should express, with one voice, its condemnation of all the recent attacks. We shall do this even though our own document would — in our view — have made a better job of doing what our own experience as Italians has shown to be the decisive factor in the fight against terrorism — namely, the firm, vigorous and widest possible mobilization of the great mass of the people.

We have been through terrible years in Italy, and now, as the result of very recent events, we know how great

**Segre**

was the complicity and connivance — even within the government and its most sensitive services — with the various sorts of terrorism, both black and red, in a more general plan for the destabilization of democratic institutions.

If Italy resisted, if Italy achieved widespread victory over terrorism in democracy and with democracy, this was due to an overwhelming degree to the fact that all those forces in the front line of this battle, from the forces of public order to the courts, have at no time felt that they were on their own, but have seen before them, as each day passed, a deployment of political parties and a mobilization of the people that left no room for hesitation and indecision. In the end, this meant that there was no room either for terrorism and terrorists, and, as we know, fish cannot survive without water.

This, with all its bright spots and darkest shadows, is the true picture of what happened in Italy's case, Mr President, not the picture — often seriously and dangerously distorted — that it was attempted to present at a conference held recently in the precincts of this Parliament . . .

**President.** — Mr Segre, you have gone over your two minutes now. I am sorry but I will have to stop you because if every Member were to speak for 10 or 30 seconds more we would lose time.

**Mr Croux (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we agree with everything that has been said here. We view with abhorrence those who use violence, kill and commit other outrages, their victims often being innocent bystanders. My group will therefore vote for the two motions for resolutions now before us. Very briefly, we should just like to add the following. We invoke democracy in defence of the constitutional state: that is the essence of the matter. We want to contrast justice with violence. That is the outcome of centuries of struggle for greater political civilization. To this end, we must show our determination and our ability to defend ourselves against those who commit acts of terrorism.

And there is an appeal to us all. We must be concerned about our own conduct and our own democratic society, about the constitutional state, which is so sensitive and delicate a flower and the result of the growth of civilization. Each and every day we must struggle to ensure that we respect others and show tolerance. We must also exercise the discipline that a democratic society requires. Justice must always be placed above any form of pressure through violence in our countries and also in our European society. This will require a great effort to ensure that the spirit of democracy that was so alive in Europe after the recent world war does not crumble or become hollow. Let us do our best in this respect each and every day.

**Sir Henry Plumb (ED).** — Mr President, may I first of all join with Mrs Castle in her plea for unanimity in totality from this House and, indeed, from Europe in using all our endeavours to defeat terrorism. I would also like to thank Mark Clinton for his remarks particularly about the terrorist attack in Brighton.

Now on just a personal note. At 3 o'clock on that particular morning, Friday 12 October, my wife and I were awakened in our hotel at Brighton by the blast of the bomb that was far too close for comfort. By the time we reached the fire-escape it was obvious that the hotel in which we were sleeping had been the scene of a fairly massive terrorist attack. A bomb had exploded 3 rooms down the corridor from which we slept and, as we later learned, 4 people were killed, and it was a remarkable escape for hundreds of others. Although my wife and I were lucky enough to reach safety, the succeeding hours were a time of horror, a time of fear for all of us, as our friends and colleagues still in the hotel were rescued by the wonderful fire and emergency services.

The whole world knows that an attempt was made on that Friday 12 October to murder the entire democratically-elected British Cabinet, and among those who so tragically died — and I knew them all, I had spoken with them on the day which preceded their deaths — I can still scarcely believe that these friends and colleagues have been so brutally and senselessly taken from us. I shall never forget the events of that Friday and the implications for our political and democratic life in western Europe. It is for these reasons that the whole of my group will be voting for the inter-group amendment on terrorism.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I am sure we would all want to sympathize with your own personal experience, Sir Henry.

**Mr Lalor (RDE).** — Mr President, as an Irish Member, I must contribute to this debate. I want to condemn unequivocally the bombing at Brighton particularly and the other outrages and to be fully associated with the urgent resolution of unanimous condemnation of those acts of terrorism.

Successive Irish governments have taken all possible action to outlaw and to wipe out illegal organizations in Ireland who claim responsibility for these horribly offensive acts. The unfortunate outcome of the Brighton outrage is the danger that it may slow down or stop any of the progress that hopefully can be made in discussions with the United Kingdom authorities arising from the recent decisions of the Irish Forum where all legitimate Irish democratic groups interested agreed to a peaceful, collective, unified approach towards the solution of the problems of the island of Ireland.

**Lalor**

May I ask the United Kingdom representatives here, representing each of their groups, to associate themselves with us Irish Members in the building of bridges across the chasms of violence, terrorism and hatred that have existed and, unfortunately, widened down the years. I welcome the comment made by Barbara Castle this morning and I echo her sentiments and I join with you, Mr President, in your expression of personal feelings towards Sir Henry Plumb.

Finally, I think it would be proper of me, as an Irish representative, here publicly to say that I reiterate the expression of sincerest sympathy in the resolution with the bereaved, the injured and everyone affected by the Brighton outrage.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC).** — *(DE)* Discussion of this subject so far has been conducted on quite the wrong lines, and this applies to all those who have spoken. They talk as if deeds of this kind — armed conflict, so-called terrorism, violence — were ends in themselves. I believe such deeds are the expression of a need to get a message across. For example the denial of the right to self determination of the Basques and the people of Northern Ireland.

*(Protests)*

Common to all speakers was the fact that they make no distinction between violence and terrorism. And the cries from the floor have shown that this is *deliberate*. We as the Rainbow Group and as part of the peace movement are in favour of non-violent solutions to conflicts and, in our view, if you are talking here of violence, of non-government violence, you should not close your eyes to forms of violence which are organized and orchestrated by the state, to the thousand and more Argentinians killed and sunk by the British in the Falklands war. You should not close your eyes to the miners bludgeoned to their knees in England or demonstrators who are also bludgeoned to their knees everywhere.

I think it is wrong here to value the life of a politician more highly than the life of any other prisoner. We feel for all victims of terror or violence in this world, whether state-sponsored or not. If we differentiate here between the supposedly important life of a politician and the less valuable life of a citizen, then that is wrong. This problem cannot be solved by calls for special laws or for a uniform legal framework. We therefore call for solidarity with all those who are victims of terror, whether state-sponsored or not, and for discussions.

We have tabled amendments and shall, for the reasons I have stated, decline to support any other proposed amendments.

**Mr Habsburg (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, this House has witnessed true solidarity among the Democrats, for I have not often found myself agreeing one hundred percent with Mrs Castle. I am very glad of the fact. But I am sorry to say that the previous speaker has clearly not understood what we are aiming at. We have been talking at cross purposes, for we do not value the life of a politician more highly than that of another person. But we do consider it extremely serious when attempts are made on the lives of leaders who represent elected authority, with the aim of using violent means to change what the majority has chosen.

I should simply like to remind the House that the previous European Parliament has already taken a number of decisions on a European judicial framework, and unhappily it is the fault of the governments that our decisions have not yet been implemented. Given that terrorism is continually on the increase I would think it extremely desirable for us to revive this question of a European judicial framework so that the governments are made to face up to their responsibilities. I would remind you that the French Government has proposed the setting up in Paris of a central police office to facilitate cooperation by the various law enforcement agencies. Here too it is perhaps high time we reminded the governments of their responsibility, for in the long run it must be said that where European problems are concerned it is always the governments, unfortunately, which are the stumbling block. It is our job to keep reminding them of what we have already said.

**Mr Penders (PPE).** — Mr President, we live in a world which consists of nation states. The system is far from perfect, but it works. International terrorism is a direct attack on this structure and, unless it is stopped, it is bound in the long run to lead to anarchy. Tough measures must be taken to combat terrorism, or there is a danger that it will triumph on two fronts.

Firstly, there are the merciless countries that make use of terrorism — some anonymously, others not — and secondly, there are the weak countries which cannot or dare not effectively defend themselves against terrorism or oppose it. As long as the world continues to consist of nation states, there will be conflicts, but what singles out civilized mankind is that differences are discussed peacefully and, if possible, settled.

Terrorism makes this approach impossible, and that is why it is so serious a threat to the survival of civilization as we know it.

**Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Mr President, I would like to associate the Commission with the condemnation of terrorism which has been so universally expressed on all sides of this House and by Members of all nationalities. I too know something of what terrorism means because four years ago

### Tugendhat

I was fortunate enough to survive an assassination attempt in Brussels. Earlier this month, like Sir Henry, I was in Brighton, though fortunately I was not so near the scene of the explosion as he was.

It is appropriate for this House to condemn terrorism in the terms that it did because this House represents, it epitomizes, the shared values of all the peoples who go to make up the European Community, our shared belief in freedom under the law and in democracy. It also, Mr President, is appropriate that this House should condemn terrorism in the terms that it did because the European Community itself epitomizes the capacity of mankind to reconcile ancient disputes within a framework, not just of law, but also of friendship and building for the future.

Those who speak blithely about terrorism — and I must confess that there is one contribution with which I did not find myself wholly in agreement — forget the point that Sir Henry made about the effects of terrorism on not just those who are killed and maimed, but also on those who are bereaved. Mr President, those are the people we must remember. They are the people we must remember in the aftermath of Brighton; but they are also the people we must remember in the aftermath of all terrorist atrocities regardless of whether or not the people are in public life or private life, regardless of whether or not they are politicians or anything else. It is the effects of terrorism which are evil and wrong, and it is right that this House, which symbolizes the shared values of European peoples of all nationalities, and which stands for freedom under the law, democracy and the reconciliation of ancient disputes, should condemn terrorism in all its forms.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1, replacing three of the motions for resolutions, and adopted the Ducarme motion for a resolution)*

### *Sentencing of Jacques Abouchar*

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

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-831/84/rev.) by Mr Saby and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the 18-year prison sentence passed on the French journalist Jacques Abouchar in Afghanistan;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-837/84) by Mr Baudouin and Mrs Anglade, on behalf of the European Democratic Alliance, on the sentencing of a French journalist by the Afghan authorities;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-841/84) by Mr Stirbois and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the 18-year prison sentence served on the French journalist Jacques Abouchar;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-842/84) by Mr Chinaud and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the imprisonment of Mr Jacques Abouchar;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-847/84) by Mr Mallet and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the sentence imposed on Jacques Abouchar;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-851/84) by Mrs De March and others on the release Mr Jacques Abouchar.

**Mr Baudoin (RDE).** — *(FR)* Now in connection with the affair of Jacques Abouchar, the French journalist, free information in a communist regime is considered a factor of disunity. All the systems are based on absolute control of external and internal information — hence the need, in this sad Afghan affair, for the Kabul Government to turn its country into an isolation ward and hound humanitarian associations, doctors and journalists. But democracy is not losing its rights. Doctors are still getting through and so are journalists. So the Afghans and their Soviet friends have to use dissuasion and make an example of someone and even frighten people. Hence the perfunctory trial, with no proper defence, and Jacques Abouchar being condemned to 18 years' imprisonment.

When we heard the verdict we were stupefied and scandalized. But after our indignation, to which we are alas all too often driven, we must make Jacques Abouchar our priority and obsess ourselves with how to help him and get him released as quickly as possible. We all want Jacques Abouchar, who is facing 18 years in prison, to be freed in a month or in six months or a year. For someone incarcerated within four walls, 18 years is an eternity. So we urge the Soviet authorities, who are cosignatories of the Final Act of Helsinki — and, as we have good reason to know, the Soviets thought it was of great interest and great importance when they signed it — to use their influence with the Kabul Government to get Jacques Abouchar released. Let us remember part of this declaration, which specifically states that: 'The participating States reaffirm that the legitimate pursuit of their professional activity will (not) ... penalize them'. And further on, it says: 'The participating States make it their aim to facilitate the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds...'. So, we call on the USSR, mindful...

**President.** — I am sorry Mr Baudouin, but your speaking time is over.

**Mr Stirbois (DR).** — *(FR)* Mr President, honourable Members, during the session of 9-11 October, four political groups, including the Group of the European Right, tabled a motion for a resolution with a request

### Stirbois

for a topical and urgent debate. Our proposal said what process the Soviets would follow — Jacques Abouchar would appear on television and then be sentenced. Yet we were prevented from signing the amendment by the Chairman of the Liberal Group. The Communists abstained, as the tone of the amendment did not please this Group — which in fact backs the murderous and inhuman activities of international communism the world over.

A few days later, Jacques Abouchar was sentenced to 18 years' imprisonment. The day before yesterday, not four, but six motions for resolutions were tabled. Curiously enough, the Rainbow Group is still absent, but it is true that it takes more interest in banning the raising of chickens in cages and acid rain in Germany than poison gas in Afghanistan — that's a façade — and its members include people who protect terrorists, so it cannot take an interest in the fate of a journalist and the people of Afghanistan.

The shortest of these six motions, a very short one and the most discreet, came from the Communist Group. It is true, there again, that, the night before, Mr Kra-sucki contrasted the discreet approach of the Communists with that of the loud-mouthed. In their motion, the Group of the European Right asked the Euro-MPs to call on their Governments to suspend trade and technical contracts with the Soviet Union until such time as Jacques Abouchar is released. It was of course alone in making this proposal.

So a further amendment has to be drafted. The moderate groups have accepted the Communists' signature and, once again, while some groups kept quiet, the Group of the European Right was prevented from signing the amendment. What is the idea? To make people think it is the friends of Jean-Marie Le Pen who are doing the killing and the imprisoning in Afghanistan? No. It is George Marchais' friends. The European Parliament is in fact no more than an extension of the Gang of Four, that band which people in our country, who are tired of fudging and compromise, are rejecting to an ever-greater extent. I am convinced that there are many MPs who are not responsible for the situation their group has forced upon them. It is obvious that the Soviet authorities will want their *quid pro quo* before they let the French reporter go. Yesterday, it was our group that took the initiative and organized a press conference with authentic representatives of the Afghan resistance in a room in Parliament. They explained why the Soviets wanted to make an example of Jacques Abouchar. The communists have gone in for a new strategy — closing the frontiers, increasing the pressure against the resistance, sending 70 000 Soviets from crack regiments — since March — to join the 130 000 others, stepping up the war which the KGB and the Red Army are fighting together, helicoptering in troops to hound the guerillas and making offensives on five fronts at once.

The representatives of the Afghan resistance also said how disappointed they were at how little support they

were getting from the West. There are 56 American military advisers helping fight the marxist guerillas in Salvador, a country which had democratic elections. Some European Governments openly support and recognize the marxist guerillas. There are 200 000 Russian soldiers in Afghanistan, but the Afghan resistance gets neither recognition nor support. The European Parliament had to do more than raise its voice — or whisper what a scandal it was. Its powers were already small and its all-too-timorous attitude makes it look like a soul-less institution — a helpful image for the enemies of the free world. So the Group of the European Right will not be voting for the joint amendment which will in any case have no effect.

And since — I shall stop here — the groups of liberals and moderates preferred the Communists' signature to the nationals', there could have been unanimity against the Soviets. We solemnly warn the groups which failed to accept the signatures of representatives of several million Italian, Greek and French anti-marxist voters that, if such attacks on the proper functioning of democracy in our Parliament were to continue, this would be borne in mind in our future voting.

Lastly, on behalf of my Group, I call for a roll-call vote on our motion for a resolution No 841. This will show us — and we shall broadcast it — which Euro-MPs have backed this choice of the Communists, who are in fact friends of the accused in the Abouchar affair, in preference to those who have shown they are the friends of the Afghan resistance.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Donnez (L).** — (FR) Honourable Members, if I signed the joint motion for a resolution along with my friends Roger Chinaud, Luc Beyer de ryke, Jean-François Deniau at Jean-Thomas Nordmann, it is because we felt that, after this parody of a trial in which Mr Abouchar was sentenced to 18 years in prison, the Afghan legal authorities were throwing down a veritable challenge to human rights. In fact, Mr Abouchar, as nobody now denies, went to Afghanistan, not with anything subversive in view, but simply to gather information and relay it to French television audiences and we now know that, in Afghanistan, an illegal frontier crossing gets you an 18-year sentence. We might well be back in the most shameful years of Stalinism. It is against such practices that we must speak out.

We think we have to take up this challenge to human rights and I would remind my colleagues on the left — or the pretended left — of something Jaurès said: 'Courage is seeking and speaking the truth'. Mr Abouchar tried to seek the truth. Speaking it in a Russo-Afghan regime gets you 18 years in prison. I do not for one moment doubt that the men of liberty who make up this House will all be together on this motion for a resolution — even if it is only to show that we too intend to seek and speak the truth.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Mallet (PPE).** — (*FR*) Mr President, we did not want just to express our indignation at the journalist Jacques Abouchar being given an 18-year prison sentence — a shameful verdict, a challenge to human rights and freedom of information and a violation of the Final Act of Helsinki.

This is why we sought very broad agreement between all the European democrats on the European Parliament's taking a step that was likely to make a useful contribution to freeing Jacques Abouchar. The joint amendment before you reflects this agreement well and it will, I am sure, get massive approval.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — (*FR*) Mr President, the French members of the Communist and Allies Group have, as you know, tabled a resolution calling for the French journalist, Jacques Abouchar, to be released.

That means we do not accept the verdict of the Afghan courts. An 18-year sentence is out of all proportion to an illegal frontier crossing, particularly since Jacques Abouchar only did what many of his colleagues do in similar circumstances. So, I repeat, we demand that Jacques Abouchar be set free. I would go so far as to add that this is our only aim, which is why the French members of the Communist and Allies Group regret that their resolution cannot be put to the vote and is being replaced by a compromise amendment couched in terms which, I think, go beyond this aim.

We know about the selective nature of the indignation of a certain section of this House. We saw enough of its behaviour here when we were discussing South Africa and Chile and Turkey. We want to get Jacques Abouchar released quickly, not stir up the present international tension — which is why we are unable to follow the path they have mapped out.

**Mr Saby (S).** — (*FR*) Mr President, Honorable Members, the Socialist Group welcomes the agreement on the joint amendment on freeing Jacques Abouchar.

I have to say that, as far as we are concerned, any attack on freedom and any form of violence or threat, from whatever quarter, is condemned.

Here in this House, of course, we look beyond divergences and take account of the cultural worth of the Community as a whole and we heard threats a few minutes ago. It has to be clear that the whole Community rejects violence and rejects attacks on freedom and freedom of information and that we shall not accept threats or blackmail from anyone. This is why the Socialists signed the common amendment calling for Jacques Abouchar to be released as soon as possible.

**Mr Baudis (PPE).** — (*FR*) Mr President, since Jacques Abouchar was captured more than a month ago, everything has been said. Everything has been said about this intolerable and arbitrary act and about the denial of the rights of a prisoner who is being deprived of all contact with his family and the representatives of his Government and who was condemned without being able to choose anyone to defend him. Everything has been said about this challenge to freedom of information and to the free nations who were naive enough to believe in the Final Act of Helsinki.

And now that everything has been said, should we now be silent? Certainly not! Let us not hesitate to repeat the same things, for they are true. Let us not hesitate to repeat the same principles, for they are right.

Obviously, the Russo-Afghans have staked everything on the situation being defused, hoping some other event will push it out of the papers. We must use every means to show them that they are wrong and prove to them with our vote today and with visa applications and demonstrations that, ultimately, detaining a free journalist is doing much more harm than the report he should have brought back.

**Mr Papapietro (COM).** — (*IT*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what we are discussing in this case is a great question of principle, one of the biggest questions of principle of our times. The right to information has been taken away, one of the fundamental human rights has been violated, a severe sentence of 18 years' imprisonment has been pronounced by a special court, after a trial that was not held in public, and without the prisoner's having the freedom to choose who should defend him. And therefore, in the spirit of the Final Act of Helsinki, and in that spirit of freedom that imbues us all, we can only condemn this grave act of legalized violence. It is the only course that is true to our conscience and our history as Italian communists — communists who have fought, from the first days of their existence right up to today, against any violation of freedom, and against all forms of special court.

We can recognize in this very serious case the fruits of that violation of a people's sovereignty that started in December 1979 and, sustained and strengthened by an atmosphere of international tension, has already gone on for too long.

Our attitude, in the previous session of Parliament, to an earlier motion for a resolution arose from our concern not to make this drama a pretext for accentuating the tone of this tension and thereby strengthening authoritarian restrictive regimes such as the Afghan regime, but we are determined . . .

**President.** — I am sorry, Mr Papapietro, but your speaking time is up.

**Mr Tortora (NI).** — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European press has only really concerned itself seriously about Jacques Abouchar since a sentence of 18 years' imprisonment was inflicted on him by a court that was no more Afghan than the pious fraud and legal window-dressing in which it was cloaked.

Only a fool could have expected any other verdict. And perhaps it is just as mistaken to expect any delegation from this Parliament to be able to contact and see our colleague Abouchar and check his living conditions.

These eighteen years, inflicted not only on a man but on a profession — which, who knows why, we persist in considering a free one — are a grave offence against the very conception of freedom, which all our countries hold in reverence. Once again the nail has been hit right on the head by a man to whom certain systems are familiar — the Soviet dissident, Amalrik. This is what he has to say:

Au fil des jours une vérité s'impose. Jacques Abouchar n'est pas seulement prisonnier de l'Union Soviétique et des autorités de Kaboul. Il est aussi et surtout devenu un otage dans un affrontement politique qui le dépasse, un otage dont les ravis-seurs se servent avec cynisme pour extorquer la plus grosse rançon possible.

So that is what he is — a hostage. Examples of piracy in the air are followed today by those committed on land.

No-one has thought to compare the case of Abouchar with the case of the Italian citizen, Farsetti, for whom it was Bulgaria, instead of Afghanistan, that was the loyal stand-in for the Soviet Union. There, too, perhaps, they were attempting to do a deal of some kind.

In supporting amendment No. 1, with the reservation that a visit by a delegation from the European Parliament would obviously be prevented, the radicals call for the immediate cessation of the infamous, barbarous practice, of taking hostages and using them to settle scores and influence relations between great powers.

You cannot fight terrorism — and we radicals are fighting it, yes, and we said so even at our conference yesterday, and only in the blindness of bad faith can that be ignored — without condemning those States that apply in practice, in their political and legal affairs, the barbarous insane logic of the 'Red Brigades'.

**Mr Beyer de Ryke (L).** — (FR) Mr President, is Jacques Abouchar guilty? Undeniably he has in fact signed confessions with the witty pen of Jacques Faizant, the cleverest of French cartoonists: 'I confess to being an enemy of freedom. I admit to having entered

Afghanistan with an automatic pen, a repeater ball-point and a flick camera'.

So if Jacques Abouchar is guilty, Jacques Abouchar must be sentenced. And what to? Eighteen years? By no means! He should be sentenced to follow the Soviet troops in the field. But there is a but.

There is a but because, if Abouchar had been sentenced to follow the Soviet troops about, he would also have been able to see the villages being massacred by the Soviets and the Afghans in the valleys of Afghanistan. And of course the Soviets couldn't have stood that . . . So, you see, behind the irony, there is indignation and it is general. And the indignation in this House is in fact being reported in the press — and the European parliamentary press too.

Ladies and gentlemen, Honourable Members, never in the history of journalism, be it in Vietnam, be it in Ireland . . . Alain Bombard, my colleague and friend (you will forgive me for mentioning one of our private conversations, although I don't think there is anything secret about it), it was you who said that such a thing had never happened before, not even during the Spanish civil war — and God knows how deeply torn the country was. Never, I say, had a journalist been taken to court for doing his job.

On the Spanish civil war! I remember *No paseran*. And the Soviets have taken over *No paseran* today, for the journalists. The shall be killed, the Soviet Ambassador Smirnov says. Today, I say, Afghanistan has accepted fascism and it is vast and it is red.

(Applause from the right)

**Mr Plaskovitis (S).** — (GR) Mr President, the Greek Socialists echo the voices of protest against the arrest and unduly harsh sentence imposed on an intellectual, a journalist, who was only doing his duty. We shall vote in favour of the common amendment tabled by the political Groups. This does not in the least imply that we can applaud cries of anticommunist hysteria within this Parliament.

More specifically, I would like to reply to the representative of the European Right, by saying that Greeks have bitter experience of what censorship means, and what imprisonment for free-thinking people means. For seven years authors and journalists languished in Greek prisons, and I believe the representative of the European Right would have had no inclination at all to protest about this; on the contrary, he would be eager to defend those who choked every intellectual freedom in Greece for seven years. Consequently, the European Right's interest in the arrest and sentencing of Abouchar is at least transparent, and hardly worth taking into account by other Members of the House. For this reason, Mr President, the Greek Socialists will vote against any resolution other than the common

**Plaskovitis**

resolution tabled by the Socialist and other political Groups.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Deniau (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I asked to speak on this topic because I was actively involved in drafting this text and because what I was actively involved in drafting this text and because what I believe to be my mission — to obtain information and to pass it on — has involved me in being at four clandestine border crossings over the past few months, which, if Russo-Soviet criteria are to be believed, means that I should get at least 62 years in prison!

It is vital, I think, to mention the Soviet Union, Mr President, because Jacques Abouchar was arrested by the Soviets in a trap laid by the Soviets. Tass said so. And it is Tass that has taken the hardest line so far, like the Smirnov declaration (Luc Beyer de Ryke called it a warning) which was in all the press and never retracted. And I quote. 'This is a warning. The next doctor or journalist will be killed where he stands.'

This is clearly intimidation and the only response to intimidation is the most absolute firmness.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Mr President, on behalf of the Commission I would like to associate my institution with the universal condemnation of the arrest, trial and imprisonment of Mr Abouchar. This debate shows that it is not only Mr Abouchar's compatriots who are concerned about his fate and about the principles to which his fate draws attention but people all over the Community, people of all shades of opinion.

**President.** — Before we move to the vote. I have two prequests under Rule 67 for personal statements, and the first is from Mr Roelants du Vivier.

**Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC).** — *(FR)* Mr President, bearing in mind what Mr Stirbois said, I should like to say something personal.

Just now Mr Stirbois used a process that doesn't even disgust me — I despise it — to say that the Rainbow Group contained people who promoted or protected terrorists. I do not think these words are worthy of an MP. Let him say what he means and try and prove something. But it is lamentable and it is scandalous of him to make vague accusations and I ask him to withdraw his remarks.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — We take note of your request and obviously, we will see what transpires.

**Mr Bombard (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I shall go along with everything Mr Beyer de Ryke said, but I should like to say that all I said was that war correspondents have always been left alone in all wars, even the worst of them. But I do not share the conclusion which the Honourable Member draws from it.

**Mr Stirbois (DR).** — *(FR)* Mr President — a simple response to that commentary, which, I believe, came from a Belgian Member.

I shall not retract anything I said. I advise him to take a closer look at the *curricula vitae* of some of the German colleagues in his Group.

*(Applause from the benches of the Group of the European Right)*

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 replacing four motions for resolution<sup>1</sup> and, by successive votes, rejected the motions for resolutions by Mr Stirbois and Mrs De March — Doc. Nos 2-841 and 2-851/84)*

#### 4. Pollution of the sea

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on:<sup>1</sup>

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-793/84) by Mr Staes, on behalf of the Rainbow Group (Agalev), on the non-ratification by Belgium of international conventions on marine pollution;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-815/84) by Mr Roelants du Vivier and others, on the action to be taken on the transportation of 250 kg of plutonium by sea from La Hague to Japan;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-828/84) by Mrs Dury and Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on a call for a European operation to refloat the Mont-Louis;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-830/84) by Mr Walter and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the international North Sea Conference in Bremen;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-840/84) by Mrs Bloch von Blotnitz and others on the protection of the North Sea and the work of the International Con-

<sup>1</sup> Doc. Nos 2-831/84/rev., 2-837/84, 2-842/84 and 2-847/84.

**President**

ference on the protection of the North Sea in October 1984.

**Mr Staes (ARC).** — (NL) Mr President, on several occasions this Parliament, like the Belgian Parliament, has stressed the need for international agreements to improve the safety and control of transport operations, like that involving the Mont Louis.

I do not think this is the first priority. It is our political view that the whole cycle of nuclear fissionable materials must be completely abandoned. The fact remains, however, that thought should also be given to aspects of present transport operations. In this context, the Belgian Secretary of State for Health, Mr Aerts, said in the Belgian Parliament that he is waiting for European conventions in this field. I attach considerable importance to his complaint about the European Community, and I therefore find it all the more surprising that Belgium itself has still not managed to ratify international conventions relating to such incidents as that involving the Mont Louis. You can see from my motion for a resolution which conventions are concerned, although the 1973 London Convention and the 1974 Paris Convention have now appeared in the Belgian Official Journal. But this does not mean that the provisions contained in these conventions have already become policy in Belgium, because implementing decisions still have to be taken.

Nothing has yet been done about the other four international conventions. One of them, Mr President, dates back to 1972. Let me give you an example of the speed with which implementing decisions follow the framework laws which appear in Belgium's Official Journal. The framework law of 28 December 1964 concerning measures to prevent air pollution is still a dead letter because the implementing decisions have not yet been published. This year thus marks the 20th anniversary of inactivity and deliberate blocking of the democratic decision-making process in Belgium. Furthermore, Belgium has something of a reputation where environmental policy is concerned: in 16 of the 62 actions brought before the European Court of Justice against countries which have not enforced the Community's environmental directives, the Belgian Government is the defendant. Belgium and Italy are thus the champions in this area.

To conclude, I do not believe that this can be regarded as interference in Belgium's internal affairs. What we are talking about here after all is the application of international conventions.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

*Vice-President*

**Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC).** — (FR) Mr President, a fleet accompanying a vessel containing 250 kg of

plutonium is currently moving across the Atlantic towards the Panama Canal. The purpose of the resolution put before you today is to ban the transportation of plutonium by sea. Why? Because of the inherent danger of navigation — and we know from the Mont-Louis what that means and it could be worse with plutonium. Then there are two other vital reasons. One, the toxicity of plutonium — we know that a dose of 1.36 microgrammes in the body will cause death in a month. And two, certain factors of proliferation — we know that the plutonium being transported, and it is plutonium 240, is not exactly right for the military to use. But there are highly sophisticated and nonetheless increasingly accessible means, particularly isotopic separation by laser, which now enable us to obtain the purity needed for military purposes.

So this reputedly civil plutonium can in fact be used for military purposes and no rules can do anything about it. Today, both France's and Japan's responsibility *vis-à-vis* the international community is strongly engaged and it must not happen again. But I am trying to exclude the nuclear fuel cycle from this assessment and I call on this House to accept the urgency and make a genuine statement on guaranteeing non-proliferation, i.e. a ban on the international transportation of plutonium, as a ban is the only answer. We know that any control or supervision can be got round. So voting for a ban is a better way of preserving our future and the future of our children.

*(Applause from the benches of the Rainbow Group)*

**Mrs Dury (S).** — (FR) We have already discussed the Mont-Louis in this House, but, as you are no doubt aware, the hull and the wreck of the Mont-Louis — minus the canisters of plutonium hexafluoride — are still near the Belgian coast. That creates two kinds of danger.

First, the danger of maritime accidents, particularly in a zone where, because of the abundant fish, there are many fishing boats.

Second, the danger implied in the fact that the Mont-Louis still contains hydrocarbons — 25 t have been removed, but there is still something like 80 t left, and you know the damage pollution of this sort can cause.

We have a legal vacuum here at the moment and it is the Belgian taxpayer who is likely to have to pay for the consequences. The *Compagnie générale maritime* does not have to remove the wreck and the Belgian Government has to take responsibility, thereby making citizens who have nothing to do with the accident pay for the material consequences.

Mr President, I think we need to create Community laws on the protection of the maritime environment, as we have done for fisheries. We regret the present legal vacuum, but, in tabling my resolution, I launch an

**Dury**

appeal for Community solidarity *vis-à-vis* Belgium, so the European Community can help with financing the refloating of the wreck. It is costing Belgium a great deal and I think a Community financial contribution to the operation to remove the wreck would be a very useful gesture.

Just now I said we should go beyond this financial solidarity and think about the legal side of things and the fact that a European Environmental Community is perhaps called for. That is the meaning of a certain number of amendments I am asking this House to support.

That will not have taken more than my two minutes, Mr President — one more reason for asking the Honourable Members to vote for my resolution.

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — My intervention is a point of order in that it is correcting misinformation. That wreck is empty. Why bother to refloat it? Not one microgramme of uranium hexafluoride escaped. It was all recovered.

**President.** — That was not really a point of order, but now that you have already spoken, there is nothing I can do about it.

**Mr Walter (S).** — (DE) Mr President, our reasons for once more placing the subject of pollution of the North Sea on the agenda for this week's part session are threefold. Reason number one is the International Conference on the Protection of the North Sea to be held next week in Bremen. Reason number two is our fear that this Conference will achieve nothing — a question of 'high cost, low return' — and reason number three is our impression that the European Parliament's demands of January last for protection of the North Sea are being steadfastly ignored by both Commission and Council of Ministers.

I have seen the draft communiqué of this North Sea Conference which is being held next week. It contains expressions such as 'Being conscious of . . .', 'In the knowledge that . . .', 'Being concerned that . . .', 'Being convinced that . . .', 'In the expectation that . . .', 'examination must be made . . .', 'efforts must be made as soon as possible . . .', 'international contacts must be continued and intensified . . .'

If that is the result, ladies and gentlemen, I tell you the North Sea will be drowned in a sea of resolutions and the Member States of the European Community will have contributed to its ruin.

(Applause)

Those responsible for physical pollution of the North Sea are known, and I am not concerned with them for the moment. But blame also attaches to those in politi-

cal circles: they are also known, and regrettably they include the Commission and the Council of Ministers. In January the European Parliament voted in favour of an International Conference on the Protection of the North Sea, as an effective international legal instrument. And will the Commission and Council be making a proposal on the matter at this Conference? No! Parliament also voted in January for an International North Sea Police. And will the Commission and Council be making a proposal on this at the North Sea Conference? No!

The billion dollar question in today's debate is this: what stinks more, the North Sea itself or the absence of initiatives by the Commission and Council of Ministers? I tell you initiatives prompted by public opinion have done more to protect the North Sea than all the Member States of the European Community put together.

(Applause)

And so a resolution of the kind being put forward today, though hardly world shattering, will at least demonstrate to these conferences that the European Parliament backs such initiatives.

In conclusion let me say just this. In the past we have seen many summit meetings concerned with the interests of the agricultural lobby. We have never had a summit which advanced the cause of environmental protection. And so I say that if the Commission and Council had devoted as much energy to promoting environmental protection as they have to decisions on more and more agricultural subsidies, we should have fewer problems with the North Sea. I therefore ask you to approve this resolution.

(Applause)

**Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC).** — (DE) The Wadden Sea and river estuaries of the North Sea are now beginning to die too. Without hesitation heavy metals such as lead, copper and chromium are dumped into the sea. By this route alone it receives every year 8 million tonnes of industrial waste, 10 million tonnes of sewage and 1.3 million tonnes of acid. This is quite apart from radioactive waste and oil dumped at sea from container ships because this is still the cheapest way of cleaning them. We really cannot stand by and see yet another important biotope destroyed, with the North Sea dying off as our forests are dying off. We must all acknowledge our joint responsibility here, and we must press urgently for international agreements to be concluded — and more importantly, adhered to — for there are a large number of international agreements of this kind already in existence.

Use of the North Sea as a dumping ground for dilute acids, radioactive waste, etc. should be stopped immediately. Existing and future industrial complexes

**Bloch von Blottnitz**

in coastal regions should be subjected to an environmental impact test. The Wadden Sea, a unique biotope, should be placed under international protection. It would really be disastrous and irresponsible if joint agreements to protect the North Sea continued to be sacrificed to industrial interests, for the end cost of such action is always higher than the profit gained. I also believe that the damage done to this rare and exceptional ecosystem will be even greater unless political action is taken, and taken at once. This, unfortunately, is what nearly always happens, and I find such irresponsibility very sad. Let us therefore jointly strive to prevent yet another of our vital environmental heritages from being irretrievably destroyed. Let us not allow the North Sea to die as our forests are dying.

*(Applause from the Rainbow Group)*

**Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I have two requests. Firstly, may we please vote at once, and, secondly, would you please remind Mr Walter that agricultural subsidies are of benefit not to farmers but to agriculture!

**President.** — I cannot accede to your request since the agenda is now adopted and cannot be changed.

**Mrs Dury (S).** — *(FR)* No change to the agenda is involved in my asking for an immediate vote on the resolutions that have just been tabled. I think it would be a useful thing for this House to do. I should also like to see those Members who wanted to speak being invited to submit their speeches in writing.

**President.** — It is not possible to make statements in writing. We worked out the procedure this morning. Once a matter has been decided, it cannot be altered: *Roma locuta, causa finita.*

We shall now adjourn the debate on topical and urgent questions, as agreed. However, I shall now call Commissioner Pisani under Rule 66(5) according to which a Member of the Commission can speak at any time.

**Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission.** — *(FR)* Mr President, the House has been forced to alter its agenda and it is putting the rest of the urgent debates off until this evening. I am unable to be there. I should like to say that I was here yesterday morning, that I went back to Brussels to the Lomé negotiations, that I came back here again this morning to answer questions at the prescribed date and time and that I have to go back to Brussels to negotiate again. So I ask the House to forgive me for being unable to be in Brussels and Strasbourg at the same time.

I realize the constraints the MPs themselves have to contend with. I know they have experience of being unable to be in several places at once and I know they will forgive me.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — We take your point, Commissioner. One cannot be in two places at the same time. There are, however, colleagues who are *not* present in several places at the same time! But you are not one of them.

*(Applause)*

We shall now break off the debate on topical and urgent questions and move on to the supplementary budget. Should the budgetary debate be concluded before 1 p.m., we shall resume the urgency debate. If not, the urgency debate will resume after completion of the voting this afternoon. We must allow up to two hours for the vote.

**Mr Chanterie (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, what Commissioner Pisani has just said is for me, and I believe for all Members, yet another reason for urgent action to move Parliament's seat to the place where the Commission and Council of Ministers work.

**President.** — That was not exactly a point of order, that was national self-interest, Mr Chanterie!

*(Laughter)*

##### 5. Supplementary budget No 1/84

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is draft supplementary and amending budget No 1/84 of the European Community for the financial year 1984, as amended by the Council on 24 October 1984 (Doc. 2-900/84).

**Mrs Scrivener, rapporteur.** — *(FR)* Mr President, Honourable Members, after the conciliation meeting with the Council yesterday afternoon, we can now get on with the second reading of the supplementary budget. It will only have taken a short time for this budget to be adopted and the extra funds needed to be implemented.

This budget, of course, is not the one we would have liked, but I should still like to thank the President-in-Office, of the Council for the efforts that have meant that the whole procedure could be completed in this time.

On the question of the substance of the budget, the Council has recognized that some of the decisions we

### Scrivener

took at the first reading are well-founded. It has accepted amendments and modifications Nos 18, 19 and 20 on the reserve chapters and it has accepted proposed modification No 6 on implementing the Christmas butter operation.

However, the Council has rejected the amendments Parliament tabled on revenue and it justifies its decision by advancing a number of arguments of unequal weight. The first, which we cannot go along with, is that, in the present economic situation, our estimates of resources are profoundly uncertain. The revenue in the budget is never anything more than a forecast, it is true, but at the end of October, we shall have information from the Commission that is reliable enough for the danger of erroneous forecasts to be substantially reduced.

The second argument is presented as being legal in nature. The Council feels that Article 203 of the Treaty, which lays down the amendment procedure, only covers non-compulsory expenditure. Neither the Committee on Budgets nor Parliament share this view. On the contrary, they feel that the amendment procedure is a general one and the modification procedure is a special procedure for compulsory expenditure.

That is a divergence in interpretation of the Treaties that seems to us to be more political than legal.

Lastly, and this is the focal point, the Council thinks that the volume of the advances — and you remember the amount, 1 003 thousand million — which the Member States make in the light of an intergovernmental agreement cannot be altered. This only concerns amendments Nos 14 and 15. But it is most important to stress that some Member States are querying not just the size of the advances, but their commitment to pay them.

The Committee on Budgets thought that Parliament could not run the risk of a further budgetary conflict with the Council over a supplementary budget — which would start up the arguments between the States again and compromise implementation of the funds we feel to be necessary.

This is why, in its wisdom, the Committee on Budgets suggests that we do not bring up amendments Nos 14 and 15 in the second reading. And in return, it suggests you amend the Council decisions on amendments nos 16 and 17 — i.e. bring them back in fact.

Amendment No 16 is only a sensible point of information. The 1984 surplus is only a forecast and of course cannot mean an actual surplus.

I have only two things to say about amendment No 17. One, coherence forces us to retable this, as there are no longer any appropriations in Chapter 100 and the available surplus will not reach the 500 million the Council proposes.

So this cut in revenue should be made up for by an increase in customs duties so that, on this point at least, the 1984 budget balances. Then, and this is a problem of principle, one of our essential aims is to preserve the new policies and structural funds. If we accepted the 500 million ECU-worth of savings the Council suggests, we would seriously compromise these policies.

We are reducing the savings the Council wanted to make on the NCE that have been voted.

Honourable Members, these then are the proposals which the Committee on Budgets wishes to submit following the meeting between the Parliament delegation and the Council of Ministers.

Although these proposals do not satisfy us entirely, we do feel they make it possible to respond to a number of our essential concerns and that the budget procedure will come to a successful conclusion from this point of view.

We are all well aware that politics is the art of the possible.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Dankert (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, sometimes the wisdom of the Committee on Budgets must be questioned. I will try to explain. Yesterday evening we had disappointing consultations with the Council, which resulted in no more than our amendments and proposed modifications on the expenditure side being accepted. This may sound positive, but it is not, because the Council, by sticking to the 500 m ECU cut in the 1984 budget, has in fact merely made a gesture and in fact given nothing away in 1984. By reducing commitment appropriations, the Council has simply shown that it is willing to make things even more difficult in 1985. I completely agree with Mrs Scrivener that we must draw the logical conclusions from the Council's conciliatory attitude by again voting on the amendments that were originally tabled by the Committee on Budgets, which increased the amounts again yesterday. In this respect, therefore, the Socialist Group endorses the approach suggested by Mrs Scrivener.

But I do not think this is enough. I hope that the approach for which the Committee on Budgets has opted will result in Parliament being able to strengthen its position in the discussion on budgetary discipline that is now in progress in the Council. I hope that, by adopting these amendments, Parliament will gain acceptance for this procedure. But I do not think that they are certain to achieve this. The Socialist Group therefore feels that the other amendments, those concerning the revenue side of the budget, which were adopted by this Parliament the day before yesterday, should also be readopted.

### Dankert

We have tabled these amendments again for the reason I have already given and also because this Parliament made it very clear in the resolution we adopted the day before yesterday, in the amendments we adopted, that we consider the estimates on the revenue side of the budget to be realistic. We cannot have a procedure whereby one estimate needs to be realistic and others do not. That would impair the cohesiveness of our position. Hence the need for this 500 m in agricultural levies to be reinstated.

Mr President, the Committee on Budgets does not want to tamper with the 1 000 m ECU mentioned in the intergovernmental agreement. I do not understand why, because I still do not know what this 1 000 m ECU is for. At all events, two governments have made their contributions subject to various conditions. And as long as these conditions apply, I feel it will be extremely difficult to regard the 1 000 m in this supplementary budget as revenue for the budget. In other words, this 1984 supplementary budget does not have a sound financing basis and, as I see it, this also raises a number of questions regarding the legality of this supplementary budget. The farmers in the Member States will notice that this budget does not mean that they can be paid, this certainly being true of Member States which depend on revenue from the Community to finance their agricultural policies, which, in other words, pay less into this budget than they get out of it. I also think that the President of Parliament must reconsider the soundness of the legal basis for this 1 000 m.

**Mr Cornelissen (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking the Council of Ministers on behalf of my group for agreeing to a number of amendments and in particular to the proposal that 150 m ECU should be made available for the Christmas butter campaign.

But, Mr President, my group is also critical of the rejection of various other proposed modifications and specifically of amendments Nos 16 and 17.

My group feels that the Council and Parliament share the responsibility and authority for the establishment of the budget. By definition a budget consists of expenditure and revenue. We therefore consider it a serious matter that the Council should want to meddle with Parliament's right to join in the decision-making on the Community's revenue. In its response the Council itself refers to the need for balance between revenue and expenditure.

Yesterday my group said that it cannot accept the 500 m ECU reduction in non-compulsory expenditure proposed by the Council unless a sound and convincing explanation is given. I refer to my statement yesterday, when I presented our arguments in this respect.

As I have said before, these resources are intended for a European approach to such problems as unemploy-

ment, poverty in the Third World and the threat to our environment. We maintain this viewpoint and again condemn the Council's refusal to withdraw this reduction.

The Council's reply confirms our view that we have provided sound cover with customs duties. On behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group I therefore make an urgent appeal to the Council to meet Parliament half-way in this matter so that we can strengthen the European approach to our problems, for which our constituents elected us not so long ago.

I should just like to say a few words about Mr Dankert's statement. I cannot help but think that, if the Dankert line is followed, it is highly unlikely that there will be a supplementary budget and the Community will then lack the resources it needs to meet its payment commitments. The farmers of Europe will then be left to foot most of the bill. Contrary to what he suggests, the farmers will be the ones to pay the bill if Parliament adopts the Dankert line. I make an urgent appeal to the Members of this Parliament not to agree to Mr Dankert's approach.

**Lord Douro (ED).** — Mr President, my group will be supporting the recommendation made by Mrs Scrivener on behalf of the Committee on Budgets. We believe that the European Parliament does have a right to alter the revenue side of budget. We believe that a proper interpretation of Article 203 leads to this conclusion. We also felt that the Council's arbitrary reduction by 500 m ECU of the non-obligatory expenditure in this current year was unacceptable.

Amendment No 17 has the effect of not only increasing the revenue based on perfectly justifiable estimates, which have been confirmed as to their accuracy, as Mrs Scrivener said, until the end of October by the Commission, but also reducing the reduction made by the Council in non-obligatory expenditure. If we had agreed to the 500 m ECU reduction by the Council, we would have been obliterating and nullifying all the amendments adopted by Parliament last December to the 1984 budget.

The other important advantage of Amendment No 17 is that it does leave untouched the intergovernmental agreement for 1 003 m ECU. I realize that there are many misgivings about that intergovernmental agreement, but the practicality is that we did not foresee any chance of changing that figure. Any attempt to do so would therefore have led to a budget which the Commission might not have been able to execute. So, the intergovernmental agreement is preserved. At the same time Parliament is making a firm stand in support of its budgetary powers, and my group is happy to support that action by Parliament. We believe in Parliament's budgetary powers and think that what Parliament will probably do at 3 p.m. this afternoon is an important step in establishing Parliament's right over the revenue side of the budget.

**Mrs Barbarella (COM).** — (IT) Mr President, we believe that the European Parliament must stand firm on its original position, on what appear to us to be two essential points.

The first is the reaffirmation of Parliament's right of action where the revenue side of the Community's budget is concerned.

The second point is the existence, in the 1984 supplementary budget, of an albeit very slender nucleus of structural expenditure.

For this reason we agree to accept the proposals of the rapporteur, Mrs Scrivener, that we should today adopt the supplementary budget, with two amendments: No 17 and No 16. This, in our view, will enable the President of the Parliament to sign and hence adopt the 1984 supplementary budget, making possible its immediate implementation in terms that will allow us to stand firm on the obligations that we had *vis-a-vis* the farming world.

**Mr De Vries (L).** — (NL) Mr President, my group will be voting for draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 for 1984, but with considerable reluctance because the Council of Ministers has set in motion the renationalization of the Community budget and also because it is not yet clear whether the Council will be keeping to its own agreements, at least one Member State having made the actual payment of advances conditional on budgetary discipline, of which there is not yet the slightest sign.

We shall nonetheless give our approval, Mr President, for two reasons: firstly, because Parliament must again make it clear that it has just as much power over the revenue side of the Community budget; secondly, because we have succeeded in persuading the Council to withdraw many of its proposals for reductions in non-compulsory expenditure.

Mr President, when the repayment to the United Kingdom for 1983 was under discussion, Parliament kept its word. Parliament is again showing that it is willing and able to assume responsibility for the satisfactory functioning of the Community where this supplementary budget for 1984 is concerned. We are doing our duty, but we also call on the Council to accept its responsibility when we come to discuss the draft 1985 budget in the very near future. We of this Parliament, Mr President, will not fail to do our duty.

**Mr Pasty (RDE).** — (FR) Mr President, Honorable Members, the supplementary budget for 1984, as it emerged after the deliberations of the Council of Ministers, is obviously not satisfactory in that it contains no positive trend, no progress in the matter of revenue.

As a result, the criticism we brought during the first reading is maintained in full and we should like to say,

once again, that this is a manipulated budget that will complicate the 1985 budget year.

But our prime concern is the working of the Community institutions from now until the end of the year and, essentially, the continuation of payments to farmers in accordance with decisions taken as part of the common agricultural policy.

We think it would be irresponsible to run the risk of this supplementary budget being thrown out, as this would mean agricultural payments would stop.

So we fully support the position outlined by the rapporteur of the Committee on Budgets. Mrs Scrivener and our Group will be voting for the supplementary budget this afternoon, with the amendments agreed on by the Committee on Budgets and our rapporteur.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — (DE) Mr President, what we are watching is a repeat performance of the scenario played out in the last Parliament. The budget debate began with all sides proclaiming their resolve to stand firm. But when the debate was over and the time came during the second reading to put their money where their mouth was, there was suddenly a deathly hush in many parts of the House. Exactly the same thing is happening again now!

During the first reading of the budget we said loudly and at length that the budget figures submitted by the Council are simply not right. The Commission's revenue estimates were right — and the Council is wrong. Unfortunately everyone knows that this is the case. The Council knows its figures are wrong, the Commission knows the Council's figures are wrong, and every group in this House knows it too. And so it was really perfectly logical that we should adopt in the second reading Amendments 14 and 15 which we had previously adopted by a large majority in the first reading. But now — I don't know whether deliberately or simply out of ignorance of our budget procedure — this House is acting as if the intention today were to reject the budget. But this is not the intention. None of the groups has declared that it intends to reject the budget. No group has indicated that it cannot approve this budget. The only intent has been to confirm the amendments adopted in the first reading. After that it is to the Council, together with the President of this House, to decide whether the agreed budget can be endorsed. If this proves impossible because the Council insists that this endorsement be withheld, then it will be the Council which has rejected the budget and not Parliament. All those who propose today to reject Amendments 14 and 15 which we adopted last time cannot claim that they wish to approve the budget: they are simply seeking to save the Council from the embarrassment of showing itself in its true colours at last.

So often we have heard it said 'we don't want to fight it out with the Council over this supplementary

**Arndt**

budget; we'll wait for the general budget'. And each time when it came to the general budget we said 'now we'll demand a supplementary budget because the general budget isn't right, and we'll fight over the supplementary budget'. Then when it comes to the next supplementary budget we again say 'no, we won't fight now'. Parliament has a chance to show this afternoon whether it has the necessary courage or whether it has lost it.

I would remind you again of this year's elections to the European Parliament. If it transpires again this afternoon that its members, or most of them, back down, then those who boycotted the elections on 14 or 17 June and stayed at home because they didn't have much faith in this Assembly were right to do so. The Socialist Group will therefore table again Amendments 14 and 15 which were approved last time by a majority vote, and we shall see whether this House is at last able to act in a way which does justice to Europe.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Just a technical point: Amendments Nos 14 and 15 cited by Mr Arndt are now Amendments Nos 3 and 4.

**Mr Langes (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I hope that Mr Arndt will be asking for a vote by roll call this afternoon on the original Amendments 14 and 15. I shall be extremely interested to see what effect the strong words addressed here by the Chairman and spokesman of the Socialist Group to all the other groups will have had on his own group. For I really think it is somewhat irrelevant of Mr Arndt to harp on the question of courage or — as Mr Dankert would have it — the question of logic.

It must be clear to all of us that our discussion of the supplementary budget is not a normal budget debate. We are currently faced with a very difficult situation in which it is known that the European Community is running out of money. We have to find a way of stopping it from doing so and the proposal by the Committee on Budgets has achieved this. I would remind Mr Dankert that it was approved by an overwhelming majority, and I would be rather wary of claiming that those who voted for it did so against all logic. I agree with him that a majority vote by no means equals a logical solution, but I cannot accept the converse that the minority represents the logical solution and the majority the illogical solution.

The fact that this decision was endorsed by an overwhelming majority shows that we are fully aware of the need for such a step. And what Mr Dankert omitted to make clear is that Amendments 17 and 16, as Mr Cornelissen also said, contain the two parts of substance for which Parliament has been pressing and

which take us far beyond that which the Council has now conceded in its consultations with us: our altering of the revenue side of the budget. Parliament is exercising its right to alter the revenue side also. Secondly, we do not accept that the non-obligatory part is the part where the Council can make its savings. Consequently we are only prepared to agree to a reduction to some 250 million ECU. I think, though, that Mr Dankert should state very clearly that these two amendments, as tabled here and approved by the Budgets Committee by a large majority, constitute the essence of this Parliament's activities for 1985. Mr Rudi Arndt is certainly familiar with Kleist's 'Michael Kohlhaas', but Mr Dankert should perhaps be urged to read it, because our job is not only to discuss and to criticize this Community but also to keep it viable.

*(Applause from the centre)*

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I don't think anyone doubts the need for a supplementary budget for 1984 any longer. You only need to have listened to our discussion to be convinced. But I think there is something outmoded in this debate. We have already said it all on the form and on the substance of the supplementary budget. But there are apparently Members here who are inclined to take any opportunity for a scrap with the Council. God knows they will get the chance when we talk about the budget for 1985. But at this stage in the proceedings, should we carry on fuelling pointless procedural arguments in a vain attempt to get one or two extra powers just when the circumstances require us to take urgent decisions? We feel that the only decision that has to be taken without further ado is for the Community to keep its promises to the farmers. If you consult the farmers' organizations, you can see they have had enough of being scapegoats or the subject of horse-trading. And that is why we shall not be voting for the amendments by the Socialist Group — which, to our mind, are a source or a danger of blockage. They would perhaps delay things and they contain the seeds of a further attack on the common agricultural policy. That is the position we shall be adopting on the supplementary and amending budget for 1984.

**Mr d'Ormesson (DR).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the Group of the European Right will be voting for the Scrivener report and Amendment Nos 16 and 17. It appreciates her position and her courage in a difficult situation. But our group has considerable reservations as to the European Council's position, the lethargy in which it plunges this Parliament and the way it blocks off avenues to the future.

It is true that the European Council was forced to take our position into account and it is up to us to rouse public opinion. The problems awaiting us are so important that it is worth the effort. The Group of the European Right will state its position and take up arms on the occasion of the 1985 budget.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (*GR*) Mr President, on the occasion of this debate I should like to bring up a more specific matter, which affects the overall approval of the draft supplementary budget, in other words its ratification by the national parliaments. I am bringing the matter up because in Greece's case the Greek Government has adopted no specific position, and we believe that as in other countries, the draft should come before Parliament for debate and be voted upon, since it represents a burden on the national budget and because the requested supplementary finance, amounting to approximately 1 billion ECU, is a product of intergovernmental agreement, and does not flow from the obligations consequent upon accession to the EEC. I think the Greek Constitution also shares this spirit. And I think the Greek Parliament should use the opportunity to take into account a series of developments, such as financial discipline, which are becoming established for reasons connected with the Community's budget and which not only do not improve Greece's relative position, but rather pose a threat to established rights such as Greece's obligations to the common budget.

**Mr Cot (S), chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (*FR*) Mr President, the subject was not worth any more in terms of this brief debate. I should first like to thank the Council for diligently examining Parliament's amendments and proposed modifications so the whole procedure could be completed in the prescribed time. I was rather insistent about the need for our respective institutions to take the necessary steps. I think we have all kept our word and I am very pleased about it.

I should also like to thank the Commission for contributing both to the drafting of this supplementary budget and, I should say, to the shaping of Parliament's position on this. I am thinking particularly of the Commission's confirmation of Mrs Scrivener's estimates of customs revenue which are the basis for the old Article 17. I think that the Commission should have Parliament's thanks here.

Mrs Scrivener has explained the position of the Committee on Budgets — I shall not return to this — and she has emphasized why our Committee maintained a position which I think is marked by a desire to be discerning and responsible in relation to the serious budgetary problems the Community has to deal with. Mr President, I should like, simply and briefly, to return to a question of principle which is not just political but legal too and that is our Parliament's right — duty, I should say — to be involved in the definition, not just of the expenditure but the revenue too. This, I think, is essential at a time when the Community budget is, as it were, becoming more a question of revenue than expenditure — because that is how the journalists put it, in a succinct but rather evocative way — and when people in some circles are talking about the need to determine the volume of revenue at the

beginning of the budget procedure rather than at the end as the Treaties currently have it. And at a time when, in other terms, a change in the Community's budgetary concepts is emerging in the whole debate, I think it is very important, as far as both principles and our political debate are concerned, to reaffirm our position on the determination of revenue over the coming weeks and months. The texts, I should remind you, are clear. Article 203 affirms the joint responsibility of Parliament and the Council as budget authorities and only makes one exception, namely the one on compulsory expenditure, where our role is to propose modifications and not amendments. But elsewhere, the right of amendment of Parliament, the joint budget authority, is untouched. This principle was affirmed on 15 December 1983 by this House when it voted on the 1984 budget and it should be reaffirmed today. The adoption of the amendments proposed by the Committee on Budgets — and this goes for the Socialist Group's proposed amendments too — will be a reaffirmation of this principle and, I should say, practical application of Parliament's right to be involved in the definition of revenue. Mr President, I think this reassertion of our prerogative here is particularly necessary at the present time.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at 3 p.m.

#### 6. *Topical and urgent debate (continuation)*

##### *Pollution of the sea (continuation)*

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S).** — (*NL*) Mr President, on behalf of very many Members of this Parliament I protest against the way in which the House conducts its proceedings. Every agenda is disrupted for various reasons. Debates are constantly interrupted. How do you expect the public and the press to understand what is going on? Who knows when we shall now be voting on this item. We simply cannot go on like this.

Mr President, for two years I have vainly been asking the Council and Commission to consider the steadily deteriorating situation in the North Sea. I have always come up against a kind of cynical attitude, something like: 'Where are your troops?' But every cloud has a silver lining. The wreck of the *Mont-Louis* has shown where the troops are: they are behind us, and for years they have been calling for thought to be given to the problems which the Community specifically faces in the North Sea. I will just list the points we consider particularly important.

Firstly, the need for all Member States of the Community to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Secondly, Commissioner Narjes

recently agreed with me at long last that there should be a specific instrument to govern the North Sea, a North Sea Convention which covers the discharge of waste, environmental policy, the problems connected with the North Sea coasts, the problems connected with the rivers that empty into the North Sea, the problems raised by pollution caused by transport operations and the burning of waste and the problems connected with accidents that occur in the North Sea.

The existing international legal instrument must be ratified. We need a legal instrument that deals more specifically with the North Sea. But what we also need are various ways and means of enforcing the law. I again call for the question of a North Sea police force to be considered. Its task should be both to ensure the safety of the inhabitants of the North Sea coasts and of passengers on ships in the North Sea and to monitor activities in the North Sea. At the moment hundreds of qualified pilots are out of work, and they could surely be used for this kind of activity.

**Mr Späth (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the North Sea has become virtually an inland waterway of the European Community. We should all be glad of this and also feel a joint responsibility. The North Sea is mainly threatened in the areas around the estuaries of the major rivers which flow into it, if we continue as we have done hitherto. Our colleague Mrs Maij-Weggen made this clear in her report on the North Sea at the beginning of this year.

A few figures at this point. 400 000 ships a year pass through the English Channel and continue to use the North Sea and the ocean as a dumping ground. 160 000 tonnes of oil a year are discharged into the North Sea, 70 % of them from the rivers, i.e. from the land.

There are many other instances to be deplored and criticized here. But I should like to mention especially the Wadden Sea and the question of polderization. In our opinion it must still be possible in future to build dykes and dams to protect human beings and ensure nature conservancy, for this is essential if human beings are to go on living there and if this very vulnerable and valuable region is to be preserved.

People living in the coastal regions remember the severe flooding of the last 30 years in Holland and the North Sea coastal areas, and they also remember the assistance rendered by our armed forces, our soldiers, in the time of their greatest need. This must also be borne in mind when military activities are mentioned in this context.

We have tabled an amendment to the motion for a resolution by Mr Walter and others of the Socialist Group. I would beg you most earnestly to support this amendment.

*(Applause from the centre)*

**Mrs Ewing (RDE).** — On behalf of my group I have great pleasure in supporting the resolutions before us on the threat to the North Sea. I suppose one could say all seas are threatened. But the North Sea is a particularly important sea for many of us and a great supplier of protein.

The seas are a sacred trust we all share and yet we are witnessing all kinds of pollution destroying this source of protein in a world where a third of the people are starving. This is not to be tolerated.

One of the resolutions, I notice, condemns Belgium for not ratifying a particular convention. But if one cares to look at all the conventions involving the sea, one will find a few other Member States, including my own, who have not ratified very important conventions.

Parliament produced an excellent code of conduct in the resolution on substandard tankers which are floating giants threatening us all at all times. The oil companies are greater offenders here since they prefer often the cheapness of a substandard tanker from Panama or Liberia, thereby putting us all in danger. The dumping practices that were mentioned by speakers are usually perpetrated by such tankers. It is time, as I think Madam Dury said, for a legislation framework to come from this Community. We could produce very practical propositions such as if, for example, Sullom Voe in Shetland turns away a substandard tanker, as it does from time to time, for malpractice or inefficiency, it would not be allowed to enter any other Community port.

We really will need to get down to such practical propositions or we fail in the sacred trust.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Chanterie (PPE).** — *(NL)* When we consider what legislation already exists, we might be impressed by the many national and international laws designed to protect the North Sea and the rivers which empty into it. Today we cannot help thinking that this multiplicity is in fact a sign of weakness and a serious obstacle. I have counted 13 international conventions, 11 European directives and 17 national laws. Enforcement and control are quite obviously causing problems. I therefore take this opportunity to repeat our proposal that Community action should be taken as a matter of urgency to harmonize the existing legislation on the protection of the North Sea and transform it into a single North Sea convention, which should also eliminate the loopholes in the present legislation. This should be the aim at the international North Sea conference to be held in Bremen on 30 October.

Secondly, I want to talk about the Dury-Arndt motion for a resolution, the spirit of which my group — if I might ask Mrs Dury to listen for a moment —

### Chanteric

endorses. By this I mean that we propose that it should be referred to the appropriate parliamentary committee so that the matter can be discussed in depth. This is, after all, a fairly complex legal subject which we cannot decide on this morning simply by taking a vote. The wreck of the *Mont-Louis* lies in international waters for which Belgium is responsible, particularly as regards fishing and safety at sea. This in fact conflicts with what you, Mrs Dury, have said in paragraph 1 of your resolution.

On the other hand — and we must admit that the resolution is right in this respect — France, and specifically the *Compagnie Générale Maritime*, has a responsibility and should pay its share of the salvage costs. A well reasoned report, in which we might also stress the role of the European Community, might make a major contribution to the satisfactory resolution of such affairs in the future. This is an important task for the European Community because a precedent is at stake. We shall therefore be endorsing the spirit of the Dury motion for a resolution. But we formally request that it be referred back to the appropriate committee.

**Mrs Viehoff (S).** — (NL) Mr President, in the early 1970s one of the environmental movements in the Netherlands put up posters depicting a foetus in a womb. The posters said: 'If we are going to pollute our waters for our economy, let's go the whole hog.' Sick it may have been, but it reflected the serious concern felt by many people at the time about the pollution of our environment.

It is sometimes said that if you stick a spade in the ground in the Netherlands, you will strike toxic waste. This may be an exaggeration, but the public have been forced to pay thousands of millions of guilders to clear up the mess. Houses have been evacuated and demolished, with all the human misery this entails. Clearly, not many lessons have been learnt.

The pollution of the North Sea is a striking example of this. The Netherlands adjoins Germany in the east, and it is here that a River Rhine that is far from clean enters our country. The polluted Meuse crosses the frontier in the south, and the rest of the Netherlands adjoins the North Sea. The Netherlands performs a kind of transit function for pollution, because these rivers discharge their pollution into the North Sea. There is also a whole range of dangerous substances that are dumped in the North Sea, which, though the world's busiest shipping route, has no coastguard or proper monitoring even though accidents like that involving the *Mont-Louis* can occur. It is inconceivable that something like this should happen to a ship carrying 250 kilogrammes of plutonium to Japan, quite apart from other objections to the transport of plutonium.

Mr President, a unique area like the Dutch Shallows is in serious danger. When will man learn that he forms

part of the ecological whole and that he cannot do with it as he pleases? Mr Chanteric has already said that there are 13 international conventions, 11 European directives and 17 national environmental laws, but there are all kinds of loopholes in the legislation, conventions have not been ratified and waste is dumped illegally. The need for the ratification of the conventions, for the harmonization of legislation and for coordination is obvious, but above all else there must be an international body to ensure that existing legislation and conventions are enforced, as Parliament demanded in January of this year.

Mr President, I sincerely hope that the conference in Bremen on 30 October will produce genuine results and that its final communiqué will not be drawn up before the conference begins, as some cynics are saying.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, this Parliament has already debated the pollution of the North Sea on several occasions. The most comprehensive debate on this subject took place in January 1984, when I had the honour of being the rapporteur and the author of the resolution. I am very pleased to hear so many Members, including some on the Socialist benches, now quoting extensively from this resolution. I am pleased because it again underlines the fact that this resolution was adopted unanimously and because the basic ideas expressed in it are again being emphasized during this debate.

My group therefore fully endorses Mr Walter's resolution which in fact reasserts the thoughts expressed in the January resolution. One of the most important points it makes is the need for an international convention in which all legislation is combined. And here I must join with Mr Walter in asking the Commission why it has not yet drawn up a proposal to this effect and presented it to the conference to be held in Bremen. After all, it more or less promised to do so, and my impression is that this proposal has not been drawn up.

Mr President, I feel we must tackle the Commission on this. I am particularly sorry that Mr Narjes is not here, because he should provide an explanation. I hope his substitute can say something about this. So much for the North Sea conference, which I hope will produce something specific.

I should also like to say something about the resolution tabled by Mr Staes. He says that Belgium has failed to sign a large number of conventions. Mr Staes is right. This point was also emphasized in the January report. Belgium and Italy are the countries which have signed the fewest conventions, but we must not use nationalist arguments to attack these two countries. For that I must criticize Mr Staes to some extent. We must use European arguments. What are the other Member States doing? The other Member States, and

**Maij-Weggen**

particularly companies in other Member States, bring the waste they cannot dump in their own countries or from their own ports to Belgium ports, Zeebrugge having something of a reputation in this respect, and it is then dumped in the North Sea. I believe that we can only use European arguments to persuade Belgium and Italy to observe the international conventions. I feel that should be made absolutely clear.

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

## IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I have a question regarding a point of order which occurred to me this morning when another member of the Bureau was in the chair. However, I wanted to address it to you as President of this House.

I had the impression this morning that the microphone was switched off during exchanges between a number of Members of the Bureau and members of Parliament. Perhaps I am wrong. If the Bureau were to switch off the microphone during a debate, then that would be something entirely new. And so the competent committee should consider whether differences of opinion between the president of the part-session and Members of the House relayed via this technical medium ought not to be discussed properly and perhaps solved by means other than switching off microphones.

**President.** — Mr Rogalla, the Chair has the right to take this step where the speaker has exceeded his speaking time or is dealing with a matter which is not the proper subject of his speech. This can happen where a Member asks to speak on a point of order but, in point of fact, begins a substantive discussion. None the less, this method may only be used as a last resort and I think that in general the Chair is fairly tolerant since quite often speakers exceed their speaking time without being cut off.

You will appreciate that our Assembly's proceedings cannot run smoothly unless speaking time is adhered to since those who exceed their speaking time often do so at the expense of other colleagues whose own speaking time is then reduced. You must understand that this is not a measure taken for the sake of the Chair but for the sake of the efficient organization of our business.

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Mr President, not unconnected with that point of order, this morning your predeces-

sor in the Chair actually allowed what I would characterize as a complete commercial, an advertisement of a meeting that was to be called shortly by one of the Socialist British Members. If this policy is not stopped and if the plug is not pulled, we are going to be subjected to advertisements for cheese, cornflakes, yoghurt and a very great many other products.

**Mr Stewart (S).** — On a point of order, Mr President, I wonder if the Member could actually repeat what that was, because it might give us the information we require for Members to take something really seriously instead of somebody looking like yoghurt.

**President.** — A statement will be included in the Minutes where you will be able to see it for yourself.

**Mr Cryer (S).** — On a point of order, Mr President, I think the Conservative Member over there was referring to me when this morning I tried to help the Chair to distinguish between the great pile of documents that we have by pointing out that I had circulated an invitation to the Trident demonstration against nuclear weapons.

*(Mixed reactions)*

If Members in the Conservative benches cannot distinguish between the life and death of people on this earth and the future of our planet, and yoghurt, they want their brains examined.

*(Protests from the European Democratic benches — Applause from the Socialist Group)*

**President.** — There is no need for discussion among Members.

## 7. Votes

*Draft supplementary budget No 1 for 1984*  
(Second reading)

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I refer to the second reading of the budget for 1984. During it the question was raised as to whether it was right or wrong to vote on a number of amendments and whether they were in accordance with the Treaties. The President chairing the debate said he would not allow one particular amendment because he could not be answerable for it.

Yesterday some members of the Committee on Budgetary Control expressed doubts as to the admissibility of the amendments currently before us. Could you please tell us whether you have any such doubts?

**von der Vring**

I should also like to ask you whether you have any doubts regarding the legality of the budget submitted by the Council.

**President.** — I have no doubt about the legality of these amendments.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Bonde (CDI), in writing.** — (DA) The People's Movement votes against the attempt by Parliament to secure an influence on the revenue side of the budget. Amendments Nos 16 and 17 are in conflict with the Treaty and can thus, at the most, be conceived as a proposal to amend the Treaties. Such proposals have nothing to do with the budget procedure, and we call on the Council of Ministers to halt once and for all Parliament's constant attempts to shift power from the Council and the national parliaments to the European Parliament.

The People's Movement is also opposed to the supplementary budget itself because it raises the Danish contribution for 1984 above the level laid down in the Danish Treaty of Accession.

(Parliament voted on the amendments to the draft supplementary budget)<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

**Interpretation of Rule 116 of the Rules of Procedure**

**Mr Prout (ED).** — Mr President, I am shocked to find I have the right to speak on this amendment, but I will take advantage of the opportunity you have given me so surprisingly.

I speak to the amendment for a very simple reason; that is that on a number of occasions this House is requested by member governments to waive the immunity from prosecution of a Member of this Parliament. At the end of every old Parliament Rule 116 of the Rules of Procedure applies. That is to say 'all business' in Parliament is held to lapse until the new Parliament sits for the first time.

The Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions decided last week that 'all business' should include requests by member governments to waive Members' immunity. My group submits that Rule 116 ought to be interpreted more narrowly than that

because we believe that requests for waiver of immunity from prosecution should not be affected by Rule 116. If they are, it means enormous complications for the Member States involved, including courts having to reassess the legal situation. I therefore ask the House to reconsider the position taken by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, to reverse their interpretation, and to send the matter back to the committee for reconsideration.

**Mr Amadei (S), chairman of the Committee on Procedure and Petitions.** — (IT) Mr President, the committee of which I am chairman has considered, at its meeting held on 16 October, the question raised by the President of the European Parliament in his letter of 17 September, concerning the request to waive the immunity from prosecution of a Member of this Parliament which was received during the previous legislature, and on which the Parliament did not at that time give a decision.

The committee decided unanimously — and Mr Prout was present, and also voted in favour — that requests for the waiver of immunity from prosecution that had been submitted during the previous legislature should be held to have lapsed. As a result, the competent legal authority should submit the request afresh. In fact, Rule 116 of the Rules of Procedure says, and I quote:

'At the end of the last part-session before elections, all requests for advice or opinions, motions for resolutions and questions shall be deemed to have lapsed.

This shall not apply to petitions and communications that do not require a decision.'

In the view of our committee, therefore, there is no doubt whatsoever: Rule 116 lays down and stipulates very clearly what unfinished business shall not be deemed to have lapsed. Such business does not include requests for the waiver of Parliamentary immunity, which, since they call for a vote to be taken, lapse like all the others.

I am reporting to the Assembly the unanimous view that was expressed by our committee.

**Mr Donnez (L).** — (FR) I speak more as rapporteur than on my own behalf and this is with the agreement of Mrs Vayssade, the chairman of the Committee on Legal Affairs.

During the previous term, as you will no doubt remember, Mr President, I had the honour to present a large number of reports on the subject of parliamentary immunity and the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights appointed me again recently to monitor the parliamentary immunity question.

I would not go so far as to say that I am fairly specialized, a little specialized perhaps, but you will allow me

<sup>1</sup> Opinion of the Committee on Budgets:  
— FOR Amendments 1 and 2;  
— AGAINST Amendments 3 and 4.

**Donnez**

to think I know a little bit more about the subject than the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions. My opinion is radically opposed to that of the chairman of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions and I fully approve of what Mr Prout has done!

I fully approve because that committee's interpretation of the Rules of Procedure is far too restrictive and, as far as the facts and any practical achievements are concerned, it leads nowhere.

Legally speaking, first of all, it is far too restrictive because what in fact is the procedure for waiving Members' immunity? There is referral. The matter is referred to you, Mr President, and you transmit it to the relevant committee. We are still at the referral stage and no further.

In this case, when the Committee on Rules of Procedure says that precariousness also comes in to the matter of immunity, I have to say that, really, it is going too far and that the committee should look at the question again even if this means altering the Rules of Procedure to make them clearer.

And on a practical level — and this is most important — it would be a real aberration if we had to follow the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions today, for two reasons. First, the Italian authorities, which referred this dossier to us, could ask why we failed to notice the precariousness of it all in October when we had had the dossier since May. I cannot see how we could make such a decision retroactive either.

Let us go a little further on this practical level. Let us imagine, Mr President, that the House went along with the committee today. Where would it lead us? Well — and I draw the honourable Members' attention to this, so as to show clearly that this case reflects the practical situation — to the Legal Affairs Committee, which was no longer competent to judge, sending it back to you. You, Mr President, then send the dossier back to the Italian Ambassador in Luxembourg, who sends it back to the Italian Ministry of Justice, who sends it back to the relevant Public Prosecutor, who starts the familiar referral procedure and sends it back to you, through the same channels . . .

It would be ludicrous, it would be meaningless and it would discredit us totally with the legal authorities!

We would not be credible if we went in for things like this. I should stress that I fully agree with Mr Prout and the chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee, who is also well placed to give you an opinion. And I am convinced that I am not just giving you my personal opinion here, but the opinion of the whole of the Legal Affairs Committee. From the point of view of the law and from the point of view of the facts, I

would ask you not to go in for such a procedure. The dignity of this House is at stake.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mrs Dury (S).** — *(FR)* We did indeed discuss this matter on the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions. Look at Rule 116 and it is clear that there is a kind of legal void here. But with lapsing, there are no exceptions on the request for parliamentary immunity. So Rule 116 is more or less clear — there is lapsing. And I think there is also a change in the situation of the Members concerned. They are no longer national MPs, so there is a new legal situation and I think the governments ought to reapply for parliamentary immunity.

*(Parliament rejected the interpretation given by the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions)*

**President.** — The question is referred back to the relevant committee.

**Mr Prout (ED).** — Mr President, I wish to make a personal statement pursuant to Rule 67(1) of the Rules of Procedure. The chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions said that I had supported the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure committee at the meeting last week. I often find myself surprised by what I do in my own political life.

*(Laughter)*

But on this occasion I am absolutely sure that I did not support the interpretation of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure.

**President.** — I note the fact.

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. 2-799/84) by Mr Pfennig, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the amended proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 384 fin. — Doc. 2-368/84) for a decision on the system of Community own resources.**

*After the vote on amendments to the Commission proposal*

**Mr Fellermaier (S).** — *(DE)* When voting one sometimes has the feeling of being in a sauna. The lights do nothing for one's well-being — they are a modern health hazard.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Mr Fellermaier, you are suitably attired for the occasion.

*(Laughter)*

But we shall have the lights switched off, all the same.

**Mrs Buchan (S).** — Mr President, can I also say that for those of us in this Chamber who suffer from migraine and who frequently get ill in this building, we should not have to suffer the added problem caused by these lights *all* the time.

**President.** — Mrs Buchan, as you can see the lights have just been switched off and the problem is therefore solved.

*Motion for a resolution*

*Paragraph 1 — Amendment No 35*

**Mr Pfennig (PPE), rapporteur.** — *(DE)* Mr President, I am opposed to any other amendments, because the wording of the resolution tabled by me corresponds to the text which has been approved. Amendments to this text would falsify it.

**Mr Curry (ED).** — Mr President, I hesitate to dispute Mr Pfennig's interpretation, but there were certain quite clear currents in the Committee on Budgets which can be interpreted in the form of additions to this resolution, and I have tabled two, one of which would separate the increase in own resources from enlargement; the other, which would commit the Parliament against a further intergovernmental agreement, and which would reflect fully the majority of feeling of the committee. Therefore it would not be a distortion to take those amendments. I am sorry to insist on this.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — *(DE)* I must ask the rapporteur to state his position on this. There are a number of amendments on the table, including the amendment concerning enlargement to admit Spain and Portugal. Many Members were of the opinion that whilst this could not be included in the Council decision it could and should be included in the resolution as an expression of political will. I should be grateful if the rapporteur would reconsider his position.

**Mr Cot (S), chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — *(FR)* Mr President, the Committee on Budgets has not had time to sum up because of the votes that have just been taken. I think it would be best to put the amendments to the vote one at a time.

I think that would be the wise thing to do.

*Paragraph 4 — Amendment No 39*

**Mr Simmonds (ED).** — Mr President, I wonder whether you, like me, are having trouble in noting how some Members of this House are voting. In particular my former constituents in Midlands-West are most anxious to know how their Member is voting this afternoon, and I cannot see from here how he is voting. I wonder if you could ask Members to vote more clearly.

**President.** — Mr Simmonds, we have just had two successive electronic votes. The result is clear.

As to knowing how each Member of the Assembly has voted, there is only one procedure possible: pursuant to the Rules a request must be made for a roll-call vote.

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Oppenheim (ED).** — *(DA)* On behalf of the four Danish conservative Members, I should like to make the following points: we vote for this report from Mr Pfennig for three main reasons. First of all, we realize that the report is the result of very thorough deliberations on the part of the committee, and indeed it must be acknowledged that the Committee on Budgets has produced an impressive piece of work. Secondly, the content of the report reflects the principles and budgetary procedure which is a natural consequence of Parliament's overall responsibility and wishes from the European point of view. Thirdly, the report ensures Parliament's participation in the decision-making process which must necessarily take place when the Community's finances are in question. It is important in that connection that Parliament's control function and Parliament's influence on the use of Community resources should not be devalued. It is after all the taxpayers' money we are handling.

On one particular issue, the Danish conservatives have a different attitude to that adopted by the group as a whole, and that is the question of the repayments. We support the view of the Committee on Budgets that the actual refunds should be entered on the expenditure side, and it is a point of view with which we have acquainted the group on previous occasions but which we feel we must stick to, having regard also to our position on the report as a whole.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — The British Labour Members of this Parliament will vote against the Pfennig report, because it upsets the agreement at Fontainebleau and places the United Kingdom rebate at risk.

## Castle

Now that does not mean that they think the Fontainebleau agreement was a good one. On the contrary, Mrs Thatcher gave away far more than she got and certainly did not obtain all the contribution rebate that she boasted she would insist on having. But at least it was a step towards correcting the imbalance of contributions on the revenue side.

We as Socialists want to see a different method of financing the Community. We think the 'own resources' principle is wrong. We want it linked to ability to pay. However, we accept that while this system continues it operates gravely to Britain's disadvantage. We reject this attempt to correct the revenue side of the financing system of the Community.

Those who say we should adjust the injustice to Britain through the expenditure side are really underestimating Margaret Thatcher. There is no way of making Margaret Thatcher spend any money she gets on good, social or anti-unemployment policies. So you are chasing a mirage. We, therefore, oppose the Pfennig report and demand a proper correction on the revenue side of the contribution the UK makes to the European Community.

**Lord Douro (ED).** — My group is in favour of an increase in the Community's own resources and we hope that that increase will take place next year. We are in favour of a better balance in the budget through expenditure. However, we recognize that in the short term an adjustment on the revenue side will be necessary in favour of the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic. We do not accept that a further increase from 1.4% to 1.6% should take place without the approval of national parliaments. We do not accept that the mechanism for the United Kingdom and for the Federal Republic should be through a separate regulation. We feel it is linked irrevocably to the increase in the Community's own resources. Also, we do not accept that this mechanism should last for only four years.

For those reasons of principle, we shall have to vote against the Pfennig report.

**Mr De Vries (L).** — (NL) Unlike the British isolationists on the other side of this Chamber, my group will vote for the Pfennig report, but not with complete conviction. We tabled an amendment, Amendment 31, which called for the orthodox application of the Treaties. Parliament unfortunately rejected this amendment. We regret this, but we believe that the earliest possible increase in own resources is vital to this Community's future, and it is for this primarily political reason that we shall vote for the Pfennig report.

**Mr West (S).** — Mr President, I crave the indulgence of this Assembly for a second, to advise you that the

British courts have ordered the sequestration of the entire funds of the National Union of Mineworkers.

*(Applause from the European Democratic benches)*

**Mr Pasty (RDE).** — (FR) We shall be voting for the Pfennig motion for a resolution because it means the Community's own resources can be increased. We have been discussing the problems of the budget for several days and we have realized that one of the main reasons for these difficulties was that own resources were exhausted. As there is a very clear Parliament policy that enables us to increase own resources, we think we cannot but vote for this text.

**Mr Bonde (ARC), in writing.** — (DA) The People's Movement votes against the Pfennig reports, which are a new attempt to extend the powers of the European Parliament on budget questions.

*(Parliament adopted the motion)<sup>1</sup>*

**Mr Ducarme (L).** — (FR) Mr President, I should like to say something about the safety of the Members of this House.

I have been told that an Italian citizen called Oreste Scalzone, apparently one of the leaders of the terrorist organization called Worker Power, who was sentenced to 36 years' imprisonment (a 20-year sentence plus a 16-year sentence) in Italy, has escaped from Italy and entered France illegally. He is said to be here now in this House — or in the corridors at least! He is apparently here and profiting from the extra-territorial nature of this Parliament.

I should like to know which Member to thank for this individual, who has a 36-year sentence to serve, being in our Parliament and whether it would not be a good idea to invite our security services to take this undesirable terrorist and fugitive from justice to the doors of this House.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE).** — (IT) Since we have already discussed this problem two days ago in the Bureau, it seems a really serious matter to me that the person in question, who was duly denounced by Members, should once again be present within the precincts of this European Parliament, and for that reason, Mr President, I ask you to take the necessary action: a President, if he so wishes, can do this. It is totally inconceivable that Members of the European

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:  
— FOR Amendments 1 to 12;  
— AGAINST Amendments 13 to 18, 20, 21, 25, 28, 29, 31 to 33, 35 to 42.

**Cassanmagnago Cerretti**

Parliament who, as Italians, have known at first hand the anguish caused by these persons who have killed workers, industrialists, and politicians, should now have to watch them walking freely about this Parliament.

*(Applause from the benches of the centre and the right)*

**Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC).** — *(DE)* Mr President, as a point of order I would ask you not to over-react, as you are being called on to do. Indeed, I do not believe that you will.

Mr Scalzone is an Italian who, in common with some 300 others, has found a kind of political asylum in France. Parliament should be glad that someone takes the opportunity of taking part in the debates of the European Parliament as an interested observer.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, the question raised by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and Mr Ducarme has been brought to the attention of the Bureau.

**Mr Barzanti (COM).** — *(IT)* I propose, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, to emphasize the seriousness of what has happened, and the need for total clarity.

In reality, Oreste Scalzone's position — and we shall not go here into the details of this terrible, horrifying affair — is one that does not allow him, and indeed should not have allowed him, to appear within the precincts of this Parliament, nor even to attend the conference that took place here. Indeed, I should like to emphasize that his presence at that conference very considerably distorted both its significance and its *raison d'être*.

For this reason we, too, ask for the situation to be cleared up; and we also ask that, for the future, adequate measures will be permanently in force to ensure that our Parliament will be able to carry on its work freely.

*(Loud applause from various benches)*

**Mr Ducarme (L).** — *(FR)* You will allow me to speak, I think, because this incident was brought up with a view to putting an end to this person's presence on Parliament's territory. I hope that the security services of our Parliament will show this person to the door of Parliament's territory. It is a question of respect for this Parliament!

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**President.** — Mr Ducarme, the concern you express, which has been expressed also by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, is legitimate.

That said, it is not by impromptu decision that we shall succeed in drawing up and enforcing rules.

The Bureau has set up a security group which will meet immediately after this sitting to consider this problem.

I simply wish to point out that hitherto the rule was that people could be admitted, not admitted to the Chamber — that goes without saying — but to the building, under the authority and at the invitation of a Member of this Assembly.

The question now is whether this rule should be maintained, modified or abolished. The matter will be given the close attention it deserves. You can count on the Chair strictly to apply the rules laid down. I would repeat that even before this matter was raised here only a few minutes ago, it was already decided yesterday that the security group would meet at the end of this sitting, following the votes that have just taken place.

## IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

*Vice-President*

**Report (Doc. 2-786/84) by Mrs Maij-Weggen, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the communication, with a motion for a resolution from the Council from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-776/84 — COM(84) 484 final) on action to combat long-term unemployment**

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE), rapporteur.** — *(NL)* I wish to give an explanation of vote on behalf of my group, which has asked me to clarify one aspect of the Christian Democrats' position. We voted for the text that calls for the redistribution of work and a reduction in working hours. We approve this text because its wording is very general and also reflects our principles. For the sake of clarity, I will explain once again what these principles are.

We are in favour of work being redistributed provided that it is done flexibly by the two sides of industry rather than being governed by legislation. We also believe that the redistribution of work and the reduction of working hours must be accompanied by a reasonable reduction in wages, possibly with the lowest income brackets excluded. It is also essential, in our view, that competitiveness should not suffer as a result of the redistribution of work and that the jobs that become available should be reserved for those who

**Maij-Weggen**

have been hardest hit by unemployment. That is our interpretation of this fairly general text.

I should now like to say something on my own behalf. We have today voted on a programme of action for the long-term unemployed, an emergency plan, as it is called in the resolution. We did this at the Council's request because it wants to take a decision in December. As the Council itself requested this debate, I feel it must also take responsibility for this plan, and that means it will never be able to cut the European Social Fund's resources. We call on the Council not to be hypocritical, not simply to ask us to vote on fine resolutions, but to accept the commitments it entails and to approve the budget accordingly.

**Mr Tuckman (ED).** — On behalf of my group, I want to explain that we would have liked to vote for this resolution. We feel that to look at the position of the long-term unemployed was the right thing at the right time. Our reason for not going along with it is that our key amendments were not accepted, and that applies particularly to No 40, where this House has, to my very great surprise, rejected its own previous resolution — namely, the effect of the Herman report. In short, our worry is that there is a lack of reality in the House about how to help people and, therefore, we are forced to vote against.

While I have the floor, may I also point out that people who do a great deal of speaking about how sad they are for the unemployed are absent.

*(Applause from the European Democratic benches)*

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE), rapporteur.** — *(NL)* I must point out to the Conservative Group that reference is in fact made to the Herman report in the resolution and that this reference has not been removed. All we did is reject the Conservative Group's one-sided interpretation. But the Herman report is mentioned twice in the resolution.

**Mr Bonde (ARC), in writing.** — *(DA)* The People's Movement against Danish Membership of the European Community cannot support Mrs Maij-Weggen's report on the Commission's attempt to include job creation within the Community's field of competence. We are opposed to the involvement of the Community in employment questions, partly on principle and partly because the Commission earlier delayed and watered down the job creation scheme adopted by the Danish Folketing.

*(Parliament adopted the motion)<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:  
— FOR Amendments 1 to 13, 16 to 20, 22 to 24, 26, 28, 32 to 37, 41, 42, 58 to 62, 64 to 66;  
— AGAINST Amendments 14, 15, 21, 25, 30, 31, 38 to 40, 43 to 50, 53 to 55 and 57.

**Mr Megahy (S).** — Madam President, I rise on a point of order pursuant to Rule 54a. I should like the presidency to take account of the fact that we have been voting for two hours now and we still have two more lengthy reports. Rule 54a was devised in order to enable the President, if more than 20 amendments had been tabled, to institute a second and third reading in committee. The precise purpose of this was to prevent these very long voting sessions if possible. To my knowledge this has never been instituted. I wonder if you could give some indication, Madam President, why the presidency has not felt it necessary to institute this and what intentions they have about this Rule in the future.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

**Mr Baudis (PPE).** — *(FR)* Madam President, this morning we voted for an emergency resolution calling for the release of a man who has been imprisoned unfairly.

I have just heard something that I want this House to know. The Afghan Government has said it is willing to release Jacques Abouchar!

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — I think I can say that we are all of us here delighted with this very good news, Mr Baudis. Many thanks.

**Mr Costanzo (PPE).** — *(IT)* President Pflimlin assured this Parliament that he would immediately call a meeting of the Security Committee to arrange for the expulsion from this building of a known criminal who was duly sentenced by the courts of a Member State.

Seeing that, strange to relate, this Committee has still not reached a decision — at least, it does not appear to us to have taken the necessary steps — I should like to express my own amazement and that of my fellow Italians who are familiar with the case; and I think that it is not only the Italians who are familiar with it.

Having said that, for the safety of all of those people who are present in this building — including visitors, members of the press, Parliamentary staff, and Members of Parliament themselves — I think that there is no alternative but to suspend the sitting. I therefore ask that the sitting be suspended.

**President.** — I let you speak as a mark of respect — you were not raising a point of order.

I can only confirm that at this very moment the matter is being discussed. I have no authority to take any

**President**

decision other than that which was taken a little while back by Mr Pflimlin.

**Mr Bombard (S).** — (FR) Madam President, when we interrupted the vote on the urgent questions this morning, we said that an hour would be given after 5 o'clock to finish these matters. So what are we doing now? Going back to the urgent questions or going on with the debate on previous resolutions?

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, according to the agenda we have first to vote on the motions for resolutions. We shall resume the urgency debate after the voting.

(Mixed reactions)

\*  
\* \*

**Report (Doc. 2-788/84), by Mrs van den Heuvel drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-269/84 — COM (84) 234 final) for a draft recommendation on the promotion of positive action for women**

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Jepsen (ED).** — (DA) In line with my position at the last sitting, I have to inform the House that, on this occasion too, I am voting against a report which deals with positive discrimination for women — and again I speak only on my own behalf.

If we are to create equal rights for men and women — and so we must — we should not apply these methods, which in my view are unfair. Any woman given a job or position under the terms set out here must, if she is honest, feel rather ill at ease. We should instead concentrate on training, training and more training and focus our efforts on making all women, old and young, and perhaps especially the latter, so well qualified that equality comes of its own accord. Positive discrimination is and will always be demeaning to women. To me, it is not just a question of equality but more one of equal value. We women shall be throwing away our dignity if we demand special treatment in this way.

This idea that all women should be in the market for jobs is a repudiation of our cultural patterns, our patterns of family life. We must realize that such a development takes time, especially in times of economic difficulty. We should use the aptitudes we have and the strength inherent in us to ensure that we are qualified. Only then shall we be able to speak of equality. If the object here is to persuade men to give

women more power and influence, I think that a large helping of feminine charm will have a lot more effect than this report. But I would hardly suggest to this Assembly that women should apply such methods.

**Mr Gaibisso (PPE).** — (IT) This is my first speech in this Assembly, and I am making it on a very important occasion — the approval of a resolution in favour of women.

I think that this is an extremely significant vote. Women are represented in this Assembly, but many mothers, today, have been deprived of their children because a scoundrel and criminal, such as Scalzone, has killed them. He is still walking freely around in this Parliament.

Madam President, this is a disgrace! I shall cast my vote, and then, out of a sense of moral duty to Moro and all those victims that have been killed by terrorists in my country, I shall leave this Chamber in protest, at the same time denouncing the ineptitude of those who have not seen fit to take appropriate action.

(Applause)

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — I shall vote in favour of this motion but I do not think it is strong enough. Women are capable of a far greater contribution to peace and prosperity than they are allowed to make.

(Applause from the left)

We now have 72 women in this Parliament. It is the highest proportion in any parliament in the world, and they make a disproportionate contribution to our proceedings, as we all know. But if women want finally to achieve equality with men, even superiority, as I believe they could, they should imitate what the women of Greece did to stop the war between Athens and Sparta.

(Cries of 'No!, No!')

As related by Aristophanes under the leadership of Lysistrates, they withdrew their favours from their husbands and the war stopped immediately. European women should do the same. It is much more effective than this resolution.

(Applause from the left)

**Mrs Crawley (S).** — On a point of order, Madam President. I do believe that contribution, however well intended, trivializes this issue. We do not want this issue trivialized in this House. This is a very, very important motion.

(Applause from the left)

**Mr Alavanos (COM), in writing.** — (GR) Programmes of positive action implemented in the public sector can contribute to the creation of new jobs, and represent a productive line of action for our country as well.

In the private sector, however, such programmes not only achieve limited practical results but also lead to a range of subsidies and tax exemptions for large capital, and to the redistribution of public money in its favour.

Mrs van den Heuvel's report contains a number of interesting proposals. We have reservations, however, about the degree to which 'controls' by the Community's bodies are to be imposed, a matter that places in doubt the sovereign rights of the Member States. Controls are indeed required, though not by the Community's bodies, but by the national authorities with the participation of the workers.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM), in writing.** — (GR) The proposed resolution prepared by the Committee on Women's Rights is one of the most justified and positive that we have heard in this House. It is bold enough not to restrict itself to generalizations, but to express itself in an outspoken way and find fault with Council's draft recommendations, stressing that they contain very little that is new.

We agree entirely with the Committee on Women's Rights' critical stance, and we share its disappointment concerning the form of the legal text preferred by the Commission of the European Communities, and at the fact that a whole range of positive directives on behalf of women are still gathering dust in Council's filing cabinets. Future generations will judge the Community's present policies in terms of their effectiveness, and not merely as expressions of good intent. Many of the factors mentioned in the draft recommendations seem to us to be impracticable in the form proposed, especially under today's conditions.

The programme of positive action at places of work, contained in the appendix to the draft recommendations, is most unlikely to be implemented by companies unless backed by an appropriate and binding framework of legislation, and by the essential controls. Today's conditions in the labour market operate against women. Progress can only be made if the governments of the Member States and the Community intervene directly and actively to promote measures of social justice which will eliminate present-day inequalities and prejudices.

We particularly commend that part of the proposed resolution which requires the various bodies of the European Communities to lead the way in their staffing policies.

Finally, we consider that paragraph 12 of the resolution is particularly important, namely that Parliament

should exercise control in the event of inertia on the Commission's part, not only because this will promote measures for the equal treatment of women, but also because by acting in this way the European Parliament would transcend its advisory role and undertake responsibilities of parliamentary control similar to those of the national parliaments.

*(Parliament adopted the motion)<sup>1</sup>*

**President.** — I should now like to give an explanation to Mr Megahy.

Mr Megahy, you wanted a referral back to committee of the report we have voted on, pursuant to Rule 54a. Under Rule 54a the President may request a referral to committee. In view of the importance of the vote, I decided to maintain the vote today.

**Mr Megahy (S).** — Madam President, I would just like to correct any misunderstanding that may have arisen. I was not attempting to get this report or any other that we are considering today referred to committee. All that I ask is that the Chair take account of Rule 54, because it seems to me that since we changed the rules it has never ever done so. In order to avoid long voting sessions like this in the future I hope it will do so.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Madam President, following the previous point of order and further to what Mr Megahy has said, a high proportion of the votes we have just taken arose from the conflict between two committees, and the whole purpose of that Rule 54a was to enable two committees to reach an agreement, thus saving the time of the House. This was a classic example of where that rule should have been used.

Another point of order arises under Rule 85. In view of the fact that you did not rule on Mr Megahy's request, it was then open, as the vote had not started, for Members to move the reference to committee under Rule 85. This can only be done before the vote starts. However, if you, Madam President, refuse to call people who wish to use Rule 85, it becomes null and void. Could I suggest that before votes start, the presidency should always ascertain, in circumstances like this, whether the reference is to be moved, because a number of colleagues wish to do so.

**Mr Newton Dunn (ED).** — Madam President, I want to remind you of Rule 82(1), which says that a Member who asks to raise a point of order shall have a

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:

— FOR Amendments Nos 1 to 8, 17/rev. (2nd part), 20, 22/rev., 26/rev. (1st part), 28/rev., 30 to 43;  
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 11, 12, 16/rev., 17/rev. (1st part), 26/rev. (2nd part), 29, 44 and 45.

**Dunn**

prior right to do so. You, in the Chair, have a duty to uphold the rules and to protect the rights of individuals. You have no entitlement to steamroller Members as you did. I actually wanted to propose reference to committee, as my colleague has just said. Please do not do it again.

**President.** — Mr Newton Dunn, I have exercised my right as President on the basis that our business would otherwise be disturbed.

**Report (Doc. 2-785/84) by Mr Megahy, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 379 final — Doc. 2-456/84) for a decision on specific Community action to combat poverty**

*Proposal from the Commission*

*After the adoption of Amendment No 2 to Article 1*

**Mr Klepsch (PPE).** — (DE) Madam President, a point of order. I should merely like to explain why my fellow members are so agitated. The presence among us in this House of a member of the Red Brigades who has been sentenced to 38 years' imprisonment leads them to feel threatened by this man, and he has shown in his own country that he does constitute a threat.

They feel insulted that he is still here and cannot understand why his presence is tolerated. Normally visitors are only allowed to remain in the gallery for one hour, but apparently this man is allowed considerably longer, and my fellow members are outraged by this. We shall in any case be discussing the matter in the Bureau.

We would ask you to take some action. I cannot believe that the security services would treat this man differently from any other visitor!

**President.** — Mr Klepsch, we all understand our colleagues' concern. I can only repeat that this matter was looked into yesterday in the Bureau, and that Mr Pflimlin clearly stated his position a little while ago. We must await the committee's conclusions. I do not feel entitled to encroach on the prerogatives of our President.

**Mr d'Ormesson (DR).** — (FR) This cannot go on. You already gave us the same answer once, two hours ago. Would you please suspend the sitting as a sign of protest?

*(Mixed reactions)*

**Mr Ducarme (L).** — (FR) Madam President, I shall not make as plain a request as Mr d'Ormesson, but I think the House should be informed about the question — and at the latest when we reopen the debate on the resolutions put forward as urgent matters. It would be unsuitable to carry on with the debate without knowing whether there was a terrorist in the Parliament building and so it would be reasonable to suspend the sitting.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, I propose that we continue voting on Mr Megahy's report and I shall then ask Mr Pflimlin what the position is.

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs S. Martin (L).** — (FR) My group thinks that, when we talk about poverty today, the time has come for action rather than discussion. But the programme of Community action presented by the Commission alas holds out little hope for those who want to see poverty really alleviated.

The anti-poverty action campaign worries us because we think that the bulk of the funds that go into it is channelled into action and research projects and that, even if it is supplementary financing, the programme does not stand a great deal of chance of actually alleviating this poverty.

What we want is for the Member States to take a whole series of measures to improve the situation of the most underprivileged quickly, as this really is an emergency. The new poor are the chronic unemployed who are no longer entitled to unemployment pay and young people with no training, no work and, in many cases, no family either. And the new poor are also women at the head of single-parent families. These people are in the tragic situation of having no help and no one to turn to, both because many of them are the victims of budget restrictions and cutbacks in the systems of unemployment benefits and because social security is unable to meet the needs of some of the most underprivileged categories of the population.

The result of all this can be seen in the streets. The ranks of the outcasts and the marginals are swelling. The spectres of hunger and want are reappearing.

What we need to handle this situation are means of social action that will provide these people with at least their minimal housing, food and health requirements.

This is solidarity, not charity. And we think it is up to the authorities in our countries to organize this solidarity, to generate it and to concentrate all its means

**Martin**

on eliminating that social scourge, poverty. We are pleased that this House voted for the amendments expressing these principles, which I proposed on my group's behalf, for we think that the situation is so serious that we cannot just rely on goodwill and charitable action.

**Mr Alavanos (COM), in writing. — (GR)** The first common programme against poverty was approved in 1975. Since then, this dramatic phenomenon has become more widespread and far more severe.

Quite clearly, it is not acts of charity that are needed. What is needed is a dynamic and antimonopolistically oriented policy to lead the way out of the crisis, to develop productive investment and employment, and to divert resources from the arms race to social aims, a policy that will create conditions that will restrict the phenomenon of poverty to some of the better developed capitalistic countries in the world, such as those of the EEC or the USA.

For this reason we find that the rapporteur, Mr Megahy's relative criticism in paragraph 1 of the proposed resolution is a positive one. The same goes for his criticism of the Commission's proposal, namely that it should be a 'programme of action' and not merely one of research.

**Mrs Squarcialupi (COM), in writing. — (IT)** The improvements made to the Commission's text enable us to vote in favour, even though we are aware of the limitations of this motion. But, if we are not to increase even further the already excessive numbers of the poor, we have to pay more attention to the social security systems that are being cut and downscaled and are unable to protect those most in need.

Secondly, we should like greater and more detailed consideration to be given to the question of the ageing of the population and the financing of pensions, which rely for their resources on the wages of the workers, whose numbers are constantly declining because of the increase in unemployment.

The programme against poverty must not therefore be an excuse to ease up on the real priorities in the fight against poverty which I have indicated — in particular the fight against unemployment, which we have been discussing recently.

*(Parliament adopted the motion)<sup>1</sup>*

**President.** — I promised you a statement at the end of the vote on the Megahy report. I shall now read out the statement I have just received from our president.

<sup>1</sup> The rapporteur was:

— FOR Amendments Nos 1 to 16, 18, 19 and 23;  
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 17, 21, 24 and 25.

Having noted that the presence, in the European Parliament building, of Mr Scalzone has been the cause of disorder, and after consulting the security group, the President has decided to revoke the pass granted to Mr Scalzone at Parliament's request. Since Mr Scalzone is no longer in possession of any documentation legitimizing his presence in the Parliament building, the security service has been instructed to escort him outside the building.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Cryer (S).** — I do think, on a rather more mundane matter, that it is absurd for this Chamber to spend something like 3¼ hours mostly in voting. It means that a tiny section of the Assembly discusses a matter which is not familiar to the vast majority of Members here and half the time, frankly, much of the voting becomes completely meaningless. Therefore, I suggest, Madam President, that you report to the Bureau on the feelings of I suspect not only myself but of many Members here. The Bureau ought to have a look firstly at the procedural possibility raised by my friend, Tom Megahy, but also at the whole business of bringing before this Assembly something like several hundred votes in an afternoon. There must surely be an opportunity for trimming down the number of votes. After all, if a committee is going to produce a report it seems to me that it ought to be able to put its own house in order a good deal more effectively than bringing forward 30, 40 or 50 amendments. It really is important that we should concentrate on debating issues before we actually vote and not just go through the motions, as it were, of mechanical or electronic puppets.

**President.** — I take note of your statement, Mr Cryer. I shall pass it on to the Bureau.

### 8. *Topical and urgent debate*

*(continuation)*

#### *Pollution of the sea*

*(continuation)*

**Mr Ducarme (L).** — *(FR)* I shall use my two minutes on the Liberal Group's behalf first of all to emphasize the fact that we agree with the Staes proposal and that one of our national MPs is taking up this debate and will be speaking in the Belgian House, asking the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Belgium

**Ducarme**

about the country's application of various international conventions.

The second point is that, in this debate about the pollution of the sea, we hope the United Nations Convention will be ratified by all the Member States of the Community.

Lastly, I should also like to say how pleased the Liberal Group is with the German Government's decision to convene an international conference on the North Sea.

It is also worth pointing out that this House asked for such a conference to be called, back in June 1981, at the initiative of our group.

I should apologize to the Greens. We didn't wait for the ecological movements to sound the alarm about pollution in the North Sea.

This is the background against which we are reiterating our request today to get the countries on the North Sea to produce a convention on the protection of the marine environment. This convention, like the Barcelona Convention on the Mediterranean, should be specific to the North Sea and make it possible to run effective, coordinated schemes to cope with both the discharge of toxic substances and accidental leakages of oil.

So this convention should, we feel, aim, in particular, to create a common environmental monitoring system, for it is essential — and I shall end here — for environmental protection measures to be accompanied by strict control.

**Mr Bombard (S).** — (FR) Madam President, it is not a Frenchman who is going to speak. It is a European defender of the environment and, I should add, a sailor. I want to talk about the *Mont-Louis*.

In this particularly dangerous part of the North Sea, off Ostend, the wreck of the *Mont-Louis* represents an additional and unacceptable danger. Before calling on European aid, which, I think, should be automatic in a case like this, the French Government should be the first to put pressure on the ship-owner and the owner of the cargo to demand they destroy and evacuate the wreck of the *Mont-Louis* as quickly as possible. If Belgium and Europe want to provide financial help and are in a position to do so, they will be welcome. But safety first. France has to act and so does the Dutch company which earned a lot of money removing the containers. If the wreck of the *Mont-Louis* caused even one person to drown, it would be an indelible burden on our national, international and individual consciences. Ridding the sea of this additional and potentially lethal danger is our duty.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Madam President, would you please be kind enough to tell us how long the

urgent debate will continue? It would certainly help restore order in the House.

**President.** — Of the three hours set aside for our topical and urgent debates under the Rules of Procedure, there must now be about three quarters of an hour left.

**Mr Ford (S).** — As someone who has trained professionally as an oceanographer, I welcome the opportunity to speak in this debate as I am concerned about the failure of this Parliament to take marine affairs seriously.

In my two minutes I wish to address two issues: firstly, the amendment I have tabled to a resolution by Mr Walter on behalf of the Socialist Group which calls on the Commission to ensure that the participating States cease the dumping of radioactive waste at sea and that any future Community work on the disposal of radioactive waste at sea is based on the two principles of recoverability and monitorability, and also on the fact that we should be signing the Law of the Sea Treaty.

The issues surrounding the dumping of radioactive waste at sea is an issue of grave concern to many individuals and organizations throughout Europe, apart that is from the British Government who have refused to abide by the moratorium requested by the London Dumping Convention. Instead the concerns of ordinary people are being protected again by trade unions. The reaction of the National Union of Seamen in refusing to allow radioactive waste dumping to continue and in preventing exploratory work by the ship *Discovery* towards ultimate disposal techniques that many find unacceptable, can only be supported.

On the second issue — the signature of the Law of the Sea Treaty — again Britain risks being isolated as Mr Reagan's poodle. The sea should be the common heritage of mankind and no lobbying attempts by organizations in this Community, with or without the assistance of Mr Ian MacGregor, and funded by American right-wing pressure groups and interests, should stop this Community and its members from signing and ratifying this Treaty so important to the new international economic order.

We must reject the approach of naked self-interest and greed epitomized by the Reagan administration and instead accept the need for international agreement to exploit in a just and equitable manner the last resource which is the common heritage of mankind.

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — On a point of order, Madam President. This motion addresses itself to the problem of the North Sea, not of any other oceanographic capitalistic manifestations that our colleague across the road has chosen to bring in. May I implore you to

## Sherlock

ensure that those who speak speak on the subject of the North Sea, the subject of our debate.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Madam President, would you perhaps reply to the previous speaker that he earlier made allusion to sex, although that was not on the agenda either?

**Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Madam President, I hope you will forgive me if I begin with just a word to the interpreters. The sea about which we are talking is known in the English language as the North Sea and not the Northern Sea, as the interpreters have been saying for some time. There is quite a lot of oil in the North Sea, so it is worth getting it right!

I have taken very careful note of the two motions for resolutions concerning the Conference on the protection of the North Sea to be held in Bremen at the end of this month and of the honourable Members' speeches on this subject. The Commission fully shares the political objectives underlying the resolutions and agrees with most of the statements arising from them. I should like to point out first of all that there is a wide degree of convergence between the points raised in the resolutions and the topics which will be discussed at the Conference on the North Sea. This is significant in my view, since it demonstrates that the questions discussed are crucial to improving environmental protection in particular in the North Sea. The Commission hopes that significant progress will be made in Bremen on a great many of these topics.

Certainly, I undertake to ask my colleague, Mr Narjes, to put the requests contained in the resolutions to the Ministerial Conference. I am happy, moreover, that the resolution adopted by Parliament in September during the debate on the *Mont-Louis* accident has already been communicated to the State Secretaries' Conference at Wilhelmshaven which has been preparing the Ministerial Conference paper. I shall not hide from the House, however, that there is still a divergence of views on the three major questions, that is to say, the control of effluents, dumping at sea and the designation of special protection zones. These will certainly be discussed thoroughly at the Ministerial Conference. In all three cases Mr Narjes will endeavour to bring home the fact that it is to the Community's advantage that satisfactory solutions should be reached.

I would also like to take this opportunity to inform Parliament that, as a result in particular of speeches by Members during the debate on the *Mont-Louis*, the Commission has decided to set up an interdepartmental working party at the highest level to study all aspects of and draw up proposals on the transport of dangerous substances and wastes. The results of this conference will certainly affect the Commission's

work on water management. Here I must draw your attention once again to DG XI staffing requirements.

The House must understand that when the legitimate requests made in resolutions are not backed up by the resources, in terms both of staff and funds, needed to carry them out, the Commission is placed in a difficult, not to say impossible position. The Commission does not wish to turn down the House's requests, but it cannot ensure that they are properly carried out. I would therefore ask the House to pay special attention to this problem when it examines the draft budget for 1985.

In addition, before commenting on the other resolutions, I would recall an important point made by Mr Narjes in January 1984 during the debate on the resolution on North Sea pollution. At that time, as Mrs Maij-Weggen may recall, Mr Narjes said that because of the preparation of the North Sea Conference, it would make more sense to concentrate the Commission's limited means on preparing that conference instead of dispersing them among several separate initiatives. The Commission will, of course, bear that resolution in mind when considering the question of possible follow-up actions in the light of the results of the North Sea Conference, taking into account its limited possibilities due mainly to shortage of staff, as I have already said.

So far as the motion for a resolution presented by Mrs Dury and Mr Arndt is concerned, I regret to say that none of the financial instruments at the Community's disposal can be used to grant financial aid, because in this case such assistance does not come within the objectives nor the criteria for such a grant.

Concerning the specific preoccupation of Mr Staes, the Commission considers that the facts mentioned relate to the position adopted by the Belgian Government and to the workload of the Belgian Parliament. It therefore suggests to the author of the resolution to use first of all the political links at his disposal to influence the work of the Belgian Parliament. The Commission does not doubt that after the sinking of the *Mont-Louis* the Belgian Government, and in particular its Secretary of State for the Environment, will take the necessary steps to speed up the ratification procedure.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

We shall now proceed to the vote.

### *Motion for a resolution Doc. 2-793/84*

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — I wish to call a quorum on this issue.

(*More than 10 Members rose to support Mr Sherlock's request*)

**Mrs Dury (S).** — (FR) Madam President, when are we going to vote on these resolutions on pollution in the North Sea?

**President.** — If I remember our rules correctly, any motions for resolutions tabled for topical and urgent debate, which are not voted on during the debate, lapse.

**Mrs Dury (S).** — (FR) Mr Sherlock's idea was that we should not vote on the resolutions at all! I should like to put a direct question to Mr Sherlock. Did you want us not to vote on the resolution at all? Did you want to postpone the voting?

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Madam President, the call for a quorum means that the vote must be held over to the next voting time tomorrow at 9 a.m. I would ask all those present to attend, and we shall no doubt be hearing from our 'true blue' friends again.

(Applause)

**President.** — No, Mr von der Vring, while I may not have held this office for very long, I know from the rules that unfortunately any resolution not voted on during the three hours of this debate lapses. It cannot be presented again until the following part-session.

**Mr Bombard (S).** — (FR) Madam President, I have been involved in the debate on the urgent resolutions since this morning. We did not get an hour and a half this morning. That is not right. Now we are getting three quarters of an hour, so we shall not have had three hours' debating this time! This is a precedent which we can look to whenever we are discussing human rights. This Parliament will no longer do its usual job.

(Applause)

**President.** — You know my feelings on this, which I cannot go into here. I was present at 10 a.m., when the sitting for topical and urgent debate began; I was also present at noon when the topical and urgent debates were broken off for the budget debate.

Two hours have been allocated this morning to this item and one hour this afternoon. This is right and proper but I cannot evade the request for a check on the quorum, which is perfectly legitimate.

**Mr Guermeur (RDE).** — (FR) Madam President, I rarely speak on a procedural motion, but I should like to ask you to clarify something.

Suppose we had spent three hours on the urgent questions, two this morning and one this afternoon.

If we did not have a quorum, would this interrupt the three hours or would it cancel them?

If the answer to my first question is yes, that means that the sitting goes on tomorrow, as was said just now, and the topical and urgent discussion should continue in the morning. However, if it means that the time set aside for urgent questions is cancelled, the matter of the quorum can be brought up in the first hour and the two hours that follow will be meaningless.

It is all a question of how the Rules of Procedure are interpreted.

**President.** — I understand you very well. After a check on the quorum, I shall ask you for a little while in which to consider this matter.

We shall now proceed to a check on the quorum.

(The President announced that the House was not quorate)

I have to admit that I cannot give Mr Guermeur an answer as up to now the votes that were suspended on the occasion of the topical and urgent debates came at the end of the morning because we had gone over the three hours.

In my experience, the situation today is a novel one.

I therefore propose that the sitting be suspended for a few minutes so that I may look into the matter and give you a precise answer.

**Mr Guermeur (RDE).** — (FR) This morning, the discussion of the urgent questions was interrupted — not because we over-ran the time, but because the President decided to substitute something else for the examination of the resolutions.

So my conclusion — and it is a personal opinion — is that, since it was possible to interrupt the three hours for some reason to do with the President, I do not see why they cannot be interrupted for other reasons too, instead of purely and simply cancelling the prescribed three hours' discussion.

**President.** — Mr Guermeur, I well understood your thinking and your proposal.

If there are no objections, I shall therefore suspend the sitting for a few minutes.

(The sitting was suspended at 6.35 p.m. and resumed at 6.40 p.m.)

**President.** — The rules make it very clear that a motion for a resolution lapses where it is found that the House is not quorate. It is extremely clear on pages 36 and 37. Therefore, the subject of the request for a check on the quorum lapses and can only be reintroduced at a later part-session.

I take responsibility for this statement.

On the basis that a check on the quorum has been requested for each vote, I now propose that we vote on and consider the motion for a resolution by Mr Roelants du Vivier.

*Motion for a resolution Doc. 2-815/84*

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Madam President, I shall call for the quorum again on every remaining item on the joint debate on pollution.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, I have to ask you again whether 10 colleagues want a check on the quorum.

*(More than 10 Members rose to support Mr Sherlock's request)*

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — *(NL)* Madam President, I was here from the very start of the sitting until it ended. Yesterday I submitted an urgent motion for a resolution on mining to the House, and it was declared inadmissible. I had a right to speak today: two minutes, then three and then another two, making seven minutes in all. I have not yet taken advantage of this right. I am a member of the smallest group and refer the House to Rule 48(2) of the Rules of Procedure, which says that in the discussion of urgent matters a balance must be maintained both between the requests from the political groups and between these requests and those from individual Members. This question of balance must not be overlooked. I therefore propose that we continue this debate tomorrow morning.

**President.** — Mr Sherlock, may I ask you a question? Will you be asking for a quorum check for all the proposals relating to pollution of the sea?

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Madam President, you have ruled that there was no quorum for a vote on the Staes resolution (Doc. 2-793/84). I then suggested, in view of the fact that you intend, apparently, to make an interpretation of the rule which says that every item under this joint debate can be taken separately, that the next item, Doc. 2-815/84, be called subject to a quorum.

If I am forced to it, I shall tackle the motion for a resolution by Mrs Dury and Mr Arndt, Doc. 2-828/

84, in exactly the same way. I shall do each one in turn, calling for a quorum on each and every occasion.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, the rules permit this. We shall therefore check whether a quorum is present.

*(The President announced that the House was not quorate)*

I therefore maintain my interpretation of Rule 48 of the Rules and I hereby declare that this motion for a resolution lapses.

*Motion for a resolution Doc. 2-828/84*

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Madam President, should it work, I call for the establishment of a quorum.

*(More than 10 Members rose to support Mr Sherlock's request — After a check, the President found that the House was not quorate)*

**President.** — I hereby declare that this motion for a resolution lapses.

**Mr Staes (ARC).** — *(NL)* Mr Sherlock naturally has something in mind when he asks for a quorum to be established. I therefore feel I have the right to ask him why he is doing this and why he is wasting our time in this fashion.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Madam President, what we have seen here serves a very specific purpose, and I can only congratulate the gentleman who has called for the establishment of a quorum.

British capitalist interests have achieved their object of preventing us from doing something to stop pollution of the North Sea, which they regard as their rubbish bin.

*(Loud applause)*

These gentlemen find it quite logical to use the North Sea as a rubbish bin. They have been doing so for hundreds of years.

**President.** — That is not a point of order!

**Mr Vergeer (PPE).** — *(NL)* Madam President, if you will forgive me for saying so, this is a ridiculous proposal and one that will be incomprehensible to the public here and outside. This is an important matter we are discussing here. It is, of course, right to apply

**Vergeer**

the Rules of Procedure, but those who abuse them in this way must take full responsibility for their action. I see no point in going on like this, and I propose that the sitting should now be adjourned and resumed tomorrow, because this is pointless.

**President.** — Mr Vergeer, my job here is simply to apply the rules.

**Mr Ford (S).** — Madam President, I would like to refer to your first declaration that there was not a quorum in the House. Can you confirm to me that you considered the whole of Rule 71 in its implications? The rule says:

When establishing the result of the vote, account must be taken . . . of all the Members present in the Chamber, and . . . of all the Members who requested that it be ascertained whether the quorum was present.

About 30 or 40 Members stood. I presume that those standing talking at the back were requesting a quorum. They were standing there, and before the count was taken they withdrew from the Chamber. On the basis of the rules as laid down in Rule 71, they should be included in the vote. Can you confirm to me that you took that into account, and how many Members did you take into account on that basis?

**President.** — Mr Ford, in the count that we take, account must be taken of those who have requested a check on the quorum, even if they leave the Chamber. That has been done.

**Mrs Dury (S).** — (FR) As the author of one of the resolutions, I should like to say that Mr Sherlock is waving a dangerous weapon which could well one day turn on the British Conservatives. But I should like to say that we are here to respect parliamentary democracy.

We, in this European Parliament, have the honour of respecting other people's opinions. The British Conservatives have just shown that they do not wish to respect other people's opinions. Let them vote against the resolutions, but not prevent the voting!

(Applause)

*Motion for a resolution Doc. 2-830/84: adopted*

\*  
\* \*

*Motion for a resolution Doc. 2-840/84: adopted*

\*  
\* \*

**Mr Pearce (ED).** — Madam President, I would ask you to let me clarify one point of your earlier ruling which has not been referred to. You did, at one stage, at least as it came across on the earphones, say that a quorum had to be demanded by at least 10 Members not all being of the same group. That is what seemed to come across. I would like to clarify the position. As far as I can see, the rules do not say that.

**President.** — You are quite right. I meant to say 10 colleagues.

*Lomé III*

**President.** — We shall now proceed to the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-824/84) by Mrs Focke and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the state of negotiations on Lomé III,
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-834/84) by Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the breakdown of the Lomé III negotiations,
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-848/84) by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the development and progress of the negotiations between the ACP and EEC on the renewal of the Lomé Convention,
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-852/84) by Mr Cervetti and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the negotiations on the future Lomé Convention.

**Mrs Focke (S).** — (FR) Madam President, I should like to speak to a procedural motion. Since we have very little time left and I hope as many resolutions as possible can be looked at, I propose to give up my speaking time if the others do the same. This would mean we could vote immediately.

(Applause)

(With the exception of Mr Christensen, all the speakers listed undertook to forgo their right to speak)

**President.** — I propose that Mr Christensen should be allowed one minute and that we should then proceed immediately to the vote.

**Mr Christensen (ARC).** — (DA) Madam President, I have heard so much nonsense from this Assembly that I must insist on having the minute I have been promised. First of all, I should like to say that the amend-

**Christensen**

ment tabled by Focke, Rabbethge, Pannella, Trivelli and Jackson to point 7 contains something which is patently illegal, since it states that Parliament 'intends participating in the ratification procedure alongside the national parliaments'. The European Parliament has no legislative powers and can therefore do no such thing.

Secondly, I would say with regard to the content that it is characteristic that four of the points concern financial assistance, and I certainly agree that the Community countries should give more to the poor countries. I prefer that it be done on a national basis and not through the European Communities. But what is open to criticism is that there are only seven words at a single point on what is the central issue in this whole complex of problems, namely trade with the Third World: point 3 calls for 'the full opening of the EEC market', but it says nothing about the practical means to achieve this objective, and I must protest about that.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the four motions for resolutions)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR SEEFELD

*Vice-President*

**Mr d'Ormesson (DR).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to point out that my group abstained from the voting.

**Mr Elles (ED).** — Mr President, are you moving on to the next urgent resolution, because I would like to see at least a vote taken on the humanitarian aid to Ethiopia and other African countries?

**President.** — My predecessor in the Chair said that the topical and urgent debate would go on another 10 minutes or so. We shall therefore proceed to the joint debate on the three motions for resolutions on humanitarian aid and then conclude the topical and urgent debate.

*Humanitarian aid*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the joint debate on humanitarian aid:

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-825/84) by Mr Hänsch and Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the humanitarian situation in the areas of southern Lebanon occupied by Israel;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-846/84) by Mr Langes and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democratic Group) on emergency aid to El Salvador;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-850/84) by Mr Elles, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, and Mr Christodoulou, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democratic Group) on emergency food aid to Ethiopia and the Sahel region of Africa.

**Mr Lenz (PPE).** — *(DE)* I would just like to say that we should bear in mind in considering these resolutions the promise by Council President O'Keefe that financial aid can also go to El Salvador, to be distributed by the various non-governmental organizations.

**Mr J. Elles (ED).** — The purpose of this urgent resolution put forward by the European Democratic Group and the European People's Party is to follow up the initiative overwhelmingly approved by the European Parliament at the last part-session on hunger in the world. I will be very brief, I shall be less than one minute because this resolution, once adopted by this House, will give the Commission sufficient funds from under-utilized lines in the 1984 budget to organize a major relief operation before the end of this year for the African countries in general. Amendment No 3 will help ensure that the Commission can achieve this objective rapidly. Let us therefore pass this resolution as modified by all the amendments with this clear message to the Commission. Let us have no further hesitation — our granaries are full, you have the available funds, you will have the support of this House — and get on with this vital and humanitarian action as soon as possible, ensuring that the aid reaches those really in need.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — *(NL)* It was agreed just now that we should vote. I have refrained from using my speaking time all day. My motion for a resolution is No 8. Can we vote on it now?

**Mr Nordmann (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I should just like to speak about the anti-Israeli resolution tabled by the Socialist Group. This is an unjust and dangerous resolution. It is unjust because it overlooks the fundamental reality of the Lebanon, that of Syrian aggression, and it also overlooks the peace agreement that was unilaterally denounced — and not by Israel either. It is dangerous because it goes too far at a time when the Government of National Unity in Israel is trying out a brave policy of withdrawal. To tell the truth, it is less a political text than something the psychologists would call a projective test, in which extravagance betrays hatred, obsession and the nostalgia of

**Nordmann**

those who were born too late to wear certain uniforms and who would be tempted to echo one of the poets and say that they 'came too late to a world that is too old'.

**Mrs Focke (S).** — (DE) Mr President, I have withdrawn my request to speak, even though I wished to deal with the most urgent topic in today's urgent debate, because we have now far exceeded our time for urgent matters. Please do not accept any further requests to speak, so that we can get on with the vote.

(Applause)

**President.** — Mrs Focke, that was precisely my intention and my hope. I hoped that we would proceed in the same way on humanitarian aid as we did on Lomé III. You have waived your right to speak, as have other colleagues. I can only request colleagues who are still on the list of speakers to do likewise.

**Mr Andrews (RDE).** — No, I don't wish to speak, Mr President. I would prefer to have the vote and I would prefer to get the aid down to these people as fast as possible. We are wasting time here.

**Mrs Heinrich (ARC).** — (DE) Parliament should visualize the reality of the situation in El Salvador and not send any aid to the government.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

(Parliament successively adopted the motions for resolutions)

**Mr Cassidy (ED).** — On a point of order, Mr President, I think the lady sitting in seat No 78 voted either on No 77 or No 76 in addition to her own, and I would like to have that point checked if you have any means of checking it straight away. As I understand the rules of this House one is not allowed to vote for someone else.

**Mrs Barbarella (COM).** — (IT) I should like to inform Mr Cassidy that it was the Member seated in front of me who asked me to vote for him. I think that there are a great many witnesses who can confirm that he was present.

**President.** — Certainly everyone must vote from his own seat, but in this instance the result would have been the same.

The topical and urgent debate is now closed.

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — (FR) Rule 48 (2) of the Rules of Procedure says that a balance must be maintained between requests from the political groups and the requests from individual Members. You did not consider my proposal. I protest!

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC).** — (NL) Mr Ulburghs has rightly raised a question of principle, the fact that there must be a balance between the various political groups. If the urgency procedure is applied, a debate follows, and this is not something that can be avoided by reducing speaking time to prevent the smaller groups or the non-attached Members from having their say. I do not think this is right: the President has a duty to protect the interests of each individual Member of Parliament, not of a given political group.

**President.** — It was the House that decided the order of the topical and urgent debates. I would also point out that in the case of a number of such debates being taken today, consideration was given to the smaller groups.

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC).** — (NL) Mr Ulburghs has rightly raised a question of principle, the fact that there must be a balance between the various political groups. If the urgency procedure is applied, a debate follows, and this is not something that can be avoided by reducing speaking time to prevent the smaller groups or the non-attached Members from having their say. I do not think this is right: the President has a duty to protect the interests of each individual Member of Parliament, not of a given political group.

**President.** — Mr Vandemeulebroucke, in its decisions Parliament is sovereign. When the agenda is being drawn up — you are quite right — due account must be taken of Rule 48 (2). Once Parliament has established the order of debates, I cannot alter it.

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — (NL) Your predecessor in the Chair decided that all these motions for resolutions should be put to the vote. Now you come along and say — quoting the Rules of Procedure — that this will not be the case.

**President.** — I was also present. My predecessor, who is still in the Chamber, said that we would carry on until the agreed time was up.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Mr President, it is precisely on the next item on the agenda, namely the joint debate, that I want to ask you how you propose to organize speaking time. Speaking time is organized on the basis of Wednesday's agenda. My group was first of all given 24 minutes which was cut back because of pres-

**Patterson**

sure to 20 minutes, so that members of my group were given 2 or 1½ minutes' speaking time, which is absurd. We now have a completely different situation. Will you tell us whether you are going to allow each Member shall we say 3 or 4 minutes and abolish the original division of speaking time?

**President.** — I have before me the jointly agreed speaking time. It has been divided up among the individual speakers by the groups.

I intend to go down the list of speakers until 8 p.m., as agreed, and resume the debate tomorrow at 9 a.m.

9. *Economic recovery (continuation)*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the continuation of the joint debate on economic recovery in Europe.<sup>1</sup>

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S).** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, during the last part of this debate — since it seems that debates now have to be broken down into parts — there was concern on the Liberal benches about what the Socialist Group's political priorities might be.

Well, the Socialist Group views with growing concern the steady increase in unemployment and poverty in Europe: 12% officially unemployed, to which a further 10% must be added for those not registered as unemployed. The disparities among the regions are also becoming more rather than less pronounced.

We Socialists believe that the European economy will not recover unless we tackle the structural and cyclical causes of the crisis and succeed in making industry and the economy more democratic. In this context, we consider it to be of the utmost importance for there to be a social consensus on the goal and on the ways and means of achieving this recovery. There will be no consensus unless we involve the workers in the decision-making, in other words, unless the workers are also informed, unless they are consulted on the measures being considered, unless they are able to play their role in the recovery policy in an atmosphere of economic and industrial democracy.

The first objective — as I see it — must be to reduce unemployment, whatever the cost may be. I will therefore reiterate the main lines of the Socialist plan for recovery. Sir Fred Catherwood seemed to think yesterday that, because this is a new Parliament, the programmes would be changed. Nothing is further from the truth. We abide by what we said in March during the debate on economic recovery in Europe.

The first requirement is social consensus, the second the redistribution of work, the third the reduction of working hours by 10% over the next two years, the fourth the reduction of regional disparities by taking specific measures in favour of the regions in which industrial decay and underemployment are the dominant features, for example, by involving the structural funds more. The fifth requirement is the stimulation of investment by both the private and the public sector and above all by involving the countries where a macroeconomic balance has already been achieved, such as the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Sixth, Community loans should be increased from 6 000 m to 20 000 m ECU over three years to encourage productive investment in priority sectors. Seventh, research and development should be better attuned to industrial policy. In other words, technological and social progress should be encouraged. Eighth, assistance should be given to small and medium-sized enterprises, which are far more labour-intensive than large firms. Ninth, more aid and more loans should be granted to the Third World, and there should be more open trade, if possible, in ECU, to help these countries overcome their debt burdens and achieve economic growth. Tenth, the position of the ECU and of the European Monetary System should be strengthened. And the 11th and final requirement is that the internal market should be improved, which our political opponents regard as the most important goal. For us it is one of the means, an important means, but only one of many. During the election campaign we demanded the abolition of national barriers to permit the free movement of people, goods and services.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Mr President, I hesitate to say that this debate is a farce, because the economic future of Europe is a serious matter. We are very close to being a farce.

My group's question, which started this debate, was a question to the Presidency of the Council of Ministers. I look across the benches. Where is the representative of the Council of Ministers to even listen to the question that we are going to put, let alone answer? I suggest, Mr President, that it would be very useful for you to ask someone to come back to take notes on what we are about to say in this debate because it is a very serious matter.

Could I suggest that first, and will you please suspend my speaking time till you can get an answer?

**President.** — You have had 43 seconds' speaking time, Mr Patterson. I shall check whether a Council representative is present.

**Mr Bonaccini (COM).** — (IT) Mr President, the gravity of the situation was emphasized at length, yesterday, by a great many Members. I do not propose adding further figures to those we already have: I shall

<sup>1</sup> See previous day's proceedings.

**Bonaccini**

simply say that, in the month of September alone, the number of unemployed in Europe rose by 300 000. In Italy, in one month, in manufacturing industry as a whole, the number of those employed fell by 6%. This shows that the problem is now no longer one of being convinced of the gravity of the situation but, instead, of recognizing the need to find a way out.

Yesterday, Sir Fred Catherwood recalled the work that we have done together to construct a programme, and he reminded us that the future of our Community depends entirely, or very largely so, on its capacity for economic recovery, its ability to provide an outlet for the pressures coming from the different classes in our country. In this connection he added an observation that I consider to be of the utmost value; he said that small steps in this direction are not enough, and that what is needed is an overall view, a strategy for getting out of this situation. I share this view. It may be that, where the individual measures are concerned, we shall not always agree with one another, but we do undoubtedly agree in believing that such a programme must be the starting point for whatever approach we decide to make, the standpoint from which we have to tackle the very future of the Community. We have, therefore, to set up a 'package' which will allow the people of Europe, as well as us, here, to understand how the situation is to be tackled, seeing that, so far, the question is not sufficiently clear.

This is in part, also, why we have not put forward a proposal of our own in this connection: there was no need to invent new items — in the last session we tackled the international question, on which our capacity for recovery largely depends. We call, today, for that document to be implemented. The President-in-Office of the Council summarized it very clearly and adequately yesterday morning.

The fundamental question, at this point, is to know who will be responsible for this work. In what was said yesterday the somewhat vague 'they' kept cropping up frequently: they say, they think, they must expect... Does this 'they' refer to the Commission, or the Council? The fact is that we have to get away from all this. The Commission — if the honourable members of that august body will forgive me — is near the end of its term of office: we cannot now expect a great, coordinated overall approach. And I regret this, because the Commission has had so much time in which to do this, and two months will certainly not be sufficient to allow us to get to grips with the problem.

We are, however, convinced that there will have to be a great debate on this subject, starting next January. We must prepare ourselves appropriately for this debate, and we must ask the present Commission to prepare the ground for that deadline. I would moreover add that the new Commission should do some very straight talking, and if necessary draw its own very serious conclusions. We should not only pour out our complaints to the Presidency of the Council, we

ought instead to say that very probably other new forms of action will have to be tackled. Otherwise, ladies and gentlemen, despite all our goodwill and determination, it will be the Parliament that will be held responsible by the people of Europe.

**President.** — I would point out that the Council is represented by two officials.

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — (DA) Mr President, of course the Liberal Group would also have greatly appreciated it if the President of the Council had been present. We are very much aware that the major problems in getting to grips with work on the internal market lie with the Council of Ministers. We note that Parliament is in broad agreement with the proposals put forward by the Commission, so it is now up to the Council to act. Such a discussion would therefore have been of great benefit. Let us hope that the Council is prepared to provide another opportunity for it.

But more important than this discussion is that the Council of Ministers should now summon the ability to act; it has been decided that a citizens' Europe should be pursued, and the citizens of Europe quite simply expect that something will be done for them. The Liberal Group thus takes the view that one of the best things we can do for the citizens of Europe is to show them what we can do best in the Community. For the tasks confronting us can best be accomplished in a Community framework.

All the Member States of the Community have been passing through a period of economic decline, but there are signs that an economic recovery is on the way. I cannot but say, as a Danish representative, that we in the Liberal Group here in Parliament take a very positive view of the economic recovery which is now taking place in Denmark; we are also much gratified to see it happening in other parts of Europe. We are pleased too that the proposal we adopted in the European Parliament before the last direct elections was a clear expression of the agreement among the great majority of those in Parliament that it is necessary to create better economic conditions so that our firms can have confidence in the future, so that they dare invest and hence create more jobs, and not just jobs but jobs that will last.

We all know that Europe is losing ground to the USA and Japan, but I am absolutely sure that we have a qualification base to build on in our countries. What we must do is show our will to build further on that base. If the will is there — and it has to be there in the Council of Ministers — we shall be able to equip our populations to meet the challenges they face in the present and will face in the future. We live with a vengeance in the age of technology, and our peoples must be equipped to deal with it. They must be retrained to meet new demands. They are confronted

**Tove Nielsen**

with new challenges. If we can meet these demands, the Liberal Group is convinced that we shall succeed in creating a better future for the citizens of Europe.

The Liberal Group has put forward a proposal on the internal market, because there is an urgent need to get the internal market to function. We deeply deplore the fact that, in the period of economic decline we have been passing through, there are Member States which have felt obliged to protect themselves and their own internal markets. It is quite simply a violation of the spirit and letter of the Treaty of Rome. The Liberal Group is therefore keen to work for the removal of technical barriers to trade and protectionism. We must ensure that our Member States have the means of marketing the new products which are absolutely necessary if we are to get out of this situation. This means that the many different rules, standards and requirements imposed in respect of a given product in the various Member States must go. When a product is approved in one Member State, it must also be acceptable in the other Member States.

It is these technical barriers which make everyday life seem difficult for the citizens of Europe; they often feel that they are beating their heads against a brick wall. We must help these people, for it is they who are going to help create a better future for us all in Europe.

**Mr Christensen (ARC).** — (DA) Mr President, I rise to speak on behalf of the The People's Movement against Danish Membership of the European Community. The common theme running through this discussion on Europe's economy is that the Community has fallen behind in relation to the USA, Japan and the Pacific countries. This has happened precisely during the 27 years the Treaty of Rome has been in force and, in particular, over the past 11 years. I think this is worth noting. It is also worth noting that it may be symptomatic of this Assembly's method of tackling these questions that it holds one debate on unemployment and a completely different one on the economy, and that the economic debate is chopped up into small pieces which make it completely meaningless.

But what I want to come back to is that it is downright astonishing that so many people — at least in this Assembly — believe that the European Community of all things is the right instrument for catching up on those countries which, during the period the Community has been in existence, have raced ahead of the Community technologically and economically. The truth is — and this is also a rejoinder to the liberal spokeswoman a moment ago, my compatriot — that Community protectionism is a magnification of Member State protectionisms, and that the Community's absurd agricultural policy is merely the old national agricultural protectionism multiplied by 10. When 10 countries sit together round a negotiating table and have to agree on everything, the easiest way is to do it

at the expense of the others. A short while ago we were debating the Lomé Convention, and that was an example of how the European Community leads in protectionism to the detriment of the countries in question here. This policy, this protectionistic policy, which is a characteristic feature of the European Community's customs union, has left the Community with obsolescent structures, while other European countries, such as Sweden, Norway and Switzerland, have forged ahead economically and technologically, with a level of unemployment which is a third that of the Community and a value of external trade which, at least as far as Sweden is concerned, in per capita terms is considerably higher than that of the Community. To me this demonstrates the value of the principle of free cooperation between free and independent countries on questions of common interest and, to put it mildly, it demonstrates the questionable value of the principle of European union underlying the European Community.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Mr President, my group put three questions to the Council which must be represented, although I cannot see the representative. Has the Council considered the programme for recovery put forward by the European Parliament? I take the answer to that question to be no. What steps is the Council taking to implement Parliament's proposals? I take the answer to that to be none.

Mr President, that is not good enough. The Albert and Ball report which we are discussing said that non-Europe was one of the principal causes of our economic problems, which were lack of investment, low return on investment, low growth and high unemployment. Everyone is agreed, capitalists, communists and all the national governments — at least according to the documents they all signed in Copenhagen in 1982 and since — that we must have a true common market, an internal market. So why is it not done?

Why is it that though everyone agreed that it is ludicrous to have 70 different documents in existence for transferring goods across Europe, we still have no final decision on the single administrative document? And, I may add, why has the draft of the document got 40 different headings when that introduced in Benelux in July makes do with 17?

Take the matter of non-tariff barriers and the need to create European standards. We in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy have just been discussing the draft 1985 budget in which there are certain items to help promote the internal market. Who were the treasury ministers in the Finance Council who cut back these budget items? Had they any idea what they were doing?

Finally, we have the Commission programme for consolidating the internal market, published in June, and comprising some 100 plus measures. The Commission

**Patterson**

says if they were all adopted within the next 18 months, they would constitute a qualitative leap forward. So, who is guilty of blocking them?

The time has come, Mr President, to name names. I call on the Commission representative to publish a systematic table which will indicate against each proposal which Member State is making the objection, and even better, which national minister or national civil servant is making the objection. Then we will have identified the few hundred men or women in the bureaucracies of our national governments who are actually creating the low investment, the low economic growth and the high unemployment which we all deplore.

I wish the Council representative could reply to it. I call on the Commission to reply in their stead.

**Mr Chaboche (DR).** — (FR) Mr President, honourable Members, at the end of September 1984, there were 12.7 million unemployed in the EEC. This was an increase of 300 000 people over the end of August, pushing the unemployment rate up from 11% to 11.3%. On the other side of the Atlantic, the opposite — to within a few thousand people — occurred.

If we are to understand what is happening in Europe, we only need to look to the USA, just as the Americans look to Europe for a better idea of what is happening in their country. This is because the similarities and analogies of our socio-political systems mean we are reciprocal units of measurement. We see that, although the economy is recovering well in the USA, it is stagnating in Europe and, although unemployment in the USA has dropped to physiological levels, it is constantly on the increase in Europe.

If we analyse the American economic recovery closely, we can see that one of the essential factors is the dynamism of the small and medium-sized enterprises. This dynamism may go some way to explaining the apparent contradiction between a drop in unemployment and a parallel drop in the rate of inflation.

In Europe too, the main connecting tissue of the economy is a sector that is just as well developed — the SMUs, although most of the time (and this is unlike what happens in the USA) their scope is restricted by structures which are currently keeping them more or less within regional limits. So the SMUs do not have what it takes to take a qualitative leap forward and become competitive on the international market. The ties that bind them, I repeat, are of regional scope and this prevents the exchange of technology with regions that are a long way away. This, among other things, was what the final report on the SMU year said.

One thing it would be wrong to underestimate is the fact that optimum economic integration means having the same monetary system — and this calls for our governments to show a firm will to reach a solution

whereby the ECU can play its rightful part as a European currency.

**Mr Smith (S).** — Mr President, in developing policies for economic recovery it is obvious that we should direct those policies to those people in greatest need — in my country the 4 million unemployed, the 5 million disabled, the 7 million living on supplementary benefits, the 9 million pensioners and, in particular, the 15 million children who die each year of starvation throughout this world of ours. The unemployed, for example, must have the opportunity to use their talents and creativity at the workplace instead of the present situation where if someone is fortunate enough to obtain a job, more often than not it is a menial, soul-destroying job which in no way allows them to utilize the talents which each and every one of them have.

The Socialist Group also believes that working people should have the right to determine their destiny at the workplace. Their destiny should not be determined by the heads of a few multinational companies whose headquarters may be thousands of miles away in Illinois or Detroit and who are accountable only to their shareholders. In reality what we are demanding as a group is that working people be given the same opportunities as successive right-wing governments have given their class over the past five years. The representatives of those right-wing governments in this House today also continue to ignore the demands of those in greatest need. In fact, one of the reports states that the answer to unemployment is even more unemployment. What is meant by that is that mass unemployment drives wages down, makes firms more competitive and therefore creates more employment. In my opinion that is nonsense. In the community in which I live unemployment is now running at 40%, but at the same time wage levels are some of the lowest in the United Kingdom. In fact, we all know that unemployment is, in reality, caused by the kind of policies outlined in many of our reports. Increasingly, however, whether it is the metalworkers in Germany or the coalminers in Britain, the workers are saying that they are not willing to allow their jobs and their communities to be crushed.

Finally, in the meeting of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy the right-wing members of that committee said that they wanted a consensus on this matter. We, as Socialists, say that there can never be a consensus with people whose policies tell the unemployed, the hungry and the homeless that they have no future. We will continue to bring this matter to this Parliament until justice is done to working people.

**Mrs Oppenheim (ED).** — (DA) Mr President, I can go along with some of the critical comments made by some colleagues regarding the fate to which this, in the view of many, very important debate has been con-

**Oppenheim**

signed. I very much hope that it will be possible to hold another debate on the same lines at a later stage, a more systematic debate, to which perhaps a little more attention may be devoted.

Many points were raised today and a number also yesterday when the debate was opened. I will not take up the many comments made, but will point out that it is half a year since the plan for economic recovery was adopted by the European Parliament, and we are still waiting for some initiatives, some efforts on the part of both the Council and the Commission. It must not be allowed to become a mere collection of words that we can go on repeating in our own countries about technical barriers and the internal market. We must be able to go home and say that some results can be achieved and that we shall soon see some concrete initiatives to do further work on. There is one point which has stayed with me and which I would have explored more fully had there been time, namely that it is not without reason that both the American and the Japanese markets have grown in relation to the European market. What do they do that we cannot do? In that connection, I would draw your attention to the findings of some American economists, published this summer, namely that technical barriers to trade in the European Community correspond to a tariff barrier of 10-12%. That is something we should think about.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Mr President, I have just one little reservation regarding the allocation of speaking time. The appendix to the agenda stated that speaking time for Thursday would be determined later. But as far as I know this was not done for today. I should be glad if this were to be done in future.

**President.** — The groups decided on Wednesday how speaking-time would be allocated. This has surely not escaped your attention.

**Mr P. Beazley (ED).** — Mr President, may I ask you whether we may be assured of an answer in our group to our oral question to the Council? I am appreciative of the fact that somebody is taking notes and we spe-

cifically wrote our question to the Council. We had the question available and were ready to speak at the last sitting. In this particular sitting we have had an extremely bad hearing. In so far as my group, at least — and I am a joint author of this question — consider that this is probably one of the most important subjects that will come before the House, we take a very unhappy view of the fact that the senior representative is not present and, particularly, the words spoken by Mr Barry at the start of the debate are totally inadequate in my opinion and that of our group. We would, therefore, ask your support to see that at the beginning of the next part-session, if we cannot have it tomorrow, we have full answers to the questions that we have put down.

**President.** — Mr Beazley, the Council was aware of the questions that have been put here and which are the subject of this debate. The President-in-Office of the Council expressed his position thereon in his introduction. It lies with you to decide whether the questions you have put have been answered or not. I am afraid your head-shaking cannot go into the Minutes. In due course we shall have to discuss how the Council answers or fails to answer the questions of our Parliament.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the close of this debate I have a request for an early vote on four motions for resolution. These are motions which are to be voted on at the end of the debate on these oral questions. This we have to decide today under Rule 42(5) of our Rules of Procedure. I therefore propose that we make our decision in one single vote since the four motions for resolutions concern the same subject. Besides this is the usual procedure and I would therefore appreciate it if you could agree. Do I have your agreement?

*(Parliament agreed to the request)*

The vote on the four motions for resolutions will take place tomorrow morning at the end of the debate on this item.<sup>1</sup>

*(The sitting was closed at 8 p.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> Documents received — Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

## SITTING OF FRIDAY, 26 OCTOBER 1984

### Contents

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i><br/> <i>Mr Ulburghs; Mr Andrews; Mr Glezos; Mr Maber; Mr Welsb; Miss Quin . . . . .</i> 196</p> <p>2. <i>Economic recovery (Docs. 2-610/84, 2-704/84, 2-816/84 and 2-817/84) (contd):</i><br/> <i>Mr Chanterie; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Rogalla; Mrs van den Heuvel; Mr Kilby; Mr Mavros; Mrs Van Rooy; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Cassidy; Mr Patterson . . . . .</i> 198</p> | <p>3. <i>Scientific and technical interchange — Report by Mr Münch (Doc. 2-796/84):</i><br/> <i>Mr Münch; Mr Linkobr; Mr Seligman; Mr Maber; Mr Staes; Mr Burke (Commission); Mrs De March . . . . .</i> 203</p> <p>4. <i>Adjournment of the session . . . . .</i> 207</p> |
|--|--|

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

*Vice-President*

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

1. *Approval of the minutes*

**President.** — The Minutes of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

**Mr Ulburghs (NI).** — *(NL)* Mr President, I request that the Minutes record the procedure which resulted in my being given yesterday, as a Member of this Assembly, unjust treatment in the light of Rule 48(2) of the Rules of Procedure. What happened was that the President asked those speakers who had tabled a motion for a resolution whether they were prepared, in view of the shortage of time, to renounce their speaking-time. This Mrs Focke did, and the fact is noted in point 16 of the Minutes; but my name is not mentioned even though I was personally asked — and I agreed — to do the same, despite the fact that I had saved up my speaking-time over the whole day and

consequently had seven minutes at my disposal — two minutes for myself, three minutes for the non-attached Members and three minutes ceded to me by Mr van Miert (this point was conveyed by him to the President). This is discrimination against a minority, and I protest emphatically.

On three occasions I was given unjust treatment. First, the Bureau of Parliament did not recognize the urgency of my motion for a resolution, probably because of my individual point of view and the fact that I belonged to a minority. The others were accepted.

Secondly, the motion was accepted by the House in plenary sitting but was put at the end of the list.

Thirdly, yesterday was the last straw. Despite the agreement reached with the President, his successor committed two errors: first, he broke the agreement by giving the floor to a number of speakers, and secondly, he completed — again in contravention of the agreement — the voting on the resolutions whilst I had refrained from speaking for the sake of the vote...

**President.** — Mr Ulburghs, you are an observer at enlarged Bureau meetings, so you can make your voice heard then. I cannot accept the case you are making. My understanding and my observation as a

## President

Member of this House was that the occupant of the Chair at the time who made the ruling was quite in order.

**Mr Andrews (RDE).** — Mr President, with respect to the previous speaker he was, I must say, waiting here all day yesterday of speak and he did not get an opportunity. I just wanted to make quick reference to that.

Mr President, are there any sanctions on Members who behave in a disorderly manner in this House and thus bring the House into disrepute? It seems to me that in the past three months we have had some of the most astonishing displays of bad manners and discourtesy to the house from all sides of the Chamber. I would like to suggest that, at some stage, the presidency should introduce, for the approval of the House, an amendment to the Rules allowing for the introduction of sanctions against Members who misbehave.

Furthermore, Mr President, yesterday we were subjected to a voting system that I believe 90% of the Members of this House did not understand or could not comprehend. I wonder if there is any possibility that in future we may have some . . .

**President.** — I am sorry I have to intervene at this point. I appreciate what you say, Mr Andrews. I fully agree with you in your appeal to people not to be discourteous to the Chair. I appreciate the example you have now given by sitting down.

We shall be following this matter up. The Bureau is very concerned about the situation as far as security and all the other matters that have been referred to are concerned.

**Mr Glezos (S).** — (GR) Mr President, I invoke your authority as President and your sense of justice, to allow me to say the following: Matters for urgent debate are covered by Parliament's Rules of Procedure. These Rules, however, make no special provision for extraordinary items. Despite this, yesterday some Members referred to extraordinary items such as the presence in Parliament of a person who, in their opinion, was not welcome. Consequently, on a different matter that is regarded as extraordinary and not urgent, namely the death sentence on and execution of the Turk Idir Aslan by Evren's dictatorship, I should be grateful if you were to tell me in what way I could bring about its introduction to Parliament for debate. Yesterday certain colleagues were able to generate debates on subjects of interest to them by concerted action, and I too would like to know how I may raise the matter of his sentence for debate.

**President.** — I am sorry, but that is not a point of order. Under the Rules of this House every Member is

entitled to table resolutions. But they just cannot be dragged up like this first thing before the actual sitting gets under way. Everybody should be aware of the proper procedure for tabling resolutions, etc.

**Mr Maher (L).** — Mr President, a point of information in relation to the question raised by Mr Andrews on security and disturbances in the House. Yesterday there was a meeting between the new security group which has been constituted by the President, and the Quaestors, and certain decisions were taken about current problems. Moreover, further measures are being taken within the Rules to ensure that disturbances of this kind do not take place again, but if they do, there will be sanctions to ensure that Members will behave themselves.

**President.** — I take it, Mr Maher, that those decisions will, at the earliest possible moment, be communicated to the Members.

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — Mr President, my name does not appear on the list of those present yesterday, and as your colleagues will confirm I think I was here for most of the day, so could that be adjusted?

**President.** — Mr Welsh, I would suggest that in future you sign your name.

**Ms Quin (S).** — Mr President, I should like to raise a point of order concerning the use of time for the urgent debate yesterday. There were several announcements from the Chair which took up time, there were many points of order, there was also a great deal of time spent asking for a quorum. As a result of this many matters that were urgent were not considered, including the Socialist Group resolution on the refugees in the British Consulate in Durban.

Is there any way in which, when part of the three hours for urgent debate has been lost, extra time could be made available later on; perhaps, for example, today? It seems a pity, when this House has agreed to take certain topics as urgent matters, that they cannot be discussed because of various disruptions and irrelevant business which comes before the House during the time which is supposed to be devoted to the topical and urgent debate.

**President.** — I fully appreciate the views expressed by Ms Quin. They were felt and, to a certain extent, expressed yesterday evening. But Vice-President Seefeld was in the Chair towards the end and extra time was in fact allowed to cover all of the time lost on technical points raised during the debate. I can assure

**President**

the House that a full three hours was given to the actual debate on urgent topics yesterday.<sup>1</sup>

(Parliament approved the minutes)

**2. Economic recovery**

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the oral questions on European economic recovery.<sup>2</sup>

**Mr Chanterie (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the plan for economic recovery to which we gave our approval in the last Parliament with the report by our colleague Fernand Herman is, as various prominent people and even government leaders have stated, the most valid plan for economic recovery that is on the table for the moment. Consequently, the Parliament is right to come back to it in order to draw it firmly to the attention of both Council and Commission.

All we can do is to repeat again and again what we said so often during the recent electoral campaign. We must stress, and keep on stressing, the need for a coordinated and coherent plan of economic recovery along the lines we had worked out and draw attention to the points of primary importance that we stressed in that plan.

The first of these points, which I wish to stress once more, concerns the abolition of internal frontiers. This is a clear aim, and I was glad to hear that Mr Narjes is prepared to work for it too. During the first five years, what we have to do is not just whittle down the obstacles at the frontiers but make definite progress towards abolishing the frontiers.

It has taken 27 years since the signing of the Treaty of Rome for France and Germany, to take an example, to announce their intention of doing away with certain customs formalities for travellers crossing their common frontiers. With effect from 1 January 1985, half of the Member States will, in principle at least, be providing a uniform European passport. These are a few modest signs of a movement towards abolishing frontiers, but we, as a European Community, cannot allow another 25 years to pass before our internal frontiers are finally abolished. That is the first item in our list of priorities for action.

The second, which is directly connected, is industrial policy. An *espace européenne* for industry and research is urgently needed. This in itself should provide a powerful impulse for new economic growth and also

put the problem of employment in a completely different light. We were all gratified to see that the agreement on the Esprit programme had come into force, a programme which might well serve as a model for this European 'economic space'; but we must all be aware that we have to draw up much more ambitious plans and that a great deal more in the way of financial resources must be made available for this purpose, for the funds provided by Member States for the coming five years of this programme do not come anywhere near the IBM budget for research and development in 1984 alone. Here, too, rapid progress must be made.

My third point concerns the reorganization and redistribution of working-time. This, too, must be promoted by our European legislation, but unfortunately we find that a number of proposals concerning this subject are lying on the table of the Council of Ministers but never get discussed.

Mr President, I will conclude with a reference to the Committee for a Citizen's Europe, established at the Fontainebleau Summit. I have to say that, unfortunately, the places on this committee were filled with officials — and precisely that kind of official who for years has been inventing over-ingenious ways of creating new obstacles at the frontiers. I am afraid that with that kind of membership we shall not have a Committee for a Citizen's Europe but a Committee of Europe against the citizens. Something must therefore be urgently done about it.

(Applause from various benches)

**Mr P. Beazley (ED).** — Mr President, the particular question I wish to put to the Council now is about what steps it has already taken and what steps it proposes to take to mobilize the Community's savings and to provide the pump-priming capital to relaunch the European economy. It will be recalled that this proposal formed part of the Herman report.

The savings potential of Europe is even greater than that of the USA. Yet, because of the failure of the Council to see its opportunities and translate them into effective action, these savings are, to an unacceptable extent, being siphoned off to fuel the US economy, dominated as it is by abnormally high interests rates. European savings and European capital must be free to seek the most profitable markets, but nowhere is the need greater than in Europe and nowhere will the long-term return be better. The Council must implement this pre-investment in the future in order to relaunch the European economy on a sound Community basis.

We must, of course, make much greater use of the opportunities provided by the European Investment Bank, which can be very considerably increased, to stimulate the relaunch of the European economy. The Herman report called for an increase in EIB loans of

<sup>1</sup> For petitions, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

<sup>2</sup> See the debates of Wednesday, 24 October 1984.

**Beazley**

20 000m ECU over three years. It proposed that the EIB should expand its group loans in collaboration with national credit institutions to provide risk capital. It further called for the EIB to issue European recovery bonds to be sold directly to the people of the Community.

What steps have been taken so far in these respects? One should not imagine that the European economy will relaunch itself of its own accord. At present it is much too fragmented, and the Council's leadership lacks definite aims, precise projects and, most of all, the necessary will and determination. Suitable Community projects will catalyse additional large-scale private investment to create long-term employment and wealth-creating businesses. However, the European economy is a large and complex piece of machinery. It cannot be started with a few cranks of a starting-handle. It requires a powerful starter motor to get it going in the form of appropriate projects.

One such project is the Channel Tunnel, which I prefer to call the 'Europa Tunnel'. This would provide a great stimulus to the steel and construction industries, to engineering and design and to job-creation. The finance to construct such a tunnel can be supplied privately, but I should like to ask the Council whether it is willing, as has been stated in the press, to support the guarantee. A 'Europa Tunnel' would lead to the creation of a unified European transport system and bind Britain both physically and psychologically to the Community.

However, we must also challenge the US and Japan in many more industries. We need a much larger aircraft industry. Airbus Industrie has already shown that it can be successful and challenge the world monopoly of the American aircraft industry. We must further develop our defence aircraft products and, in particular, invest much more in space research, telecommunications, bio-technological engineering, etc., from which so many new industries will develop. We have the science, the development capability and the production skills. The Council lacks the will, the organization, the courage and the confidence. When will the Council accept this challenge?

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Mr President, some mysterious stroke of managerial genius must be responsible for the fact that this debate, largely concerned as it is with the citizen's Europe and our responsibilities towards these citizens, is taking place at a moment when regrettably few citizens are listening from the visitors' gallery. That is my first worry, and I would point out that not only Mr Chanterie but also, yesterday, my friend and comrade, Llewellyn Smith, drew attention to these citizens — that is, the workers, the underprivileged citizens who suffer from life's disadvantages and hope to gain something from closer cooperation in Europe.

My second point is that I am less worried by the fact that during this debate the Council benches are once more empty: that is one of the customs we have to get used to. I count on our friends from the press and television to report on this debate.

Thirdly, before I come to an instance which I would like to describe to you as a convincing illustration of our backwardness in keeping our promises, I should like you to look at a little barrier I have put up here, which is in the position that should be normal in this Community — that is to say, a barrier that is open. The only places where we still need barriers in this Community are level-crossings. By way of demonstration material I have also brought a notice like those still to be found everywhere at our internal frontiers, where they serve to separate citizens from one another and prevent them from moving freely, and I hope that none of my colleagues and also no one from the Bureau will think that . . .

**President.** — Mr Rogalla, you have made your point.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Mr President, may I add that a meeting of the enlarged Bureau, which you unfortunately did not attend, discussed the interpretation of Rule 70 — a question which might conceivably be raised in this connection — and it was pointed out that we in this Parliament also have to make use of visual means to bring home our problems.

**President.** — Mr Rogalla, I accept that. In actual fact you are wearing the material, so there is no problem.

(Laughter)

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Mr President, on 9 March of this year, during the campaign for the European elections, Mr H., a lawyer, coming from Germany, arrived at the Dutch frontier-station on the motorway near Aachen—Heerlen. He intended to attend an international conference in Antwerp. He describes what then happened as follows:

'A male frontier official inspected my identity document and checked my personal details in a concealed brown box. He then asked me where I was travelling to. I asked him why he wanted to know, since I, as an EEC citizen, was entirely covered by the regulations concerning freedom of movement. The official insisted, and so on and so forth. After waiting some time, I was approached by a woman frontier official, who asked me once more for my destination. As I refused once again to reply, she told me to go back into the Federal Republic (we were on Dutch territory); there I could make a complaint, and so on and so forth.'

The lawyer refused to give way. After waiting a short while, he was referred to a gentleman behind a glass

**Rogalla**

panel, who told him peremptorily that he was either to declare his destination forthwith or to return to the Federal Republic. After prolonged discussion, during which the lawyer pointed out the legal position, the official reaction was finally, 'We'll see what we're allowed to ask you and what we are not!'

I dare say many of you have experienced the same sort of thing.

When the question came up as to what should be done, the official asked suddenly how much money the lawyer had with him in cash. The latter, having replied that he had five marks in cash, was told that he was obliged by Dutch law to carry at least 30 Dutch guilders; he could not be allowed in, and would have to return to the Federal Republic. The information that he had valid 'Visa' credit-cards and also cheques with him was of no avail.

Finally, a written correspondence with the Dutch authorities culminated in a reply from the Dutch Secretary of State — not, of course, personally but introduced with the formula:

*(NL)* The Secretary for Justice, on behalf of the Secretary of State, through the head of the Directorate for Foreigners' Affairs.

*(DE)* That makes four levels of authority for dealing with the man in the street. What lends especial piquancy to the whole affair, however, is the following sentence:

*(NL)* The fact that the official concerned the while kept his hand on his pistol is entirely the result of habit and is assuredly not to be understood as a means of intimidation.

*(DE)* That, being interpreted, means: the man didn't rattle his sabre but grinded it as a matter of habit.

In this, the twenty-sixth year of the Community's existence, we find that fire-arms are still used at internal frontiers. — Not on this, but on other occasions. There are reports in the newspapers. Who can do something here to bring us further along the road? The Commission does its best, but the steel and automobile workers of Bochum or Westphalia or . . .

**President.** — You have gone four minutes over your speaking-time.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, last night I deliberately pointed out that I intended to use Mr Mattina's speaking-time in order to obviate interruptions of this kind during my speech today. I am sorry, but I think I have another minute.

**President.** — Very well. I have no difficulty in conceding that extra minute.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — *(DE)* I wanted to ask, is it really necessary to have incidents such as this, which demonstrate our backwardness in achieving freedom of movement and applying civil rights and privileges anchored in the Treaties since 1958, to turn back the wheel of history and say, progress has proved impossible, we want to go back 151 years — in the Federal Republic, that would mean going back to the Customs Union — and carry on burdening our economy with strangling restrictions? I hope not. Rather I trust that all of you, and you in particular, Mr President, will join me in stepping up the pressure for a workers' and citizens' Europe, so that we really get some results.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Rogalla. I want to apologize: I had wrong figures.

**Mrs van den Heuvel (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, for the House's information may I say that I myself have drawn the attention of the Dutch Minister of Justice to the case just described by Mr Rogalla. I am waiting for his reply.

**Mr Kilby (ED).** — Mr President, my observations start from the baseline that the principal reason for the high levels of unemployment in the European Community is the fact that the Community has become progressively less competitive over the last ten years. This decline in competitiveness has led to a fall in our share of world markets; it has also led to increased penetration of the European market by non-EEC countries, notably Japan, with whom our ever-growing trade deficit has now reached alarming proportions. Our free-trade system here gives our people the freedom to purchase form whatever source of supply they prefer. It is a democratic philosophy which has also taught us some very sharp lessons. It has taught us that many of our products, goods and services are no longer competitive when measured against world competition. So I address myself to the unemployment problem not from a viewpoint which seeks the solution by introducing work-sharing or other social schemes, however superficially attractive they may appear, but rather from the pragmatic standpoint which asks the basic question: if Europe has become progressively less competitive, then what do we need to do to improve that competitive position? That would also persuade our people to purchase European products, goods and services.

There is a solution: I believe we should clearly identify the capital projects which come within the authority of this Parliament and which would help to make us competitive. The implementation of such cost-beneficial schemes would stimulate demand and reduce unemployment. I shall be working with my group in our respective committees to identify those projects, for this, I believe, is the best and most effective way for this Parliament to reduce the unacceptably high

**Kilby**

levels of unemployment which are of great concern to us all.

**Mr Mavros (S).** — (GR) Mr President, there is no doubt that Europe is passing through a great and protracted crisis which has resulted in 15 million unemployed, as every speaker in the House has stressed. They have also emphasized — and this point is more important still — that a very high proportion of the unemployed are less than 25 years of age, in other words that unemployment is particularly affecting the young.

It has also been stressed that such is not the case either in America or in Japan. The Europe of the Ten is ailing, and radical changes are needed. The Treaty that created the Community 30 years ago in Rome has remained unmodified, whereas enormous economic, social and even cultural changes have taken place. We have a budget of the order of 30 billion dollars, of which two-thirds are absorbed by agriculture and of these three-quarters by butter, milk and beef. Mr President, we should feel ashamed that we hold vast stores of milk and butter while children in the Third World are dying of hunger.

European economic recovery can under no circumstances take place within the narrow framework of the ten Member States of the Community. We live in an age of close economic interdependence, and economic prosperity can only be uniform and indivisible.

The solution to Europe's problem is to open up towards the Third World, which is the greatest market for European products. What is needed is a European Marshall plan, which would help the economic recovery of industrial and developing countries alike.

Above all, Europe must undertake to strive for the healing of the Third World economies. At this time the Third World is plunged in debt to the tune of 800 billion dollars, which it is paying off with interest at the rate of 140 billion dollars a year. We have to consider how the Third World can be healed, since it is the great market for European products. Only in this way can recovery be achieved. All that has been attempted within the narrow framework of the Ten has failed, and all of us who speak for this movement lament the failures in question.

*(Applause from the benches of the Socialist Group)*

**Mrs Van Rooy (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, complaints are made only too readily in Europe about the high exchange-rate of the dollar, which is keeping interest-rates in Europe high and so acting as a brake on economic recovery. This reproach may to some extent be justified, but it still sounds pretty hypocritical so long as we in Europe make no effort to launch what is the most important means of

revitalizing the European economy — that is to say, achieving a common market. That this fine phrase 'common market' still has little meaning is proved daily by the long queues of lorries waiting at the frontiers between EEC countries. Delays at the frontier, together with all the fuss and bother with papers, mean a loss to business of thousands of millions of ECU every year.

This was illustrated once more by Mr von Wogau at the beginning of this debate. In my country, the Netherlands, alone, this means another 5 000 million guilders, or roughly 2 000m ECU, thrown away this year. Doing away with delays at frontiers is an effectual way of relieving business of some of its burdens, and these reliefs can lead to new investments without further loading national budgets.

Despite repeated calls from government leaders to give high priority to strengthening the internal market, the results are still unsatisfactory. Recently, however, there have been some encouraging signs. Happily, Mr Delors has already declared that, as the new President of the Commission, he intends to give first priority to the internal market. The Council has adopted some 15 technical directives, the most important thing being the introduction in principle of a single document. We shall not, however, be content until the final decision is made and the single document really simplifies things. This means limiting the number of data required, and the yardstick must be not the largest number desirable but the minimum number necessary. This should be digested above all by the statistical authorities of the Member States.

Technically, the document must be so drawn up that it is of some real practical use. This applies particularly to small and medium-sized enterprises. Moreover, the single document must really be a single document in that national authorities will not be given the opportunity to start once more requiring all kinds of supplementary documents.

I should like to ask the Commission whether they are doing anything about the offer made by some big chemical firms to try out the single document for the purpose of gathering experience and tracking down faults in the system. I would point out that not too much should be expected of the single document with regard to reducing delays at the frontiers, since these delays are primarily due to the handling of VAT. My group therefore much regrets that negotiations on the draft of the Fourteenth VAT Directive have come to a standstill and that the United Kingdom now even wants to turn the clock back.

The removal from frontiers of VAT payment points is in fact of much greater importance for internal trade than the single document. I therefore urge the Commission to do everything possible to prevent any further delays with the Fourteenth VAT Directive. This directive is, in my opinion, a test case that will show

**Van Rooy**

what value is to be attached to Member States' fine words about strengthening the internal market.

Finally, a brief remark on the examination of personal documents at internal frontiers. This is, of course, pre-eminently the sphere in which something has to be done when people talk about a citizens' Europe. There are a number of cases where bilateral steps have been taken to reduce frontier inspections, and this can only be a source of satisfaction. At the same time, however, we find a development in the opposite direction: the installation of electronic equipment for checking purposes at frontier-posts actually makes the business of inspection yet more sophisticated, as, for example, with the collection of duties that are outstanding. It goes without saying that the citizen will not be too happy about Europe if frontier crossing-points are turned by the national authorities into debt-collecting agencies. This is not the function of frontier-posts.

*(Applause from various benches)*

**President.** — The debate is closed.

We shall now vote on the four motions for resolutions to wind up the debate.

**Motion for a resolution by Mr Klepsch and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, Mr Rogalla, on behalf of the Socialist Group, and Sir Fred Catherwood and others, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on proposals for European economic recovery (Doc 2-819/84)**

*Explanations of vote*

**Mr Bonaccini (COM).** — *(IT)* I feel that our position was made abundantly clear in the speech that I made yesterday evening on behalf of my group. While the motions for resolutions before us might be faulted in parts for being somewhat one-sided, we shall nevertheless vote for them in order to bring about a broadly-based agreement in this Parliament that can enable us to bring some influence to bear on the present situation. Nonetheless we shall be abstaining on one of these motions for a resolution because of its excessive one-sidedness, even in relation to the others.

**Mr Cassidy (ED), in writing.** — Europe's problem is plain to see. Between 1973 and 1983, the EEC lost 3 million jobs. In the same ten years, the USA gained 15 million jobs. The cost of financing this loss of employment in the European Community has meant an increase in the public-sector share of gross domestic product from 32.1% to 58.5% in the twelve years between 1960 and 1982. In the USA it increased from 27.8% to 35.5% in the same period.

There appears to be a general consensus in Europe on unemployment. The inflexibilities of the labour market and the shared assumptions about job protection mean that all ten Member States have legislation which has the fine intention of protecting those in jobs. Unfortunately, this legislation also has the effect of keeping out of jobs those who are currently unemployed.

It has been calculated that the Community would need an economic growth-rate of between 6% and 7% per year to increase the number of employed persons by 1%.

The seeds of Europe's present crisis were sown in the period of the energy crisis 10 years ago. At that time Europe should have been united and have invested to safeguard the future. Instead, all ten Member States opted for the maximum consumption, financing the increased cost of energy with inflation, each country pursuing its own solutions without coordination with its neighbours. This sacrifice of future prospects for present comfort has led to the current situation in Europe, where two unifying factors are predominant: economic decline and unemployment. That is the essence of the challenge facing the Community today.

*(Parliament adopted the motion for a resolution)*

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — I regret that the Socialist Group have not given an explanation of vote. Mr Rogalla signed the motion on behalf of the Socialist Group and they then vote against it.

*(Laughter)*

\*  
\* \*

**Motion for a resolution by Mr De Vries and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the plan for European economic recovery (Doc. 2-856/84) Adopted.**

\*  
\* \*

**Motion for a resolution by Mr de la Malène and Mr Malud, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the plan for European economic recovery (Doc. 2-857/84) Adopted.**

\*  
\* \*

**Motion for a resolution by Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on economic and monetary questions (Doc. 2-855/84) Rejected.**

\*  
\* \*

### 3. Scientific and technical interchange

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr Münch, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-251/84 — COM(84) 215 final) for a decision adopting a plan to stimulate European cooperation and scientific and technical interchange, 1985-1988 (Doc. 2-796/84).

**Mr Münch (PPE), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in many debates in this House, it has already been pointed out that in various fields of technological research and practical innovation the USA and Japan have overtaken Europe and forced it out of its leading position on the world market in important advanced technologies.

This is not because the state of research in Europe, generally speaking, is bad; indeed, here there is no reason to be too pessimistic, for there is adequate potential in comparison with the USA and Japan. The real reason for our backwardness and our loss of leading positions is that in the countries of the European Community too much research is being undertaken at the national level and too little at the Community level. Research projects undertaken by individual states are not, of course, bad in themselves, but as a rule they have narrower limits than those undertaken by a number of countries together, which have a greater or wider effect. The present unsatisfactory situation should not, however, merely be a subject for complaint, particularly as complaints have nothing to do with practical or serious politics: it should be felt as a challenge.

This means that the research potential already available can be better coordinated by appropriate Community measures and put to better use. We must prevent any further loss of grey cells, which is irreparable and in the long run has disastrous consequences, and instead promote and intensify concerted Community projects.

With its proposed plan for stimulating European cooperation and scientific and technical exchange over the year 1985-1988, the Commission has made an important and constructive contribution to progress in this field. Its fundamental aims have already been debated and approved by large majorities on the basis of Mr Linkohr's report on the problems and prospects of a common research policy and Mr Markopoulos's report on the adoption of an experimental Community action to stimulate the efficacy of the Community's scientific and technical potential. In addition, I was gratified to learn a few weeks ago that Mr Jacques Delors, the designated President of the new Commission, had stated at a meeting of the enlarged Bureau at the beginning of this month that one of the Community's primary aims for the next few years must be

to respond to the technological challenge, thus entirely echoing our own views.

The principal aims of the programmes now put before us are seen by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology to lie, first, in making good, by means of specific Community measures, the decline in the competitiveness of European research and, secondly, in creating a scientific and technical *espace européenne* and a coherent Community research policy, since only concerted action can promote the organization of European research and also its efficiency in the widest sense.

These aims can be approached by the following means, as set forth in the main lines of the programme:

1. by creating the conditions necessary for enhancing the mobility and flexibility of research-workers;
2. by creating conditions favourable to the development of cooperation among different research teams on an international scale;
3. by supporting and promoting the training and professional integration (including advanced training and reintegration) of young researchers;
4. by establishing appropriate links between basic and applied research;
5. by ensuring that such exchanges are not confined to the research staff of university departments and the like, but are extended to cover research laboratories and departments in industry;
6. by ensuring that there is no division by sectors in primary research, even if sectoral research action programmes are to be supported;
7. by keeping this programme open to extension to include countries outside the European Community and also, be it said, outside Europe;
8. by regular continuation, development and also revision of the programme. Here the European Parliament must be regularly kept informed in order that it can deliver its opinion on each proposed revision.

These views have been incorporated by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology in the two amendments to the Commission's draft and also in the motion for a resolution. All these, indeed the entire report, received the committee's unanimous support.

I must add that I consider it important that research departments in both the academic and the industrial world be given full information about this programme. Moreover, the national governments, as Mr von Wogau said in the debate the day before yesterday,

**Münch**

must be prepared to give up certain favourite habits of theirs and instead develop the political energy and conviction necessary to remove existing obstacles and not only support the programme but also supplement it with a number of contextual measures.

I therefore appeal urgently to the Council not to delete or to cut the resources we wish to see made available for promoting research, for such a reaction, in view of the present severity of the struggle for competition in the field of innovative research, would be a deplorable step of great political significance.

This programme can be no more than a first step in the right direction, but it is an important step, without which we cannot emerge — as emerge we must — from our present sluggish state in order to proceed to further energetic measures in the medium and long term. Certain extensions into the sphere of the natural sciences and also the incorporation of sociological fields are as conceivable as they are desirable.

For all these reasons, I ask the House to adopt the report and so make an important contribution towards facilitating the free movement and exchange of research workers. Only by determined progress in this field can we survive the challenge to the European Community — a challenge which we have to take, and indeed are resolved to take, very seriously.

*(Applause)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*President*

**Mr Linkohr (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the programme just presented by Mr Münch is in my view one of the most interesting that we have had to discuss here in the last few years, for it heads straight for an offensive research policy, and this is what we want in the European Community. To be precise, what we are lacking in the Community is not so much the money — we know that we spend roughly as much *per capita* as the United States or Japan — as a single *espace européenne* for research, the possibility for Frenchmen, Italians, Britons and Belgians to work together in the same research team, as Europeans and not just in national laboratories. This is the purpose of this programme, to enable researchers to work together in teams across the frontiers. I consider this an excellent idea, and would urge national authorities down to the level of the governments of the *Länder*, for example, in the Federal Republic to improve upon this scheme, perhaps by initiatives of their own, so that in a few years' time what we have always been aiming for is a reality — European research as a single organizational entity.

This programme would exert an even bigger and wider appeal if it were to be extended from the natural sciences to the field of the humanities, and this for a very simple reason: in the third industrial revolution, we are concerned not only with building a faster computer than the Japanese but with finding an answer to the question how we are to live in this new society. That is the central, cultural question that Europe faces today. How do we want to live in the coming decades? This question has to be directed not only to the scientists but to other thinkers as well. We must work together — sociologists, philosophers, historians, scientists and technicians. I should therefore be thankful if this programme could serve to bring all the disciplines together. What we need is not a division into single disciplines, but a symbiosis of the various branches of study into an entirety of natural and spiritual sciences.

I welcome this programme, and we as a group shall vote for it.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — Mr President, the Münch report is an excellent report on this vital matter, and we certainly support the amendments that he has put forward on behalf of the committee. We also support Mr Ford's amendment, which is very important. Unfortunately, he is not here to promote his amendment, but there is no doubt that Europe falls behind the United States and Japan as regards effective research and the result of research in the form of patents per expenditure on research.

Research is one of the prime areas for Community cooperation. As Mr Münch said this morning, nationalism in research is our problem. If we are to the advantage of scale from the common market — and the advantage of scale is the fundamental economic reason for the common market — we must use our scarce resources in scientists more efficiently. We should look at the USA and say, why are they more efficient and more effective in their research results? We should compare with them the obstacles to research that we have.

In the United States, they have no language problem, for instance, as an obstacle to mobility. They have no tax problem as an obstacle to mobility. That is why I support practical steps to make it easier for scientists to be mobile.

Since Mr Ford has not read out his amendment. I would like to do so. He says we must also have measures with regard to double taxation, pension rights resettlement grants, financial assistance for family visits, etc. to minimize the barriers to free movement of young scientists. I think that is a very practical amendment. I would add that we should add facilities for elementary language training. I know scientists have their own international language when they get down to technicalities, but I am sure many are put off by lack of elementary linguistic knowledge in daily life.

### Seligman

Also, the other thing that is needed is better communication of jobs in this area — jobs available and jobs wanted. I am sure a lot of scientists do not even think of moving because they do not know the opportunities are there.

But, of course, all this costs money and the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy on the Münch report highlights the fact that with 40m ECU, only one-half of 1% of European scientists could partake in this scheme. I do not think that is enough. It is no good half baking this scheme, because it is vital for economic revival. It is vital for the competitiveness of industry. European industry is miles behind in information technology, biotechnology, space and other technologies. These industries are short of specialist scientists. That is why mobility of the scientists we have is vital. Nor has industry heard about this research stimulation programme. I have never heard it mentioned outside our own circle. Industrialists do not seem to know much about it. So, we must make sure that there are more financial resources available to publicize this programme and make sure that scientists know that there are these opportunities.

In fact, out of 609 applications for the pilot programme — and that is not very much — only 78 were accepted. If the demand is so difficult to meet, this scheme is not going to get off the ground and applicants will be discouraged not only by failing in their application, but also because of the time they have to wait to have their application considered.

Nevertheless, I agree with Dr Münch that this is one of the most important fields for Community action and financial support if we are to catch up with the USA and Japan.

**Mr Maher (L).** — Mr President, I too support the report presented by Mr Münch. I would say that a people that falls behind in research must inevitably fall behind in economic and social development. I think both things go hand in hand. I believe our aim in Europe should be not merely to catch up with the US and Japan but to be ahead of them. That ought to be our target.

For instance, we have some institutions which are doing fairly useful work. We have a European institution in Dublin, the Institute for Living and Working Conditions. I believe that some of the work this institute does is quite useful. Much of it is not of very great relevance to the European peoples; but should we not consider converting or orientating this institute more towards research that would be really valuable and useful to the peoples of Europe? If that were the case, the institute might no longer be as it is at the moment under severe financial pressure; indeed, we may find ourselves in the situation where we are paying the staff and there is no money to provide work for them to do.

This would be a ridiculous situation. I think we should look at this institute and see whether we can give them research work to do. They are a European institute and they could be doing a lot of useful research in this general area of living and working conditions, because we do want to point clearly at the kind of Europe, the kind of countries we want in the decades ahead of us. That would be a progressive step to take; otherwise, in my view, that institute is going to become less and less relevant. I do not think that is very sensible either.

I would also point to a very practical field where I believe a united effort on the part of the research organizations of the various member countries could be useful, and that is the whole question of using a resource which providence has so bountifully given to us, which is not given to peoples in other parts of the world, and that is our fertile land. We have great areas of very fertile land in Europe. We have a suitable climate for using that land in various ways, whether for food production, the production of forests or biomass, and yet the only problem we seem to be faced with is how we can lessen the output from that land, how we can depress production. Could we not take a more positive attitude towards it? Could we not bring together the research organizations that are working in this field in the various countries, though mainly independently of one another, and see whether we could use this land in a better way? Is there not some new way in which we could use this wonderful resource that the Lord has given us to offer more of the products that people need? Could we look at areas where we already have surpluses, for instance, and make new use of these surpluses? Is there another use for milk? It is a problem for us at the moment. It is coming out through our ears, because we do not yet know how to use it other than in the traditional ways, and so on.

Here are whole areas where Europe might be giving a lead. But it will not give that lead while research organizations work independently of one another. There is no category where we find more *prima donnas* than we do in research. Every little research organization thinks: 'We must do our own work. It is very important that we should do it our own way.' We in Europe should cut through that, get rid of these *prima donnas*, say: 'Yes, there will be resources made available provided that you work together, make the best possible use of the resources and the best possible use of the brain-power that you have' and bring them together. In my view, that could well hold the key to the future of Europe. We often discuss other questions. The internal market, for instance, is very important and so are all these other questions. However, unless we can find new roads ahead, new ways to make progress, then in my view we shall still be talking in 20 years' time about catching up with the USA and Japan. Let us not catch up but let us get ahead of the USA and Japan, and let people in America and Japan

**Maher**

20 years from now be standing up and asking: 'How can we catch up with Europe?'

*(Applause)*

**Mr Staes (ARC).** — *(NL)* Mr President, it goes without saying that every effort that leads to greater coordination and cooperation and helps to avoid overlapping, unnecessary work and useless expenditure of capital can only be welcomed. On the other hand, when we look at the subjects that are actually described in Mr Münch's report, we find that a number of important sectors are, in our view, missing. — And that is not only our view: another committee has pointed out that social and environmental questions are ignored. On that we are agreed, but as far as we are concerned it goes further than that.

On the other hand again, I am deeply disturbed, Mr President, by the eternal argument — if we can call it that — about Europe's capacity for competing with Japan and the United States. I am beginning to get sick and tired of this argument. I know its pretty important, in this connection as well; it isn't that I want to ignore it, but it's beginning to be too much of a good thing, I fear. When people talk about scientific research and technology, that means to me something rather different from the mere question of commercial competition: I would have thought that fundamental scientific research deserved in principle to be regarded as something outside the commercial sphere.

If you listen closely to what research-workers at our universities say, you find that one of their biggest complaints is precisely that when it comes to a crisis they are practically forced to put their fundamental research on one side and devote themselves to commercial research for private investors.

All this prompts me to raise two questions in connection with this report. First, what priorities have been fixed, what is the policy behind the granting of aid for all these projects, what political vision is all this based on? Secondly, and finally, what guarantees do we have that the aid that is granted, the efforts we make and the progress in scientific research that will undoubtedly result will not be applied in the military sector? We all know that about 60% of scientific research finds a military application in one way or another, directly or indirectly. I have seen nothing about this either in the report, and I should like to have this point clarified.

In the meantime, I shall ask my group to abstain in the vote on this item.

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, as is customary it gives me pleasure on behalf of the Commission to pay particular tribute to the thoroughness and the rapidity with which the com-

mittee's rapporteur, Professor Münch, discharged his task and to the understanding and the constructive attitude displayed by the committee. In a very short time it is clear that a remarkable effort in terms of examination and analysis has been undertaken. I feel that this bears witness to the serious interest which Parliament has always displayed in the stimulation action, and this is of immense encouragement to the Commission in pursuing the course of action it has chosen.

As Professor Münch has stressed in his report on our proposal, the decline in the competitiveness of European research, which is currently perceived and deplored everywhere, must be regarded and accepted as a challenge to the Community's capabilities and research potential.

The Community stimulation action takes its essence from a careful analysis of ways of meeting the challenge and its form from the highly successful experimental phase of the action over the past two years.

The proposal now before Parliament builds upon the lessons of the experimental phase and recommends a carefully calculated expansion in the scope of the action so that it can respond to the extent of demand already expressed by Europe's scientists and involve a significant number of them.

In bringing forward a mature and well-tested plan of this kind, the Commission feels it is going a considerable way towards fulfilling one of the major goals of the framework programme for Community science and technology — that is, to improve the efficacy of Europe's scientific and technical potential. The framework programme remains at the core of the Commission's aspirations for Community science, and its significance has been confirmed by the Council and indeed by this Parliament. The stimulation action must, therefore, be seen as a pivotal element in the Community's existing and undoubted scientific potential for the benefit of all.

In its consideration of the Commission's proposal, the Council has recognized the importance of having continuity in the stimulation action and thus in briefly anticipating the formal end of the experimental phase by working towards a January 1985 start. In so doing in February this year they paid particular tribute to the successful launching of the experimental phase.

The proposed plan has incorporated the important lessons to be learned from experience at this experimental phase and was drawn up in consultation with the Committee for European Development of Science and Technology, which gave the Commission invaluable assistance in launching and running the action.

The objectives of the plan are to encourage the mobility of researchers, collaboration between research teams and the career prospects of young scientists. The

**Burke**

Commission's hope is that in this way it will become easier for European science to respond quickly to the new and changing needs and for appropriate specializations to be developed in fields where there are, or are likely to be, inadequate human resources.

Mr President, whilst once again expressing the Commission's appreciation of the approach to this question by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, I should like to mention the various amendments to the Council decision that the rapporteur has proposed. The Commission finds these constructive and helpful, and since they effectively improve the proposal, we are more than happy to accept them.

I should like also, on behalf of the Commission, to indicate that in relation to Parliament's Amendments Nos 1 and 2, I can accept these. I take no position on Amendment No 3, except to indicate that perhaps an enumeration list might be incomplete and, secondly, because expectations once created may not easily be fulfilled.

I would like to tell the House, however, that the Commission is aware of the importance of the social security aspects to mobility, and these aspects have also been stressed at a recent conference of research ministers organized by the Council of Europe.

Once again, Mr President, thanking the Parliament for its help on this matter, I stress and accept the importance and take note of all the points made by the various speakers.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mrs De March (COM)**, draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy (in writing). — (FR) The plan to stimulate cooperation and scientific and technical interchange that has been put before us by the Commission is an attempt to get to grips with an underlying weakness of research in Europe namely, the inadequacy of communication between scientific institutes and of cooperation between laboratories and universities, as well as the differences in scientific training and in research systems.

In the opinion of which I have the honour to be the draftsman, our Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy expressed its entire agreement with the objectives of this plan. An initial assessment of the 1983-1984 experimental programme showed the enormous interest that the plan had aroused amongst research workers, because 5 000 requests for information were received between July 1983 and September 1984. Of these applications for financial support, 609 were declared admissible, but only 78 of them were accepted by the Commission. Our committee would point out that this number needs to be considerably increased. The financial package envisaged for the next two years is of the order of 35 million ECU, but 90 million would be needed in order to cater for 1% of Europe's research workers, that is to say 4 000 research workers.

Our committee also believes it is important that this multisectoral plan should range over all areas of scientific research and that it should therefore include in the list of areas covered the social sciences and the sciences related to the protection of the environment.

Finally, we express our concern that the results of this scientific and technical cooperation should benefit primarily European industry and not the United States or Japan, with whom we are engaged in a neck-and-neck race as far as industrial development is concerned. How does the Commission see itself getting to grips straight away with this question of linking up cooperation in research with the avenues that this would open up in the matter of industrial cooperation?

In the light of all these considerations, therefore, we support this stimulation plan, which is along the right lines namely, those of a Community anxious to strengthen its industrial employment potential and its economic development.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

**4. Adjournment of the session**

**President.** — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.<sup>1</sup>

*(The sitting closed at 10.25 a.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> For items relating to declarations entered in the register under Rule 49, forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting, and the dates of the next part-session, see the 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**

Sun Alliance House  
Molesworth Street  
Dublin 2  
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

**Stationery Office**

St Martin's House  
Waterloo Road  
Dublin 4  
Tel. 78 96 44

---

**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

---

**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  
Madrid 1  
Tel. (91) 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**

2182 St Catherine Street West  
Montreal  
Quebec H3H 1M7  
Tel. (514) 937 3519

---

**JAPAN**

---

**Kinokuniya Company Ltd**

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome  
Shiniuku-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 15.26    BFR 700    IRL 11.20    UKL 9.10    USD 14



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

