

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 2-316

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1984-1985 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 11 to 13 September 1984

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Tuesday, 11 September 1984	1
Resumption of the session, p. 2 — Verification of credentials, p. 2 — Request for waiving of immunity of three Members, p. 3 — Agenda, p. 3 — Deadline for tabling amendments, p. 5 — Question Time, p. 8 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 22 — Supplementary budget 1984 — Statement by the Commission, p. 23 — Annex, p. 28	
Sitting of Wednesday, 12 September 1984	36
Approval of the minutes, p. 37 — Decision on urgency p. 38 — Budget (continuation), p. 39 — Topical and urgent debate (motions), p. 65 — Question Time (continuation), p. 68 — Accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community — Negotiations on the accession, p. 82 — Annex, p. 107	
Sitting of Thursday, 13 September 1984	125
Approval of the minutes, p. 126 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 126 — Deadline for tabling amendments, p. 148 — Votes, p. 151 — Adjournment of the session, p. 158	

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, 11 SEPTEMBER 1984

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	2		
2. Verification of credentials Mr Rogalla; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Cryer . . .	2		
3. Request to waive the immunity of three Members Mr Tortora; Mr Pearce	3		
4. Agenda Mr Cot; Mrs De March; Mr Klepsch	3		
5. Deadline for tabling amendments Mr Pannella; Mr Pearce; Mr Cryer; Mr Huckfield; Mr Le Pen; Mrs Castellina; Mr Sherlock; Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr Staes; Mr Pannella; Mr Arndt; Mr Verbeek; Mr Glezos; Mr Smith	5		
6. Question Time (Doc. 2-470/84)			
• Questions to the Commission:	8		
• Question No 1, by Mr de Ferranti: Testing and certification trade barriers: Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr de Ferranti; Mr Narjes; Mr von Wogau; Mr Narjes	8		
• Question No 2, by Mr Simmonds: Commission funds: Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Simmonds; Mr Dalsager	9		
• Question No 3 by Sir Peter Vanneck: Dumping of waste at sea: Mr Narjes; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Narjes; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Narjes; Mr Staes	10		
• Question No 4, by Mr Normanton: Europeans owning property anywhere in the EEC: Mr Narjes; Mr Normanton; Mr Narjes	10		
• Question No 5, by Mr Seligman: Free health care while travelling in the Community using Form E 111: Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Seligman; Mr Richard; Mr Sherlock; Mr Richard	11		
		• Question No 6, by Ms Quin: Difficulties experienced by British local authorities in applying to the EEC Social Fund: Mr Richard; Ms Quin; Mr Richard; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Richard; Mr Marshall; Mr Richard	12
		• Question No 7, by Mr Bøgh: The role of the European Community's information offices during the European Parliament election campaign: Mr Dalsager; Mr Bøgh; Mr Dalsager; Mr Christiansen; Mr Dalsager; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Dalsager; Mr Møller; Mr Dalsager; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Dalsager; Mr Bonde; Mr Boutos; Mr Dalsager; Mr Bøgh; Mr Schinzel; Mr Dalsager; Mr Bonde; Mr Cryer; Mr Dalsager; Mr Chanterie; Mr Alavanos; Mr Dalsager	13
		• Question No 8, by Mr Rogalla: Customs Union: Mr Narjes; Mr Schinzel; Mr Narjes; Mr von Wogau; Mr Narjes; Mr Alavanos; Mr Narjes; Mr Ducarme; Mr Blumenfeld	17
		• Question No 9, by Mr Welsh: National Aid: Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Welsh; Mr Andriessen; Mr Chanterie; Mr Andriessen	19
		• Question No 10, by Mrs Ewing: Presentation of proposals for an EEC assisted development programme in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland: Mr Giolitti (Commission); Mrs Ewing; Mr Giolitti; Mr Hutton; Mr Giolitti; Mr Morris; Mr Giolitti	19
		• Question No 11, by Mr Habsburg: Community funding for the Innkreis-Pyhrn motorway: Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Mr Habsburg; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Fitzgerald	21
		7. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Alavanos; Mr Andriessen (Com-	

<i>mission</i>); Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mr Andriessen; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Andriessen	22	<i>Annex</i>	28
8. <i>Budget 1984 — Statements by the Council and Commission and report by Mrs Scrivener (Doc. 2-475/84)</i> Mr O'Keefe (Council); Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Cot	23		

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

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

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament suspended on 27 July 1984.¹

2. *Verification of credentials*

President. — I have received from the Committee on the Verification of Credentials a report concerning the credentials of Members which have so far been verified.

Mr Rogalla, chairman of the Committee on the Verification of Credentials, wishes to make a brief statement.

Mr Rogalla (S), Chairman of the Committee on the Verification of Credentials. — (DE) Mr President, at its meeting yesterday, my committee verified Members' credentials, taking care to adhere to the appropriate provisions of the Rules of Procedure, particularly Section XVI of Annex V. The committee authorized me to refer, when you made the announcement, to Article 138(3) of the EEC Treaty, which says

The Assembly shall draw up proposals for elections by direct universal suffrage in accordance with a uniform procedure in all Member States.

This, as you know, has been done: on 10 March 1982, Parliament adopted such a proposal by 138 votes to 77, with 24 abstentions.

¹ *Adoption of agenda — Membership of Parliament: see Minutes.*

The second subparagraph of this same paragraph provides:

The Council shall, acting unanimously, lay down the appropriate provisions, which it shall recommend to Member States for adoption in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements.

As you also know, this has not been done. At its meeting yesterday, the Committee on the Verification of Credentials, mindful of its tasks as laid down in these provisions and anxious to see the powers of this Parliament given as broad a definition as is possible under the existing legislation, expressed its regret at this fact and authorized me to put forward in plenary sitting, in the hope that the House would lend its fullest possible support, the demand that the Council lay down the provisions provided for in this second subparagraph of Article 138(3) in time for the next direct elections in 1989.

We then proceeded to verify the credentials and, apart from one point concerning France, found nothing out of the way to point out, relying upon Members' statements made pursuant to Article 6(1) of the Act. Only one question gave rise to discussion — that concerning the validity of the election of Members elected in France on the list known as 'Front d'opposition nationale pour l'Europe des patries'. The discussion could not, however, be pursued, because we are bound by the Act of 20 September 1976 to accept the electoral results communicated by the Member States and only to rule on any disputes referred to us pursuant to the provisions of this Act. This the committee regretted, in connection with what I have just quoted from Article 138 of the EEC Treaty, but the committee found itself powerless to go further into the question of the legality of the election of these French Members.

It is true that Article 17 of the European Convention on Human Rights might provide some basis for doubts in this connection, but after some difficult discussion it was decided not to pursue this point. However that may be, we noted the fact that the Socialist Group had tabled a proposal to modify Rule 26 of the Rules of

Rogalla

Procedure on the basis of Article 17 of this Convention.

Mr d' Ormesson (DR). — (*FR*) I wish to make a formal objection against the presence at the entrance to the Chamber of the flags of the Chilean protesters. Like many others, I regret what is happening in Chile. Moreover, my group has tabled a motion on the events both in Nicaragua and Chile, but it is inadmissible that we should hold our debates under any pressure whatsoever. I ask you, Mr President, to have both the flags and the protesters removed.

President. — Your statement has been noted.

Mr Cryer (S). — Mr President, with regard to the report from the Committee on the Verification of Credentials, it would be quite wrong for this plenary session to accept that report as an expression of all the views of the representatives here in this Assembly. The notion that this Assembly should impose its wish on the way in which the elections should be conducted would in fact be quite wrong. It would certainly meet very strong resistance from the United Kingdom if, for example, it was attempted to impose a system of proportional representation. Therefore, I wish on a point of order, Mr President, to make absolutely clear that the attempt to slip in by the back door from the Committee on the Verification of Credentials a notion that there should be a common system of direct elections as though it were the universal view of the whole of this Assembly would be quite wrong.

President. — Your comments will be recorded in the Minutes.

3. *Request to waive the immunity of three Members*

President. — I have received from the competent German authorities two requests to waive the immunity of Mr Härlin and Mr Klöckner and from the competent Italian authorities to waive the immunity of Mr Tortora.

Pursuant to Rule 5(1) of the Rules of Procedure these requests have been referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights.

Mr Tortora (NI). — (*FR*) Mr President, my sense of the honour and the dignity of this Parliament and the respect due by me to my country — a respect which I have always paid it — and to its magistrature compel me to ask you to comply at once with the request concerning me personally. My case, Mr President, has caused considerable sensation and scandal in my country. It concerns the *emergenza* which enables any

so-called repentant criminal to send an innocent person to penal servitude by treating him as a criminal.

Mr President, I was elected a radical deputy by half a million Italian citizens who revolted against stupid and barbaric laws. This occurred after 13 months of detention. I decided to transform my own horrible experience into a struggle to change the laws in my country, into a struggle for those men and women who have been waiting for years for the elementary right to be brought to trial. This is the case of Giuliano Naria, a dying man, who for eight years — I repeat, eight years — is still awaiting trial in Italy. I therefore request, indeed I demand, that my trial should take place. I appeal to this Parliament to grant the authorization requested by the Italian courts. I have nothing to fear. I have no reason to hide behind a parliamentary immunity which would become an unthinkable privilege.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am fighting and I shall never cease to fight to obtain for each Italian citizen the privilege of respect for fundamental rights.

(*Applause*)

President. — Your statement has been noted.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, I wanted to ask you the outcome of a request which I made at the July part-session that the Bureau consider the way that the proceedings were handled. You decided, Mr President, to put to a vote of the plenary the Committee on Budgets' decision on transferring certain funds from one line to another. You will recall that I pointed out in July that this was a complete change of the way in which this House is accustomed to deal with these matters. It was a change which had massive political and economic importance in that it provoked a major disturbance of public opinion in the United Kingdom and great contestation between the Member States.

I asked, Mr President, that you should refer this to the Bureau for decision. I ask you now to tell me what was the outcome of the Bureau's consideration of this problem.

President. — The question was examined by the Bureau which considered that the procedure followed was perfectly in order.¹

4. *Agenda*

President. — At its meeting of 25 July 1984 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has

¹ *Petitions — Documents received — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council — Topical and urgent debate (Announcement): see Minutes.*

President

been distributed. At this morning's meeting the chairmen of the political groups instructed me to propose a certain number of changes.

Tuesday:

- the Council has not yet adopted the draft budget for the Communities for the 1985 financial year. However, under item No 213 of the draft agenda there will be a statement by the Council on the budgetary situation. This item will be dealt with as follows: joint discussion, statement by the Council on the budgetary situation, statement by the Commission on the same topic, Mrs Scrivener's report.

Are there any comments?

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Mr President, with regard to the debate on the failure to present a budget introduced by the President-in-Office of the Council and by the Commission, the Committee on Budgets requests that the deadline for tabling motions for resolutions should be extended by 24 hours, i.e. until 8 p.m. tomorrow so that the motions can be considered in the light of the situation which has recently arisen.

President. — We shall come to that matter in a few moments.

Are there any other comments?

That is agreed.

I have received from Mr Maffre-Baugé and nine other Members a request, under Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure, to include a statement by the Commission followed by a debate on the communication from the Commission to the Council on the situation and prospects of the wine market, together with a proposal for amending the common organization in the market in wine.

Before putting this request to the vote I shall call one speaker for and one against the motion.

Mrs De March (COM). — (FR) Mr President, I rise to present this motion to amend the agenda since I am a cosignatory of the motion with Mr Emmanuel Maffre-Baugé. In July 1982 the Council quite rightly amended the regulation on the wine sector by providing in particular for guaranteed prices and market rationalization. Experience has shown that these provisions are quite insufficient and badly applied: exaggerated statements of harvest in certain countries, artificial inflation of distillation and, in particular, non-respect for minimum guaranteed price. The result is that the situation in the wine sector in the southern regions is more disturbing than ever, with prices

remaining at the 1981 level. Moreover, the bad agreement of 31 March has been extended.

The Commission has recently submitted to the Council a report on the situation and future of the Community wine market together with proposals for amending the existing regulations. Basically the Commission is trying to make wine growers bear the responsibility for the current budgetary difficulties by proposing a price freeze and the acceleration of grubbing up between now and 1985 of not less than 210 000 hectares of wine grape and table grape vines. The Commission's goal is clearly part and parcel of the preparations for enlargement and it aims at eliminating part of the Community vineyards to make room for Spanish wines. I wish to inform the House that the wine growers of our regions who have been trying with considerable success, as the recent growth in table wine exports shows, to improve the quality of their vineyards regard the Commission's document as a serious slap in the face. In drawing up the proposed regulation which will be based on this document the Commission, we feel, should give serious consideration to the opinion of the Members of the European Parliament and the universally negative reaction of the wine growers and their organizations.

That is why, Mr President, 10 Members are now proposing an amendment of the agenda for this part-session to include the presentation of the Commission document and a debate on it.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, are we now to introduce a new custom into this House? It was precisely for these purposes that we instituted urgent procedure. If we now, as our Communist colleagues have just done, start asking, for the benefit of our statements to the press at the beginning of every part-session, for the inclusion of subjects which may be of public concern but which at all events disturb the order of business already agreed upon by the House, then in future everyone will be doing the same and I fail to see how any form of order can then be maintained.

I say once more to Mrs De March: It was precisely for this purpose that the institution of urgent procedure was created — that is to say, the opportunity to devote three whole hours on a Thursday to the discussion of topical matters. To be correct, therefore, you should have raised this question when we were fixing the order of business. I am therefore opposed to changing the order of business now.

(Applause)

(Parliament rejected the request and adopted the agenda as amended)¹

¹ Speaking time: see Minutes.

5. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

President. — I would remind the House that the deadlines for tabling amendments are set out in the Bulletin except for the following items for which I propose that the deadlines be set as follows:

- motions for resolutions on the budgetary situation: this evening at 8 p.m. and for amendments on the same topic: Wednesday, 12 September at 3 p.m.;
- amendments to the report by Mrs Scrivener on measures to cover the 1984 and 1985 budgetary requirements: this evening at 8 p.m.;
- amendments to all the items entered under urgent procedure (Rule 57): Wednesday, 12 September at 3 p.m.

Mr Pannella (NI). — (*FR*) Mr President, I asked to speak a moment ago when you asked if there were objections concerning speaking time. The damage has now been done since you have already gone on to other items. I should simply like to express reservations at the fact that the speaking time allocated to non-inscribed Members is not in line with the criteria in force until now.

President. — Your reservations have been noted.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, may I again draw your attention to the fact that outside this Chamber there is a demonstration taking place in which three people are holding a large flag which obstructs the entrance to the Chamber for people entering by this door. There is a large notice in German which I cannot understand. Photographs are being taken and the right of Members to circulate is being obstructed. You were asked, Mr President, to give a ruling on this. Either these people are Members of Parliament or they are not. If they are not Members of Parliament, will you have them removed from the building? If they are Members of Parliament, will you please establish rules for this kind of situation? If you permit this to go on, am I to assume that we could bring up 50 or 500 or 5 000 demonstrators? It is time we had a decision on this. Your attention was drawn to it about five minutes ago. Now is the time for a decision and for action.

(*Applause*)

President. — Mr Pearce, this question was raised a little more than five minutes ago by Mr d'Ormesson, after which I immediately gave orders that the situation should be examined. The report I have received indicates that the people in question are Members of

this House. I have no authority to expel Members of this Assembly. . .

(*Applause from the far left*)

If movement is being obstructed I shall have the situation looked into again to determine the identity of the people involved, since I agree with Mr Pearce and Mr d'Ormesson that we cannot tolerate persons who are not Members of this House demonstrating here.

Mr Cryer (S). — Mr President, on a point of order I wish to draw your attention to the wholly unfounded and dramatic terms in which this complaint was made. When I entered this Chamber, I was very pleased to see a demonstration about the death of Mr Allende in Chile under brutal circumstances, when the democratically-elected government of that regime was brutally overthrown. To try to suppress the right of people to express concern over such a series of events seems to me quite mistaken, and I hope you will bear in mind the democratic rights of people who work and who are Members of this Parliament and sustain them, because it is exactly those democratic rights that were so brutally crushed in Chile.

(*Applause*)

President. — Mr Cryer, let me explain my position. I repeat what I said in reply to Mr Pearce. I said that according to the report I had received following Mr d'Ormesson's statement, the people in question were Members of this House, and I immediately added that there could be no question whatsoever of expelling Member of this House.

The matter would be different if the people in question were non-Members of this House who had made their way into the part of this building reserved to Members. I believe that respect for the rights of Parliament also requires that persons who do not belong to this Parliament should not be able to enter the part of this building reserved for the exclusive use of Members of this House. I have, moreover, been informed that they have all now left.

Mr Huckfield (S). — Mr President, I think that the remarks made by Mr Pearce are much more serious than we have so far judged them to be.

I have just come into the Chamber and I have gone backwards and forwards, in and out of the Chamber, over the past 10 minutes, and in no way at all have I been obstructed. There is in fact no obstruction outside the doorway. What we have seen is various Members talking to other Members of this House.

If Mr Pearce is suggesting that in some way Members of one group do not have the right to communicate with Members of another group, then I would submit

Huckfield

to you that that is a much more serious affair. And I would certainly hope that you would stress to Mr Pearce, who has been a Member of this House for some time, that one of the fundamental principles upon which this whole Community ought to be based — for those who still believe in it — is the right of individuals to freely communicate with one another.

Mr Le Pen (DR). — (FR) Ladies and gentlemen, it seems to me that the function of Parliament is to debate in a peaceful and orderly manner conflicts of just this kind, between different interests, individuals or groups.

Obviously this form of expression is exclusive of the usual means of demonstration. If the Members of our Assembly wish to express an opinion, they may do so freely within the Assembly, but everyone will understand that by accepting external and, to some extent spectacular demonstrations — even by Members of Parliament — we risk seeing demonstrations escalate and quite obviously parliamentary life, not to mention the respect due to our Assembly, would only suffer.

(Applause from the right)

Mrs Castellina (ARC). — (IT) Because all forms of parliamentary life were suppressed in Chile on the occasion of the tragic event in that country 11 years ago, we intend by our initiative to remedy a culpable omission of this Assembly. I feel that this anniversary is sufficiently important for the President of our Assembly to open the sitting by recalling that dramatic date. Consequently, if we took this initiative ourselves, it was only because it was not touched upon by the Chair at the opening of the sitting.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Sherlock (ED). — I merely wish to add by way of supplement, Mr President, a question as to what are your powers to forbid the bringing of equipment into the vicinity of this Chamber. In my opinion a banner is not part of that equipment customarily carried by a Member of this House. I think Mr Cryer may want to bring his hunting horn along at the next meeting, or Mr Huckfield his euphonium.

(Laughter)

We must have some rules with regard to equipment. As for simple persuasion, I feel, as do many Members, that this is merely an extension of that natural principle of British democracy that miner shall spit upon miner whenever he wishes.

(Laughter)

President. — Mr Sherlock, the powers of the President are not limitless, but he should be able to ensure

that the work of this House takes place in a peaceful and orderly manner.

I shall make every effort to ensure this.

Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, what should be an occasion for mourning and reflection is being exploited by the right wing of this House to throw this Parliament and the resistance of the Chilean people into discredit, and this, I feel, is in extremely bad taste. This Parliament ought to be grateful that the eleventh anniversary of the murder of Salvador Allende is being observed here in this manner after Chile has been ruled for 11 whole years by a military dictatorship which has ruined the country's economy and reduced the greater part of the Chilean people to misery.

The present military regime can uphold its rule only by murder, torture and political persecution, and that, I think, is for us the main thing. The overwhelming majority of the Chilean people calls for a return to democracy; this call is reflected in the actions of Members of this House, and the attempt to turn our President into a kind of policeman to obstruct expressions of solidarity with the Chilean people should fill us with shame.

This House would have done itself much more credit if it had taken the initiative to invite the widow of Salvador Allende to attend this debate as a guest of honour in the visitors' gallery. That would have been a gesture taken by the House as a whole, and I hope that the actions taken outside will be interpreted in the same way.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I should like to point out two things, ladies and gentlemen. First, during its last term of office European Parliament dealt with the situation in Chile on many occasions and adopted several resolutions on it; secondly, at this part-session a request for urgent procedure on which Parliament will be required to vote has been tabled. I feel therefore that when Parliament wishes to deliver its opinion or its views it can and it should do so in the normal way, i.e., by tabling motions for resolutions and not by demonstrations of one sort or another.

(Applause)

Does it really make any sense to continue indefinitely a debate on a problem which, in fact, no longer exists since I have been informed that the people whose presence was referred to have left?

Mr Staes (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Le Pen for stressing the importance of pacifist activities. We hope that he continues to think

Staes

along these lines. This was indeed a completely pacifist action. It has to do with the freedom of expression, which is a constitutional right. It was not a demonstration, and we in no way obstructed the normal proceedings of this Parliament. I know this because I took part myself. I can say that all those who participated had the right to be there because they were Members or staff of this Parliament. I would simply ask you to realize what is happening in Chile on this eleventh anniversary of the seizure of power by the junta. We were drawing attention to the importance of democracy and to the democratic rights which we all defend in a completely peaceful manner. I would describe this not as a right but as a duty that we all have.

Mr Pannella (NI). — (FR) Mr President, I feel that by allowing this procedural debate — and I believe that what you have decided and announced is proof of this — you display great tolerance, in the best sense of the word, and great sensitivity, for it is clear, Mr President, that you have fully grasped the problem. From now on none of us will have the right to protest against anyone who engages in demonstrations of this sort in our Chamber. I therefore pay tribute to the perfect wisdom and, I must say, the exemplary attitude shown by our friends today.

I simply wanted to say that I am happy, for my part, that now, 11 years after the assassination of a man — whom even on the left, alas, we were not always unanimous in liking and supporting — a man of great tolerance and opposed to all violence, this memory perhaps inspires us to attach greater importance to our responsibilities.

Exactly four years ago, in Turkey, another sinister assault on human rights was successful, when democracy was wiped out . . .

(Interruption by Mr Romualdi)

You missed a good chance to remain silent, Romualdi, for the nth time. But I do not hold it against you!

President. — As you are aware, Mr Pannella, I always appreciate your courtesy but, alas, we are making what amounts to a world tour to examine all the human rights problems. This, unfortunately, would require a very long debate and this is not our task today.

For this reason I would ask you to conclude.

Mr Pannella (NI). — (FR) Maybe the microphone was not working, Mr President. I was not referring to all the world's ills — I was merely saying that today just happens to be the anniversary of another great blow to human liberties.

In conclusion, I thank you for giving my friend Romualdi a chance to say something good about freedom,

so that he was able to make some amends. Perhaps he omitted to do this 40 years ago.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, we should concern ourselves with the question raised by Mr Romualdi and Mr Pearce, whether the work of this House has been held up or obstructed. The work of this House has not been obstructed or delayed in the least by the three Members who have been drawing attention, outside this Chamber, to the anniversary of Allende's death. The delay has come from Mr Romualdi and Mr Pearce — the latter of whom, I notice, has in the meantime left the Chamber. He no longer seems to be interested in what is going on! Incidentally, I would point out to the Members who have been demonstrating that they had posted themselves before the wrong door: they should have been, not at this entrance here, but at the one over there.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, I find it humiliating that, while the people of Chile are exposed to so much suffering, a few people here are obviously upset when they have to walk a few feet further to get round a banner.

I would also point out that, although we adopt or reject resolutions here, they have little influence on the public or public opinion. Democratic people in society consequently ask if they can help us with the resources they have. I therefore hope that it will be reported in the minutes that it was the Rainbow Group which took this initiative, and that it did so for the people of Chile and not for its own benefit.

Mr Glezos (S). — (GR) Mr President, I must congratulate you on the sensitivity you have shown, both in relation to the protection of Parliament's authority and concerning the safeguarding of democracy in other countries. Despite this, as a Member of the European Parliament I feel shame that there are some colleagues who, taking advantage of the parliamentary institution, are protesting at an expression of views which reminded us, not of the birth of a democracy, but of the tombstone that has closed down over parliamentary life in another country on this Earth. However, quite unintentionally, those colleagues have stimulated a debate that is to the advantage of parliamentarianism. The voices we hear merely confirm the will, I believe shared by us all, to consolidate the conviction in all the world's citizens that nobody has the right to do away with parliamentarianism.

Mr Smith (S). — Far more important than the ability of Members to move freely outside this Parliament is the ability of working people in Chile to move freely, and, in particular, the ability to move from the jails

Smith

where they are at present rotting, to a position where they can share the good life with their families.

If this Parliament ignores the feelings of the oppressed in Chile, then it will become a laughing stock in the eyes of all libertarians the world over. It will become totally and utterly irrelevant.

I am not surprised that the British Tories are opposed to demonstrations outside this Parliament, because in my own community — a mining community in south Wales — they are doing exactly the same thing. They are trying to take away from miners the right to demonstrate and protest to defend their jobs and their communities. But the people of Chile, like the miners, have no intention of being defeated.

(Applause from the left)

President. — The debate is closed.

I thank all who took part in it.

Before moving on to Question Time I would inform the House that at its meeting this morning the enlarged Bureau drew up the calendar for part-sessions of European Parliament for 1985.

These proposals were distributed this morning. I therefore propose to fix the deadline for amendments at Wednesday, 12 September, at 3 p.m. The vote will be taken on Thursday at 3 p.m.

6. Question Time

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. 2-470/84).

We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr de Ferranti (H-87/84):

Subject: Testing and certification trade barriers

Would the Commission state what progress is being made in their consultancy studies of the existing testing and certification systems in each Member State and do they envisage proposing a Community-wide arrangement for mutual recognition in the near future?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The problem of mutual recognition of national testing and certification procedures is an extremely important task, on which practical work is now in full swing — work on applying the directive on common information procedures in the context of the standards and technical arrangements of March 1983 and the deci-

sions of the Council of Ministers of July 1984 on the Community's standardization policy.

Consequently, the answer I give today can only be in the nature of an interim report. The Commission is making every effort to prepare further argumentation in good time for the second meeting of the internal-market Council to be held under the Irish presidency in December. It will of course duly brief the Parliament in advance in the appropriate manner. In connection with this work the Commission had first to consider the question of an intensified application of the method of standardization and applying the initial priorities. The chief reason for this is the need for debureaucratization and a greater flexibility in the work of the Community.

A more systematic standardization would substantially simplify the hitherto extremely complicated and for this reason much criticized Community legislation on harmonization. It would enable us to propose simpler legislative texts. To that extent the work is going ahead well.

The specific question on mutual recognition of national testing and certification procedures posed by the honourable gentleman was scheduled for later consideration in our work programme. Should we succeed in applying this common standardization procedure extensively, national technical legislation could be replaced by Community arrangements. In this way the problem of the mutual recognition of existing national technical legislation would be considerably reduced. The methodological aspects of this work need to be looked into still more closely, and in particular the question whether the work should be conducted sector by sector or whether a general harmonization process is possible. In this connection it should be noted, as far as higher technology is concerned, that the Commission has already decided in favour of a sector-by-sector approach. The preliminary work has already started.

In addition to the order of priority assigned to these two matters, there is also a budgetary problem, since the necessary investigations in the area of testing and certification procedures depend on whether the budgetary authority grants the funds asked for by the Commission under the 1985 budget. I would point out that the relevant Item 7724, for which an estimate of 1.2 m ECU has been made, was cut back by the Council at first reading. Since this is a matter of non-compulsory expenditure, the Commission seeks the active cooperation of the House with a view to full restoration of these funds.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr de Ferranti (ED). — I am grateful to the Commissioner for his full reply and I must say I am grateful to

de Ferranti

the House now for actually getting down to the real work of making this Community work, instead of endless and irrelevant political waffle that we tend to get involved in from time to time. I would like to ask the Commissioner if he is aware, first of all, that the type of trade barrier which is so often represented by the non-recognition of certification and testing procedures is one of the most pervasive and damaging of all the trade barriers with which we are concerned? Secondly, is he aware that the many certification bodies that exist — there are hundreds of certification bodies — can in fact, still be influenced to this day by manufacturers who are represented on their governing bodies? Will he be very careful when he is carrying out these studies to recognize that manufacturers are there and are, whether knowingly or not, influencing the certification bodies to produce trade barriers which cost the citizens of our European Community very dear indeed?

Mr Narjes. — *(DE)* I fully endorse the way in which the honourable gentleman, Mr de Ferranti, has presented the procedures. Involvement of the various groups concerned takes place first in the standardization bodies and preliminary work towards an eventual agreement with CEN and CENELEC is so well advanced that we hope at the very least that it can be completed this year so that we may begin to apply it as from 1. 1. 1985, as planned.

It is my belief that the more successful the work of the CEN and CENELEC delegations, the more decisive will be their influence in removing superfluous certification and testing procedures, so that the corresponding obstacles to trade may be reduced. Furthermore, should the Commission note any tardiness on the part of the authorities, it will not hesitate to submit appropriate proposals.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — *(DE)* Does the Commission not agree that there is no common market in the technologies of the future because technical legislation differs from country to country and as a result the European Community's competitiveness, particularly as far as the small and medium-sized undertakings are concerned, is very substantially diminished? Can we not see in this area of common standards, but also of common patents and trade marks, an important instrument for improving this situation and thereby make a vital contribution to overcoming unemployment? Is it not the case that the process of mutual recognition of certificates — which is being held back somewhat — could right now be a means of making quicker progress?

Mr Narjes. — *(DE)* There is no difference of opinion here between the author of the question and the Commission. In its informatics documentation the Commission has already pointed out that in these high-technology areas priority work by sector has to be

carried out in order to push through expeditiously the standardization and mutual recognition of procedures. We shall be able to submit appropriate — fundamentally sound — proposals to harmonize certification procedures when we have a precise idea of the extent of the areas covered by standardization.

We reckon that this will be possible before the end of this year. A working-party report on the subject is expected in October. I have already referred to the argumentation being prepared for the Council of Ministers' meeting in December so that by 1 January the ground to be covered will have been fully mapped out. But there are also enormous difficulties over the details of individual products and the conditions of their manufacture, sale and marketing.

President. — Question No 2, by Mr Simmonds (H-88/84):

Subject: Commission funds

How much money from Commission funds has been spent on constructing or improving slaughterhouses which will practice ritual slaughter — i.e. without pre-stunning?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — *(DA)* The rules which the Community has concerning slaughtering methods can be found in Council Directive No 577 of 1974. This Directive says nothing about ritual slaughterings which, when this Council Directive was adopted by the Member States, were considered to be a national matter, and that is still the position. The Commission therefore has no statistics on what slaughtering methods are applied or what abattoirs have been given assistance under Directive No 355. I cannot give the Honourable Member the information he wants because the Commission does not have it.

Mr Simmonds (ED). — I am grateful to the Commissioner for his information, but I think that the way that the Commission apparently washes its hands of this issue at present will be in direct conflict with the views of many Members of this House who, amongst other issues concerning animal welfare, regard the slaughter of animals without pre-stunning as one of the least acceptable issues before us in that field.

I do hope that the Commission will take it upon themselves — and I shall be urging this upon them in the form of resolutions in the future — to look further into this matter because I believe that it is of widespread concern. I have probably received more letters from my constituents on this subject in the last six months than on any other. I wonder whether the Commissioner would give an assurance that he is prepared to look into the matter to make it something of a Community-wide issue.

Mr Dalsager. — (*DA*) I personally have much sympathy with the views the Honourable Member presents. I do not remember the discussions which took place at the time, but I do realize that there is a problem here, and I am prepared to look into the matter to see whether it can be solved by Community regulations in the area concerned. But, as I am familiar with this special area with all its difficulties, I have my doubts as to whether that can be done. But I am prepared to investigate the matter.

President. — Question No 3, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-89/84):

Subject: Dumping of waste at sea

What changes, if any, to the Community's policy for radioactive waste management are required as a result of the study undertaken recently by the members of the London Treaty on Protection of the Sea of the dumping at sea of low-level radioactive waste?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (*DE*) Work on the study undertaken by the International Atomic Energy Agency on the radiological effects of the dumping of mildly radioactive waste at sea, referred to by the honourable gentleman, has not yet been completed. As we informed the honourable gentleman on 23 May 1984 in answer to a question on the subject, a report on the study cannot be expected before September 1985. Consequently the Commission, which has no say over the continuation of the study itself, cannot at this moment draw any conclusions in respect of its position on the dumping of radioactive waste.

However, the Commission is firmly of the opinion that a common position on the dumping of waste at sea must be a Community objective. It is hopeful that after completion of the current investigations sufficient information will be available to bring closer together the standpoints of the Member States and arrive at a common position. The Commission will closely monitor the development of the situation at international level, particularly in connection with the London Convention, and seek to ensure, where necessary, that international arrangements are brought into line with new scientific findings. A moratorium is in force until 1985. The Commission has no reason at the moment to doubt that it will be adhered to.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — I thank the Commission for its answer. I do hope the Commission can assure us that it will not be bulldozed into changing its position, which is based on the current state of the art, by any particular pressure group, however starry-eyed and well-meaning.

Mr Narjes. — (*DE*) The observations of the honourable gentleman are in line with the Commission's posi-

tion. As long as the moratorium is observed, we shall have ample opportunity to consider scientific findings and reflect on their possible application.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — (*NL*) The Commissioner has just spoken about the Community's point of view and about appropriate regulations, and Sir Peter Vanneck referred to pressure groups. But I would just point out to the Commissioner that the European Parliament has already on two occasions pronounced itself in favour of a ban on the dumping of nuclear waste at sea. On those occasions Parliament requested by a large majority that the European Community should act as a contracting party at the London Convention.

Does the Commission agree with the opinion which the European Parliament has adopted twice by a large majority?

Mr Narjes. — (*DE*) The Commission is aware of Parliament's opinions and resolutions. The problem arises in respect of their application. The honourable gentleman will be aware that some Member States see things differently and that a decision is only possible if we can induce them to change their position on the basis of solid new findings — and this is precisely the concern in London.

Mr Staes (ARC). — (*NL*) I should like to make one or two points. What we are concerned with here is the deliberate dumping of waste at sea and the arrangements that must be made to control it. But these days certainly we are confronted with a very special situation, the accidental dumping of waste at sea. I do not intend to raise now the case of the *Mont Louis* — this comes later on the agenda — I simply want to say that before long 250 kg of plutonium are to leave Cherbourg for Japan. I ask the President of Parliament to urge the French Government on behalf of this Parliament not to authorize this operation, in the light of the enormous difficulties that are now being met. A further reason for my request is the fact that France has not signed the non-proliferation treaty.

President. — Mr Staes, since what you said was a statement and not a question, the Commission is not obliged to reply.

Question No 4, by Mr Normanton (H-90/84):

Subject: Europeans owning property anywhere in the EEC

Are there any obstacles in the way of the rights, clearly expressed in the Treaty of Rome, for all citizens of the European Community to acquire and own property anywhere in the EEC?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) In answer to the questions raised by the honourable gentleman, I would refer to the provisions of Articles 48, 52 and 59 of the EEC Treaty on freedom of movement and freedom to provide services. According to these provisions, which are directly applicable in all Member States, all citizens of the Community have the right, in any other Member State in which they are gainfully employed, under the same conditions as laid down for its own nationals, to purchase property, both for the purposes of their profession and also with a view to acquiring a principal or subsidiary place of residence.

In Greece acquisition of property in the frontier regions is subject to various restrictions. The relevant Greek legislation is incompatible with the EEC Treaty inasmuch as it discriminates against nationals of the other Member States. The Commission has therefore initiated proceedings against Greece for failure to fulfil an obligation under the Treaty in accordance with Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, in order to ensure compliance with Community law. It is the Commission's understanding that the Greek Government intends to modify existing legislation and adapt it to the requirements of Community law. The Commission is not aware of any comparable restrictions in other Member States that might be incompatible with the abovementioned provisions of the Treaty.

Mr Normanton (ED). — I thank the Commission for that reply. It is encouraging. But will the Commission explain to the House why one of my constituents, whose name and details can be given, is currently being denied even a hearing in the court on an issue analogous to that which the Commissioner has already declared has been resolved. My constituent signed a firm contract with the Greek owner of a derelict building in Corfu, which is not a border area, to conduct a perfectly legitimate business there. Yet, two years later, once that business had become prosperous, the Greek owner unilaterally abrogated the contract in total contravention of the internationally recognized legislation. My constituent is being denied access to the court for the resolution of this dispute. Will, therefore, the Commission undertake to investigate the case — which I will put to him — and if it finds in favour of my constituent, will the Commission support the submission of my constituent's case to the Court of Justice for a clear decision?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) I would be grateful to the honourable gentleman if he could supply us with the material on which he bases his statement. The Commission will of course thoroughly follow up any infringement of the Treaty and take appropriate action if the legal situation so warrants.

President. — Question No 5, by Mr Seligman (H-91/84):

Subject: Free health care while travelling in the Community using form E 111

Many people, who travel abroad regularly and require free health care, find that the laborious procedure of obtaining a form E 111 for each trip is intolerable and, therefore, do not make use of it.

Can this form be given extended validity and is it also possible to eliminate the need for the patient initially to pay cash for the treatment and then have to claim repayment?

Some holidaymakers do not have large sums of cash with them.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Under the provisions of the Community regulations on social security for persons who move within the Community, persons, for example holidaymakers, who are staying temporarily in another Member State may receive urgent medical treatment as if they were insured in that Member State provided they are entitled to sickness insurance benefits in the Member State in which they are resident. Such proof of entitlement is provided by form E 111 which is issued on request by the sickness insurance institution of the country of residence.

It is issued pursuant to Regulation No 1408/71 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons, to self-employed persons and to members of their families moving within the Community. The regulation does not stipulate any period of validity. The procedure for the issue of form E 111 and the period of its validity are at the discretion of the Member State issuing it. When determining the period of validity, Member States tend to take into account the substantial financial implications which may ensue as well as the status of the insurance record of the person requiring it.

I should tell the House that the national systems of three of the Member States — namely Belgium, France and Luxembourg — provide that the patient pays initially for treatment. As Regulation No 1408/71 provides for the coordination of national social security schemes rather than their harmonization, the Commission does not see any means of enforcing a change in this respect.

Mr Seligman (ED). — I am grateful to the Commissioner for that answer which is quite complex. Of course the whole procedure seems to have become complex and therefore rather forbidding for travellers to engage in. In fact, many travellers find the system so complex that they do not bother to use it. That is a great pity because free medical treatment should be one of the main selling points of membership of the Community, particularly with the general public. So, I would like to know why form E 111 is necessary at all.

Seligman

All citizens of the Community are covered by some form of health insurance. Surely proof of identity, proof of citizenship of the Community should be enough to entitle you to medical treatment.

The only piece of information on this form E 111 is my insurance number. That could be put on the passport or identity document and then form E 111 could be torn up and never be used again. It seems rather unnecessary.

Secondly, prepayment by travellers should be abolished. This must be simplified. Can the Commissioner look into that as well?

Mr Richard. — I have considerable sympathy with the thrust of what the honourable gentleman is saying, but I have to say two things to him.

First of all, as I said initially, this whole form E 111 and the procedures attached to it are an attempt to coordinate 10 different national social security systems. They operate in different ways. Some countries demand prepayment. In some countries of course — and this is why the form has to be the way that it is — entitlement is still based upon a person's affiliation to a national sickness insurance scheme. It just is not true to say that everybody in the Community — if they happen to be a citizen of one of the Community countries — is entitled to access to national sickness benefit schemes. That does not necessarily follow in some Member States, as I understand the position.

Secondly, as far as payment is concerned, again we are back at this difficult issue which is that some Member States demand payment before the person who is receiving the treatment can claim back from the national social security system the amount that they have paid. I really have to put it to the honourable gentleman and the House that it would be quite impossible for us to advocate that holidaymakers in those countries should be treated differently from the nationals of the country in which they happen to be taking their holiday.

Having given that perhaps somewhat daunting answer to the honourable gentleman, I can at least say this to him: I personally will have another look at it, but I do so without commitment and it would be wrong of me to give him very much hope.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr Commissioner, I would like very much, of course, to support the material you have already given in your answer and remind the House that so much of the difference results from the fact that in the United Kingdom, for example, the scheme is entirely taxation funded, whereas an actuarial basis of some sort is the essence of the other countries' schemes almost in their entirety.

The danger, Mr Commissioner, that I would like you to take steps to correct is twofold. First, there is the danger of people not knowing in advance the benefits; and I feel that one of the great benefits of this Community is the ability to participate in the health service schemes. The second and more worrying matter is coincidental, to some extent, in that again there is no publicity — and I would ask you to ensure that this be improved — about the fact that, especially where hospital costs are concerned, the issue by the hospital authority of Form E 107 allows the retrospective issuing of Form E 111. People are scared stiff by hospital bills. Could we, Mr Commissioner, not have some publicity and some investigation?

Mr Richard. — I think the honourable gentleman makes a fair point. I can only say in answer to him that as far as we are concerned, we try to disseminate the necessary information as widely as we can. We publish a guide — rather an excellent one, of which I have a copy in front of me — and we circulate press releases every year before the holiday season begins so as to try to make known as widely as we can to people who are going abroad that this advantage is there if they wish to avail themselves of it.

On the general point he makes, that this is one of the advantages of membership of the Community, I entirely share his views. I will certainly see to it that his concern, as expressed today, is brought to the attention of the Member of the Commission specifically responsible for information and the press.

President. — Question No 6, by Ms Quin (H-94/84):

Subject: Difficulties experienced by British local authorities in applying to the EEC Social Fund

What is the European Commission's view of the situation in the United Kingdom whereby certain local authorities are deterred from submitting applications to the Social Fund because the UK government's spending 'penalties' are preventing them from being able to find the necessary 50% matching funding?

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — I have to say to the honourable lady that the Commission does not take a view on this issue since the levels of local authority spending in the United Kingdom are the concern and prerogative of the British Government.

On a personal level, however, may I say that I am extremely concerned about a situation where, firstly, there is a clear need to increase action to combat unemployment; secondly, the willingness to increase action is being expressed very clearly at the level of local authorities and by an increasing number of them; thirdly, the Commission and the Council have strongly recommended not only to increase training and

Richard

employment measures but to do so in a way which fully associates local authorities and takes account of local needs and conditions. Yet, local authorities are having to trim their budgets in the most dramatic fashion, leaving many authorities, as I understand the position, unable to benefit from the Social Fund or, indeed, from the very existence of the European Community. As the Commissioner responsible for social affairs and for considering the problems of employment, I find that a worrying situation.

Ms Quin (S). — I am very glad the Commission is so concerned about this problem, and I am sure the Commission is aware that it is precisely those local authorities who are most in need of Social Fund assistance who are being denied it by the UK Government's attitude. Does the Commission not think it rather strange that the United Kingdom Government, which, understandably, says it wants to get as much money back from the EEC budget as possible, yet, on the other hand, denies many authorities the chance of recouping some of that money?

Mr Richard. — The honourable lady must not provoke me into going down roads which, on this day of all days, I would be extremely anxious to follow.

May I say to her that it is not perhaps entirely true that local authorities in the United Kingdom are deterred entirely from making application to the Social Fund. In 1980, only a handful of local authorities made such applications; by 1983, 67 local authorities in the United Kingdom had sought assistance; and in 1984 this number has risen so far to 138. So at least there are 138 local authorities in the United Kingdom that do have the finance necessary to pay their part of a programme which they think is worthwhile applying to the Social Fund for. It seems to me that this trend, in which local authorities are seeking and, indeed, creating a direct relationship with the Commission in Brussels in respect of their own local employment and training initiatives, is thoroughly commendable, and I hope it continues.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — The Commissioner has given us some very useful information about the number of local authorities who have been benefiting, but would he not agree that many authorities who are very hard pressed in terms of expenditure because of decisions taken by the British Government would be assisted enormously if the Treasury decided to disregard, for rate-capping purposes, the matching 50% contribution that local authorities have to make? It is their refusal to disregard this 50% which is causing some of the most hard-pressed local authorities difficulties and acting as a deterrent to their being able to apply to the Social Fund.

Mr Richard. — The answer to that question is, obviously, yes. It is a question of mathematics, not of

policy. Obviously, if they had more money available at the other end, it is quite clear that more local authorities would wish to apply to Brussels to get 50% of whatever their programme may be. The answer is clearly yes.

Mr Marshall (ED). — May I say first of all how many Members of this House regret the fact that Commissioner Richard will not be a Commissioner after January of next year. Many of us believe that he has been one of the most considerate and courteous Commissioners both at Question Time and in replying to Members' enquiries.

(Applause)

In respect of the figures he has quoted, would he not agree that the reason many of the local authorities allegedly have difficulties is because of their pursuit of *doctrinaire* and inefficient policies? As the former chairman of a local council's finance committee, may I say that if they were to pursue efficiency they could certainly take advantage of the Social Fund, as 138 are currently doing. Would he not agree that much of unemployment in those authorities is created by the very high rates which they charge local industry, thereby discouraging firms from staying there?

Mr Richard. — I thank the honourable gentleman very much for the kind words he used at the beginning of this question. As far as the rest of his question is concerned, having resolutely refused to be tempted by Ms Quin, I equally resolutely refuse to be tempted by Mr Marshall.

(Laughter)

President. — Question No 7, by Mr Bøgh (H-96/84):

Subject: The role of the European Community's information offices during the European Parliament election campaign.

Ten weeks before the elections, the head of the Danish information office started sending a publication entitled 'Europæiske Breve' (European letters) to candidates, organizations and editorial offices that shared his view of the elections. These letters were not sent to those holding contrary views, despite the fact that they contained gross accusations and personal allegations against such opponents. Despite direct requests to the information office the latter found it impossible to obtain copies of these scurrilous attacks. According to the information office, the head of the office was personally responsible for these activities.

Does the Commission consider it acceptable for one of its information offices to take part in a national European Parliament election campaign and to support one side?

President

Will the Commission examine the complaints about the information office's activities during the election campaign which have been published in Danish newspapers?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Prior to the European Parliament elections, the Commission followed the customary rules and procedures relating to information work. Following a very considerable increase in the demand for concrete information, the information office published the 'European weekly report'. This publication was sent to anyone who wished to receive it. The 'European weekly report' supported neither one side nor the other in the election campaign but gave concrete information, whether it was popular or not. The information office has been told by the readers that the 'European weekly report' was very clear, short and up to date and hence very useful.

Mr Bøgh (ARC). — (DA) As I understand the Commissioner then, there is no intention to undertake a thoroughgoing investigation of the manner in which the information office in Copenhagen interfered in the Danish election campaign. The mere fact that the question arises — a question of basic political principle — is reason enough to undertake an investigation. I would ask the Commissioner what he would say if the Danish Folketing began to use its press office to attack the various parties and to interfere in the election campaign. It is quite unacceptable.

I have two questions. One is: how do we ensure that the information offices do not in future interfere in an election campaign, as happened in Denmark? It is not true that it was impartial. Personal attacks were made on candidates of a particular list. We must therefore ask: how do we ensure that violations of this kind do not occur in future? The second question is personal: what are you going to do to assure me that I shall not again be exposed to a column full of personal attacks, as has happened?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) The weekly report referred to was in no way direct participation in the election campaign. The Commission has a clear right and duty to provide information, during an election campaign too, on the activities of the Community touched upon in the campaign. The more errors of fact we encounter, as we did during the election campaign, the more actively of course must the Commission's information office react.

Mr Christiansen (S). — (DA) I cannot accept the question the Commissioner has answered here, since it conveys the impression that Mr Bøgh, in putting the question, is the sole representative of Danish opinion on the Commission's activities. Many of us praised the Commission's information bulletins, which we found

to be short, precise, relevant and honest — relevant information on Community policy in the run-up to the European Parliament elections. I should like to clarify Mr Bøgh's intention in tabling this question by putting the following supplementary question to the Commissioner: is it true, as I have heard, that the People's Movement against the EEC complained to the Danish Prime Minister that a Member of the Commission, Mr Dalsager, interfered in the election campaign by advocating a certain party at the European Parliament elections in June?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) As far as I am aware, the People's Movement against the EEC in Denmark also attempted to limit my personal freedom of expression by denouncing me to the Prime Minister who, as you know, belongs to a different party from the one I belong to. The Prime Minister has enough sense, however, not to seek to limit the personal freedom of expression of a Member of the Commission — at least he did not approach me. I do not know what form the letter took which the People's Movement against the EEC sent to the Prime Minister, but I did not receive an approach from him. The implication of this is that the Prime Minister shares my view that a Member of the Commission must of course maintain his personal integrity and also the personal freedom of expression which a Member of the Commission has; this cannot be challenged by any national authority.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — (DA) As a Dane, as a Danish newspaper reader and as a Danish observer, I am truly amazed at how badly the truth goes down. My supplementary question therefore is whether we, who operate democratically — and those who are against Parliament but have nevertheless allowed themselves to be voted into the Parliament they oppose must also accept that — should not agree that the information offices have an important task to perform in providing information about the real issues, in presenting the truth and, conversely, in correcting untruths, wrong interpretations and conscious or unconscious errors. I think it is vital to stress that it is the truth we want to hear, as it has been presented in such a loyal and honest manner by the Danish information office — and it can only be due to a tactical ploy gone wrong on the part of the anti-EEC faction that they are now pursuing an entirely unjustified witchhunt against a loyal information office!

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) I am not sure whether I caught the question in Mrs Nielsen's intervention. It was more in the way of a statement, but she is right in that it is of course the task of the Commission's information offices to provide the public with all factual information on the Commission's work and on what is happening in the Community, and to ensure that that information is as plentiful, as correct and as informative as possible. In many cases it is necessary to pursue that activity in order as it were to counter the disinform-

Dalsager

mation of which there have been various instances. I consider that to be the most important task of the Commission's information office.

Mr Møller (ED). — (DA) It seems to me that Mr Bøgh in his wording of the question is seeking to have a gagging order placed on all officials of the Commission. It looks to me almost like a base attempt to establish a *Berufsverbot* within our circle of officials, and I am against that. I see nothing in what has been said here today — even by the Commissioner — which in any way justifies the invective, the abuse which Mr Bøgh directs at a respected leading official, the head of the Copenhagen information office. I should like to put a supplementary question and to ask whether the Commissioner does not think that it is right for an information office to try to cut through the smoke-screen in which the People's Movement against the EEC seeks to envelop the entire European Community — whether the Commissioner is not of the same opinion as myself: that the truth should suffice for us all.

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) Not only are we right to do what Mr Møller says but, in my opinion, the Commission also has the duty to do so.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (GR) I have listened to the Commissioner's comments and answers, and I would like to ask him a specific question. Are the information offices entitled to become involved in the election campaign, or is the campaign to be conducted solely by the political parties?

A similar occurrence took place in my own country. The information office in Athens did not limit itself to giving out objective information on the activities of Europe, the Council and Parliament, but took up the banners of crude propaganda. And while it may not actually have named parties that oppose the EEC, in essence it aligned itself against those parties by decrying the positions they stood for. I would also like to say that the information office exerted all sorts of pressures to ensure electoral publicity on television, on the radio and, to some degree, in the Greek press.

I therefore ask the Commissioner to answer whether the information offices have the right to become involved in the electoral campaign, in other words to influence that sovereign public opinion in each country which should find expression through the country's political parties and through those who do have the right to indulge in propaganda, whether in favour of the EEC or against it.

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) The information offices must not of course interfere in the voters' choice of the parties they vote for. During an election campaign, if information is presented which is simply incorrect or is misleading, the information offices must of course

provide the correct information. That is what information is, and it is the job of the information office. It may perhaps be called interference in the election campaign, but the object is to get the election campaign on the right track and to present correct information on the Community we belong to. I am not aware of any complaints about our information office in your country, and I cannot therefore answer the question as far as you are concerned, but I will bring what you have said here to the attention of Dr Natali, who is responsible for information activities. He cannot unfortunately be here today to hear this question.

Mr Bonde (ARC). — (DA) I understand that it is the truth the Commission is obliged to bring before the public. I should therefore like to ask why I, who according to the Commission, am pursuing disinformation, am not the first to be given guidance. I should like to know why it was not possible for the truth to be conveyed to my address. I should like to know why it was a week before we were able to get hold of any of the relevant weekly reports from the Commission, after we had asked for them. Finally, I should like to know why to this day I have still not been able to receive from the Commission's office a complete set of those smear bulletins which were sent out weekly during the election campaign. If there is so much concern to present the truth, surely they should be sent to precisely those people who, in the Commission's view, are on the side of disinformation.

A second question for the Commissioner: what would Mr Dalsager say if Prime Minister Schlüter employed an official at 35 000 kroner per month after tax during a Folketing election campaign to issue a weekly smear bulletin about Mr Dalsager's former party associates, headed by Anker Jørgensen, and sent that smear bulletin to the editors of all the middle-class newspapers, systematically omitting *Aktuelt*, *Bornholmeren*, *Ny Dag* and all the social democratic union newspapers? For what has happened in this affair is a form of discrimination. All the pro-EEC candidates have been carefully selected, all the pro-EEC newspapers have been picked out, but *Berufsverbot* has been practised against the anti-EEC elements. Representatives of prominent newspapers in Denmark have not shared in the truths of the EEC Commission, they were not sent to the weekly newspaper of the anti-EEC side, they were not sent to those who might be feared to hold a different view, even after we had telephoned and asked to receive . . .

President. — Mr Bonde, you are required to put a precise question on the topic; you may not make a speech.

Mr Bonde (ARC). — (DA) . . . Half a score of smear bulletins were sent out about us. We therefore have some questions to ask, and we expect you, as President of this Assembly, to ensure that the Commissioner gives us answers to the questions put and does

Bonde

not fob us off with talk about the documents in question having been available to everyone. These smear bulletins were not available to me. To date, I have not received a complete set of those smear bulletins . . .

President. — Mr Bonde please note that that is not the proper way to speak during Question Time. I cannot allow you to continue.

Mr Butos (PPE). — (GR) One of our colleagues has characterized as crude the propaganda carried out in his country by the office of information of the European Communities based there.

Each one of us in this Parliament, of course, carries the responsibility for both his own words and his sense of what is right. Yet, I would like to ask a supplementary question. The first part of my question is this: By what right is the European concept turned upside-down by parties that do not believe in European unity, nor in European ideals, but that on the contrary make use of political freedoms and the pluralistic system that exist all over Europe, to introduce new methods which imitate states where the denial of democracy is a fact of life?

The second part of the same question is as follows: Are the information offices responsible solely and exclusively for publicizing the European ideal, or should they also ensure that this ideal is presented via controlled governmental channels of enlightenment and information? Because the problem that arose in some countries was that governments that control television and the media in general issued hardly even the minimum information that their citizens, due as they were to vote for the European Parliament, should have been aware of before adopting one or the other position.

Thus, I would like the Commissioner to examine not just the information offices, but also the ways and means by which governments that benefit from the Community, both themselves and the people they represent, sabotage or promote the European ideal.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, before calling the Commissioner responsible I should like to ask the House to observe scrupulously the provisions of the Rules of Procedure regarding Question Time, and to put a single precise question to the institution to whom it is addressed.

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) I would inform the last speaker that the Commission is of course responsible for the activities of the information offices; it is after all responsible for the work of the departments and services, whether they are concerned with information or some other activity. Our information offices have various tasks to perform around the Member States.

Everyone will understand that the citizens of the Member States often want to have clarification of a number of the problems which are debated in the Community and to receive documentation which will enable them to study the issues currently confronting the European Community. The information offices therefore perform a number of services of assistance to people who wish to make contact with the Commission, people who wish to make a request on some matter, or organizations wishing to present their views to the Commission. The information offices have responsibility for a very wide range of tasks.

May I say to Mr Bonde that these weekly reports, which he attacks and moreover refers to as smear bulletins, were not aimed at any particular group or particular individuals. They took issue with the kind of misleading information, distortions and concrete errors which were present in the Danish election campaign. And I would add that Mr Bøgh, who also complained earlier that he was unable to get hold of the weekly report, according to the information I have, got his report two hours after he had telephoned to the information office asking for it. That is a fact.

Might I add finally that I do not think that Mr Bonde should be so strong in his criticism of the Commission on these matters, since Mr Bonde was the man behind the move to report me to the Prime Minister of Denmark for urging my former voters to vote for my party in the election campaign. Fortunately the Prime Minister rejected that form of censure. At all events, he did not refer the complaint to me, and the People's Movement against the EEC should therefore maintain a somewhat lower profile on the kind of question which it has raised here.

Mr Bøgh (ARC). — (DA) On a point of order, Madam President: I regret to have to inform the Commissioner that what he says is untrue. I did not receive these reports two hours later. I got them 14 days later. And the Commissioner should know that.

President. — Mr Bøgh, that was not a point of order nor a question on the subject matter of the original question.

Mr Schinzel (S). — (DE) Mr Commissioner, are you prepared to state categorically that EEC information offices fully satisfy the obligation to provide adequate information during election campaigns and do not allow themselves to be intimidated by attacks on the part of militant opponents of the EEC?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) I can answer that question in the affirmative.

Mr Bonde (ARC). — (DA) On a point of order, Madam President: I merely wish to say that Mr Dalsager

Bonde

ger's assertion that I was behind the complaint to the Prime Minister is untrue. I should like to ask the Commissioner . . .

President. — Mr Bonde, that is not a point of order!

Mr Bonde (ARC). — *(DA)* Madam President, it is your duty as President of this Assembly to ensure that I get an answer . . .

President. — You do not have the floor, Mr Bonde.

Mr Cryer (S). — Can the Commission tell the House what proportion of the information budget is spent explaining the common agricultural policy? How do the information services of the EEC explain the proportion of the Community budget (70%) which is spent on maintaining the massive and, to most people, obscene food mountains? Is the same proportion — 70% of the information budget — spent on explaining away the deficiencies and the obscenities of the common agricultural policy, particularly at a time when many people in the world are going hungry? To many people this is a very difficult policy to explain, and I wonder, therefore, if the information department spends a lot of money in trying to do so.

Mr Dalsager. — *(DA)* I am not sure that I have understood the question. I do not have the precise figures for the amount of money spent on information on the common agricultural policy, but I would urge the Honourable Member to study the bulletins we issue on the common agricultural policy and a wide range of similar matters — the so-called green bulletins from the Community's information office. That is one example of the ways in which we provide information on the agricultural policy.

Mr Chanteric (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, I should like to know if it is not the normal procedure for Question Time that after the intervention of the author of the question one supplementary question per group may be asked. I note that for the past half hour we have been attending a kind of Danish festival and I should like to propose . . .

President. — Mr Chanteric, I am delighted to hear that you agree with what the Chair has said on more than one occasion, namely that colleagues should not put to the institution questioned more than one question, as the Rules of Procedure stipulate.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* I shall be very brief. I would like to reiterate to the Commissioner exactly the same question put by Mr Butos, because I think it is a serious question, and one that demands a specific

answer. The leader of the group of Members representing the New Democracy, who, I fear, tends to be more royalist than the King and more European than the EEC — even though Greece is but a short step from Asia and Africa — asked the Commissioner whether the Commission and the other bodies of the EEC .

President. — Mr Alavanos, you are referring to a question put by Mr Bonde to which the Commissioner has already replied.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* I would like to ask the Commissioner whether it falls within the Commission's competence to impose programmes even of a political nature on the State radio and television media in each country.

Mr Dalsager. — I definitely do not think the Commission has any competence in regard to that.

President. — Question No 8, by Mr Rogalla (H-98/84); for whom Mr Schinzel is deputizing.

Subject: Customs union

How does the Commission account for the fact that, 26 years after the EEC Treaty entered into force, the Customs Union is still not complete; is it the Member States that are largely responsible for this delay; to what extent is the Commission responsible; how does the Commission propose to make up for this delay and in what stages does it propose to complete the Customs Union?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* After the impressive successes of the 1960s resulting from the establishment of the customs union, construction of the internal market slowed down markedly in the 1970s. This was due among other things to the fact that at a time of mounting economic difficulties persistent protectionist tendencies emerged practically everywhere. On top of this there was the increasing resistance on the part of national specialist departments and various pressure groups to any changes in arrangements and procedures aimed at removing borders. Nor must one fail to mention a definite deterioration of the decision-making process in the Council of Ministers. This became particularly apparent in connection with the harmonization of technical legislation and standards as well as indirect taxation.

Things only began to change when, in 1981/1982, after numerous fresh political initiatives awareness of the importance of the internal market in the construction of the European Community and the concomitant advantages for all Member States was heightened and sharpened. This turning point led to the now familiar decisions of the Copenhagen Summit in the autumn of

Narjes

1982 and the institution of a special Council of Ministers for the internal market.

What we have to do now is exploit the forward impetus in which the European Parliament and the European Council also had a hand and continue to strengthen the internal market in a more comprehensive and determined manner than in the 1970s.

To this end the Commission, on 13 June, submitted a communication on the consolidation of the internal market, which forms part of a series of internal-market initiatives of the last few years. In this the Commission is pursuing the goal, within the framework of an overall plan, of pushing the adoption of a multiplicity of internal-market proposals before the Council by the end of 1985 at the latest. These proposals relate to the removal of borders, the legal framework for the activities of undertakings, the movement of capital, services and people as well as aspects of tax, agricultural and transport policy. This should bring about a substantial improvement in the quality of the internal market within the next 16 months and a new stage of integration comparable to the speeding up of the customs union in the 1960s.

Now more than ever the European economy needs the breakthrough to a European internal market. Only a faith in the irreversible character of this process will prompt it to make the necessary investment. Only in this way can competitiveness be strengthened, the upturn assured and unemployment tackled. Furthermore, it is important to put our house in order in preparation for the entry of the applicant countries and prepare the ground in good time for a solid further development of the Community after enlargement.

Mr Schinzel (S). — (DE) Mr Commissioner, can you tell us whether the Commission is making preparations with a view to building a uniform European customs administration, and when we can expect this to be completed?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) Our first goal is the adoption of a modified uniform European customs legislation. As far as organization is concerned, this will involve us in efforts to achieve as soon as possible a standardized training for customs officials. Possibly these officials will have their own distinctive uniform. A further point: this idea of a European customs administration in which all customs officers of the Community become Community officials is not in our view feasible in the foreseeable future given the associated problems posed by civil service and salary legislation, etc. Consequently, if we are to achieve this goal we must proceed by stages and we have a pretty good idea as to what form these stages will take.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — (DE) Mr Commissioner, I should like first to express my appreciation of the

report and to acknowledge reference to the fact that in 1981/82 some action was possible thanks in part to initiatives from Parliament. But I should like to ask you whether you share the view that since that time in the different Community Member States the wind has begun to blow again in the other direction and that matters are now discussed in those countries from national and rather narrow points of view? Is this not the moment for us to launch an information campaign to redress the balance? I also very much appreciate the reference to the communication on information from the Commission to the Council. Are you prepared to report to Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on this in the near future?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) Naturally I am prepared to report, and I hope that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs can be briefed as early as possible. I agree that in the past eight to ten weeks circulation of information has fallen off somewhat. However I hope that, as efforts are made to bring closer the Europe of the people, there will again be a growing awareness of the necessity for change. The real problem is to convince bureaucracy, the specialist departments and interested groups of the necessity for changes for there can be no adjustments without changes.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Recently it was reported in the Greek press that the Commission is encountering certain problems with the Greek customs authorities, and that Commission representatives will soon be sent to examine the situation of the Greek customs. On this opportunity, and because there has been no official information, either to the European Parliament or to the Greek people concerning this particular subject, I would like the Commissioner to give us some more information regarding the Greek customs authorities and the Commission's actions in the matter.

Mr Narjes. — (DE) I am not aware of any sentence — but please correct me if I am wrong — that can justify the charge that Greek public opinion has been misled. To the best of my knowledge those statements of the Commission that have been published in Greece — I take it that the translations are accurate — have tended towards understatement, rather than giving a full account of the state of internal-market development in Greece.

Mr Ducarme (L). — (FR) I found the information given by the Commissioner extremely interesting, but like the colleague who spoke before me I wonder if, instead of governments becoming aware of public opinion, we are not witnessing a *de facto* renationalization of customs policy. And here I believe that we are faced not only with shortcomings, imperfections and irregularities but also with new controls and, certainly, with

Ducarme

complications created by administrative documents in the frontier regions. In these areas frontier workers, self-employed persons, farmers and professional people are increasingly confronted with difficulties. I should like to ask the Commissioner if the Commission has a reference document on the application of legislation in force in the frontier regions and — if not — if it does not think it should draw up such a text so that we may know precisely, at the borders between the various Community Member States, the way in which stages already completed are being implemented by the national governments.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, just a little while back you were very generous with colleagues from other groups: the Socialist Group was able to ask three questions and the Communist Group two questions. I also wanted to speak to put a question, but I was not called. I am asking you if there are not double standards here.

President. — Mr Blumenfeld, I called you to speak but you indicated that you did not wish to do so. There was probably a misunderstanding.

Question No 9, by Mr Welsh (H-101/84)

Subject: National aid

On 27 June the Commission announced that an aid of BFR 224 million to the Belgian Company Idealspun was incompatible with the Common Market and requested the Kingdom of Belgium to abolish the aid.

Can the Commission confirm that the Kingdom of Belgium has complied with the request?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* The Commission decision to which the honourable gentleman refers is set down in an instruction forwarded to the Belgian Government on 6 August last. In that instruction the Belgian Government was invited within two months of notification to report on the steps it had taken to give effect to the Commission instruction. As I said, the instruction was communicated on 6 August; the Belgian Government has thus another few weeks in which to report and therefore I cannot at this moment answer the honourable gentleman's question in either positive or negative terms.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Commissioner Andriessen will appreciate that that is not a satisfactory answer. The fact is that this aid has been in the possession of the company that received it for something like nine months. During that nine months they have had the benefit of this money which is allowing them to compete unfairly.

Could I ask the Commissioner to confirm that it is not a matter of the Belgian Government agreeing or not

agreeing to implement a Commission decision? The Commission is required to enforce the Treaty, and there should be no question of negotiations about a decision which they have the power to make and which they have a duty to enforce. So can we stop this business of asking people who are in default of the Treaty if they would kindly obey the rules.

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* There is no question of the Commission's kindly asking, whatever the government, that the rules of the Treaty — in this case a Commission decision — be observed. It is the Commission's practice — and certainly this has become increasingly evident in the recent past — where it has issued negative decisions over assistance to undertakings which fail to obtain its approval, to call for the cancellation of such arrangements. That is what has happened here. That a reasonable deadline should be allowed seems only natural to the Commission, but I can assure the honourable gentleman that the Commission expects implementation by the government concerned and is urgently requesting, indeed demanding, that it does so.

Mr Chanteric (PPE). — *(NL)* I should like, if I may, to enlarge the scope of the question to the Commissioner to cover the following matter: some time ago the Commission gave instructions for the whole question of aid arrangements in the textiles sector to be investigated and promised to make the results of the study available. I should like to ask the Commissioner if this study has already been completed and when he thinks the findings will be made available.

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* I agree with the honourable gentleman that this is a considerable enlargement of the original question. So much so that I do not have precise information at this moment as to the progress of the investigation into the situation in the textile industry. I remember how some time ago we exchanged views on this matter during Question Time or in some other context. Naturally, Madam President, I shall inform you and Parliament at the earliest possible opportunity in writing about the current state of affairs. It goes without saying that as soon as the subject has been thoroughly prepared and followed up by a proper discussion in the Commission, Parliament will be duly informed.

President. — Question No 10, by Mrs Ewing: (H-102/84):

Subject: Presentation of proposals for an EEC assisted development programme in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland

Having regard to the support which was received from all quarters during the recent European election campaign for an EEC assisted development programme in the Highlands and Islands of Scot-

President

land and bearing in mind the Commission's expressed commitment to such a scheme, will the Commission now come forward with specific ADP proposals?

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — (IT) The Commission has taken note of Parliament's resolution on the development programme for the Highlands and Islands in Scotland. The Council is currently discussing the proposals for improving and strengthening agricultural holdings. The document concerned is COM(83) 559 of 30 November 1983. Article 18 of that document will constitute the basis for specific arrangements for the agriculture of that region. However, it should also be noted that we have still to decide the scale of resources in the Community budget earmarked for the agricultural holdings policy, i.e. the Guidance Section of the Agricultural Fund. Once this problem has been solved, we shall then have a clearer picture of the various possibilities open to us to adopt new arrangements with a view to overcoming structural and infrastructural handicaps in the areas concerned.

Furthermore, the Regional Fund could operate alongside the Guidance Section of the Agricultural Fund in that region. Article 34 of the Fund's new regulation, which was recently adopted by the Council of Ministers and which enters into force shortly, on 1 January 1985, stipulates that in the administration of the Regional Fund's resources priority will be given to projects that form part of integrated development programmes.

An integrated development programme of precisely this sort is now being carried out in the Western Isles along the lines laid down in Council Regulation 1939/81. This is a programme which, in our opinion, has already produced satisfactory results and which could therefore be taken as a point of reference, indeed as a model, for a larger region.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — May I thank the Commissioner for this answer, but may I also say that it will give little comfort to one of the most disadvantaged areas in the Community. Could I not ask him if he would resolve a deadlock which exists with regard to this particular programme which was passed by this Parliament. Commissioner Dalsager is on record as saying that this programme could be produced in a matter of weeks; Commissioner Tugendhat, speaking from Mr Dalsager's brief, said that the Commission is in favour of this particular programme, but the problem was lack of interest by the United Kingdom Government; but the UK Government is on record as saying it cannot consider it because it has not got the Commission's proposals. Is what we have here not a ludicrous chicken and egg situation? Could I therefore ask the Commissioner if the Commission would not simply resolve the deadlock, as all they have to do to imple-

ment their own promises is to bring forward the proposals and then let the blame be put where it possibly belongs, i.e. on the shoulders of the UK Government. At least then we would know.

Mr Giolitti. — (IT) In answer to the honourable lady, and in line with what I said not a long while back, the Commission for its part is prepared to undertake immediately the action requested by Mrs Ewing. However, the two conditions to which I referred earlier must first be satisfied. First, the Council must adopt the Commission's proposals with particular reference to Article 18 — which I mentioned earlier — in order to have the necessary legal basis. Second, we must know the volume of resources available to us.

Without knowing this, and without the Council's approval, the Commission is unable to develop its own initiative. Once these conditions have been fulfilled, the Commission for its part is favourable to the proposed initiative.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Is the Commissioner aware that the area referred to in the question already has its own development board? Would he agree that any development programme should be directed towards all of the less-favoured areas in Scotland?

Mr Giolitti. — (IT) As I have already said, we have in hand in that region an integrated development programme for the Western Isles and I have pointed out the regulation on which this programme is based. I also said — and I can confirm this — that we are prepared to consider a wider application in that area of the integrated programme approach as soon as we are able to do so on the basis of the proposals we have presented to the Council and when we have the necessary resources.

Mr Morris (S). — I welcome every and any form of aid to the regions, since I too come from a part of Britain which is just as remote as that of my colleague, Mrs Ewing. However, I would remind this Assembly that the action taken by Mrs Thatcher and the British Tory Government in removing and robbing parts of my constituency of Powys and Dyfed of its Development Area Status has made it difficult, if not impossible, for areas with high unemployment like mine to qualify for EEC funds and grants under its regional policy.

I would therefore ask the Commission not only to come forward with new and specific proposals for assisted development programmes but also to urge the Thatcher government to increase its spending on regional policy so that areas like mine can overcome the scandal and the terrible hurt of youth unemployment and general employment.

Mr Giolitti. — (IT) The Commission has as a matter of course relations, contacts, with all the Governments of the Member States, and therefore with the United Kingdom Government in connection with contributions from the various Community funds, in particular those funds that are considered under these programmes, and therefore the Agricultural Fund and the Regional Fund. Within the limits of the resources available on the basis of the priorities agreed between the Community and national governments, funds are contributed and distributed in support of the various initiatives.

President. — Question No 11, by Mr Habsburg (H-105/84):

Subject: Community funding for the Innkreis-Pyhrn motorway

What progress has been made in the negotiations between the Commission and the Republic of Austria on Community funding for the Innkreis-Pyhrn motorway?

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) The Community's negotiations with Austria concerning the revision of our relations in the transport sector have been in progress for about three years, on the basis of Council's terms of reference as approved on 15 December 1981. These terms of reference did not include all the economic and financial aspects of the problem. This provision was opposed by Austria, which insisted that no integrated negotiations could take place unless the economic and financial aspects were included. As a result, on the Commission's initiative Council reinterpreted and amplified the terms of reference by a decision on 20 December 1983, so as to allow the financial aspects of the matter to be included in the negotiations.

I must say, though, that Council expressed reservations concerning the possibility of any participation at all by the Community in any infrastructural programmes in Austria. This development was followed by a meeting between representatives of the two sides on 16 and 17 May 1984. Relevant topics were discussed and the Commission's services attempted to draw up a balance of respective burdens and advantages arising from road and rail transport between the two sides. However, difficulties were encountered for lack of reliable statistics, and also because there is a difference of opinion between Austria and the Community as to whether the bipartite network between the Community and Austria should be included. Austria would like to exclude it. That is where the negotiations have got to, and to urge them along and accelerate their pace it was decided in common with the Austrian Government to hold a further meeting next 4 and 5 October in Vienna, where together with the competent Ministers of Transport and Public Works we shall examine how the negotiations may progress.

I hope that following the meeting and the discussions in question we shall be able to make more rapid progress.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Mr Commissioner, thank you very much for your very full answer. I should however like to ask a very down-to-earth question: there can be no doubt that the Trieste link with Western Europe has to pass through Austria. It is therefore very much in the EEC's interest to build this road as quickly as possible. Are you not also of the opinion that as regards the great needs of the EEC — and more particularly of the Eastern Mediterranean — it is rather slow and laborious to proceed from one negotiating deadline to the next? Instead of the difficulties being solved they just go on and on, and the development we seek for the Eastern Mediterranean is simply delayed.

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) I would like to inform the Honourable Mr Habsburg that the terms of reference approved by Council do not include discussion, at this time, of certain specific infrastructural programmes, and consequently of possible Community participation in them. Of course, when the meeting with competent Ministers takes place, all programmes that can be contemplated will be discussed, including the one that relates to Trieste.

Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC). — (DE) Does the Commission not agree that it would be more useful from the economic and ecological point of view to promote public local and long distance transport, rather than private transport, with the aim of providing comprehensive rail and bus services?

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) Most freight bound for Austria is transported by road in heavy goods vehicles. Of course, the Commission shares the view that where some of the freight can be transported by rail, this would be desirable in that it not only protects the environment but also saves fuel. However, the exercise of such a preference should not constitute unfair and artificial discrimination against one means of transport and in favour of another.

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

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — On a point of order, I have an urgent question on the future of certain subsidy schemes that affect the lives and working opportunities of many people in my country, namely, the AI and lime subsidies. I would ask the Commissioner concerned for a brief reply to that question.

¹ See Annex of 12. 9. 1984.

President. — Mr Fitzgerald, you will receive a written reply. Question Time is over.

7. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament

The next item is the communication from the Commission of the European Communities on action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament.¹

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) I should like to ask the Commission a question relating to the document now before us. It concerns the action taken on the resolutions and so on adopted during the May part-session. I refer specifically to point B3 of the Commission's document, which states that the Commission has not accepted three of the amendments proposed by Parliament to the directive on the equal treatment of self-employed women.

I find that it has not in fact accepted a single amendment, and the Commission tries to justify this by saying that the directive already takes sufficient account of the broad lines of Parliament's resolution of 17 January 1984. I have made a comparison, Madam President, and I find that, on the contrary, the amendments Parliament adopted to the directive correspond exactly to its resolution of 17 January. I therefore believe that as rapporteur I must object to the Commission's view. My objection applies in particular to Article 7(a) of the directive. Parliament wanted to use this article to ensure a reasonable distribution of incomes to women working in family businesses. But the wording the Commission has chosen does not require this reasonable distribution of incomes. The Commission is thus in fact leaving the way open for all manner of indirect compensation and so for all kinds of indirect situations where social security and taxation are concerned. And that is precisely what this directive should have been trying to prevent.

If the Commission does not accept the amendment we have proposed in this respect, I must point out — and we have already discussed this in the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe — that the directive submitted to the Council will in fact be completely worthless because its heart has, as it were, been removed. I therefore urge the Commission to discuss this again with the committee to see if this aspect cannot after all be covered by the proposal submitted to the Council. There is, of course, absolutely no point in offering the Council something worthless and then giving women working in family businesses the impression that their legal position is being improved. I should like to hear from the Commission whether it is willing to reconsider this matter.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — May I say right at the outset that this type of procedure, in which detailed questions are put on detailed texts, is not perhaps the best way of dealing with what is, in any view of the matter, an intricate and complicated question.

Mrs Maij-Weggen asked whether the Commission will look at it again. I think I will look at it again. Obviously I cannot commit the Commission totally on it. However, if points have not been covered which ought to have been covered, which are, so to speak, legal points and drafting points, then, of course, I will look at it again — no problem with that at all. If there are points of major substance on which the view of the Committee on Women's Rights and that of the Commission diverge, then perhaps it is just as well that we know precisely what the extent of that divergence is and what we can do, if possible, to bridge that particular gap. So I think that the most I can say to Mrs Maij-Weggen is that I will have another look at it. I cannot guarantee that I will be able to go along with her. If I can, then I will.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) In the Commission's document, in section (d), reference is made to information concerning aid granted following the last meeting, for natural disasters. I would like to ask the Commission whether any aid has been granted, or whether there is any intention to grant aid in the immediate future, to Ethiopia which, as is known, is facing terrible problems of drought and famine, and which is not included in the schedule of grants for urgent aid. It is true that Ethiopia features in a second schedule of foodstuff grants, but I think that the quantities of milk given are quite inadequate. I would like to ask the Commissioner whether it is intended to grant similar aid at a time when Ethiopia has appealed to all the international organizations to stand by her in the severe problems she is facing.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) I can tell the honourable Member that a number of measures have already been taken this year to help Ethiopia and that fresh decisions are due to be taken this autumn, in November or December, to be precise. The answer to the question is therefore in the affirmative, and the Commission is naturally quite prepared to provide Parliament with more detailed information on this matter.

Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM). — (IT) I should like to take up the principle invoked by Mrs Maij-Weggen with regard, this time, to the Salisch report, where the Commission's differences are not with the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women but with the Parliament as a whole. According to the document that has been distributed, some amendments did not reflect the general position of the Commission — even here we might have no objections — while others had not been taken over by the Commission because the

¹ See Annex.

Rodano

Council was to state its views very shortly after. This argument does not seem to me to be entirely valid. I appreciate that the Commission, stating its reasons, may not accept Parliament's amendments, but not that it should fail to submit them because it was not acting in time.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) It will not have escaped Parliament's notice that my colleague, who has just discussed this matter, has now left the Chamber. On his behalf, and referring, of course, to what he has just said, I should like to remind the House that he said that, in view of the comments that have been made, he is willing to review the present position to see if changes can or need to be made to bring the proposed directive more closely into line with the amendments Parliament has suggested. I do not believe I should say more for the moment.

I would add that the written communication from the Commission on the action it has taken on Parliament's recommendations has recently made explicit references to the debates that have taken place and to the position adopted in such debates by the Commissioners responsible. Some of the reasons for the Commission's refusal to accept certain amendments are thus normally given during the debate, and reference is made to them. Where this has not been the case, or where the reasons have not been made sufficiently clear, they should, of course, be stated elsewhere.

I therefore assume that, if this has not been done in this specific instance, the Commissioner will inform either the committees or Parliament in the appropriate manner why the Commission cannot accept the amendments proposed by Parliament or what changes he intends making to his position.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — (NL) I should just like to say to the Commissioner that it is, of course, very nice if the communication on the action taken on resolutions adopted by Parliament refers to a debate. But if the essential points on which Parliament has made a statement are not accepted by the Commission, we do not gain a great deal from a reference of this kind. The arguments that were advanced during the debate did not convince Parliament, and it may well be that Parliament's decisions will still persuade the Commission to accept Parliament's views.

I do not know if the Commissioners are aware of this, but the purpose parliaments usually serve is to change measures that have been proposed by governments or, in this case, the Commission.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) Neither I nor the Commission take offence at the lesson we have just been taught. I feel I can say that in the vast majority of cases the Commission showed during the life of the last Parliament that it was prepared to accept amendments

proposed by Parliament, and Parliament expressed its satisfaction on several occasions. But the Commission cannot tolerate a situation in which it is forced to accept whatever Parliament says.

Parliamentary debates are also designed to give the Commission an opportunity of convincing Parliament.

8. Budget

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

- the statements by the Council and the Commission on the budgetary situation and
- the report (Doc. 2-475/84) by Mrs Scrivener, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on

I. the amended proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-362/84 - COM(84) 399 final) for a regulation introducing measures to cover budgetary requirements in 1984 given the exhaustion of own resources

II. the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 2-367/84 - COM(84) 383 final) for a regulation introducing reserve measures to cover requirements in 1985 should the new decision to increase own resources not enter into force in time.

Mr O'Keefe, President-in-Office of the Council. — Madam President, on this my first appearance in this Parliament on behalf of the Council — although I came last year to familiarize myself with Parliament's work — I take the opportunity to offer my good wishes to all the Members of the House, to the new President and all the Vice-Presidents, as you start the new parliamentary year of the new Parliament.

Madam President, five years ago a distinguished President of the European Parliament, Madam Veil, said that the first task of the first directly-elected Parliament would be to consider budgetary questions. Her remarks hold true today after what have been five adventurous and, at times, arduous years in the history and development of the two branches of the budgetary authority. My purpose today is to report on the budgetary situation. As the President of the European Council made clear when he addressed you in July, the Irish Presidency is determined to carry through the budgetary procedure with vigour, commitment and in the closest possible collaboration with you and with the Commission. With this in mind the Council — unusually — devoted the whole of the first day of its July meeting to formal and less formal exchanges with the Parliamentary delegations. It was then that we took leave of the former chairman of your Committee on Budgets, and I am happy to welcome the new

O'Keefe

incumbent, Mr Cot, who has taken up his onerous responsibilities and to whom I renew the assurance of my close collaboration.

The Budget Council has now met twice. I am disappointed to have to tell you that it has not successfully completed this stage of the budget procedure. The Council has not so far been able to reach final agreement on the solutions which we are to bring to the complex of budgetary problems in both 1984 and 1985. To avoid any misconception, you may recall that the Budget Council strictly follows Treaty rules and that in the present case the divergencies which remain cannot be settled by taking votes and finding majorities.

The budgetary authority is faced with a preliminary draft supplementary and amending budget which deals with the 1984 deficit and which asks the Council to provide additional finance in 1984 for expenditure in excess of the 1% VAT limit.

I can tell the House with satisfaction that there is no dispute within the Council as to the need for a supplementary budget for 1984. In addition there is large agreement on the amount and on the method to be used to provide the supplementary finance required.

You will recall that the Commission asked for an additional sum of about 2 000 million ECU, almost all for agricultural expenditure. Just as Parliament has shown its concern in successive votes, members of the Council are concerned over the growth of agricultural expenditure. Nevertheless, the Budget Council generally is bound to accept the consequences of existing policies and it aims to ensure the continuing normal functioning of the CAP. For this, and taking account of the expected budgetary outturn, the Council has concluded that the indispensable additional financing required in 1984 is of the order of 1 000 million ECU. We have accepted the Commission's view that it can operate some economies in non-compulsory expenditure because it foresees with confidence that certain anticipated expenditure will not in fact arise during the year. In fact, the Council believes that the Commission's expectations are too conservative with regard to the takeup of payment appropriations. This is not a question of distorting budgetary intentions or the wishes of Parliament and the Commission or of Member States, it is simply a question of noting that, as in previous years, certain amounts are going to remain unspent and are going to be added to the already very substantial overhang.

Parliament will, of course, be aware that the Court of Auditors has drawn the attention of the budgetary authority to the substantial credits which have remained unspent year by year. It would be financially irresponsible with this knowledge to allow unused funds to accumulate while calling up new finance from Community taxpayers.

I should also mention here that the residual financing need is further reduced by the Commission's helpful suggestion that sugar levies can be brought forward from 1985 to 1984 by an amount of 200 m ECU.

As regards the method: we have considered at length the Commission's proposal for a system of reimbursable advances on the Community's future own resources. This system ran into major difficulties with certain Member States who — and I now speak as rapporteur and not as defender of a point of view — disagreed fundamentally with the notion that a resources ceiling established by a procedure involving national parliamentary ratification could be got around simply by secondary legislation enacted by the Council. Although it has gone hard for some of my colleagues, the strongest support is for the idea that Member States should contribute their shares to the financing of the agreed deficit, not on the basis of a Council regulation but in the framework of an intergovernmental agreement. On each side of the argument, and in both form and substance, this agreement represents major concessions. If, like me, you believe that the supreme question is the provision of finance rather than the particular means of making it available, you will take the Council's orientation on these terms and with whatever reservations you may formulate. This would depart from the Commission's proposals, and one of the reasons — not the major one — for the Council's hesitation is that it has not had your opinion on the regulations. I hope it will not be delayed.

I now turn to the 1985 draft budget. If this were a normal year I would be able to lay a draft 1985 budget before you because in all its detail it had been agreed by the Council. Unfortunately, this is not a normal year. The preliminary draft budget proposed by the Commission went beyond the 1% VAT and envisaged that the excess would be financed either by the entry into force during 1985 of the decision to increase the Community's own resources or by national contributions of advances on future own resources based on a Council regulation.

The Council concluded that it could not adopt a draft budget on this uncertain basis and it did not feel able to fix here and now the particular amounts that might be needed 12 months from now to finance rising expenditure. Against strongly-argued opposition, the Council decided that the draft budget should be limited to 1%. Within this it ensured that the consequential reductions should be distributed equitably and that Parliament's rights should be fully respected. In the eyes of some Member States' representatives, this immediately implied that unavoidable 1985 expenditure would be under-financed and that receipts would need to be supplemented in the course of the year. I can tell you that after intensive debate the Council for its part accepts that a supplementary budget will be necessary in the course of next year.

Even though the 1985 draft budget is virtually agreed, the Council was not able last Friday to establish it.

O'Keefe

First of all, most of my colleagues considered that as the Council was not able to establish the draft 1984 supplementary budget, it was not practical politics to establish the 1985 draft either. Secondly, the Council, which had spent most of its 24 hours on the supplementary budget, concluded that for final agreement it needed some time to consider the implications of the need for supplementary financing next year, taking especially into account that the main need is again for agricultural spending — perhaps the most sensitive of all budgetary issues.

I have therefore acknowledged to you openly that the Council's work is incomplete and that there is some way to go before I appear before you again to report further success. That, however, remains my intention. I shall be grateful for all the support this House can give me. My firm intention is to place before next week's meeting of the General Affairs Council a series of recommendations which, in my judgment, will be acceptable to the Council and which will permit it, with the delay which I personally regret, to open with you the interchanges between the two branches of the budgetary authority which will lead to the adoption of both budgets.

Finally, I do not want to harp on the past, but I am bound to say that it would greatly help the efforts which the Irish Presidency is making to resolve these problems if it could be agreed that you will unblock the British refund for 1983 when the draft 1984 supplementary budget is established and transmitted to you.

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — Madam President, as the President of the Council said in his speech a moment ago, this debate takes place against a background in which the Budget Council has failed for a second time to establish either a draft supplementary budget for 1984 or a draft budget for 1985. The President of the Budget Council has also already explained the circumstances surrounding that failure, and it is to him, as the representative of the Council, that Members of Parliament will no doubt wish to put their questions or express their concerns.

For my part, I set out in my statement to Parliament in July the considerations which had led the Commission to present the particular budgetary and legislative proposals which we have made. Earlier this afternoon I had an opportunity for a brief exchange with the Committee on Budgets, and, in the light of what I said to the plenary sitting in July and the exchange that I had with the Committee on Budgets earlier today, I do not think it would be in the interests of the House for me to repeat these considerations. None the less, I emphasize that in our view what we said in July remains valid today.

I should also like to inform Parliament of the representations which the Commission made to the Council

in recent days to emphasize the gravity of the situation. At its meeting on 5 September, the Commission reviewed the agricultural market situation and outlook to check whether or not the Commission's earlier assumptions remain valid. We concluded that such changes as had occurred since the presentation of our preliminary draft budget were more or less self-balancing in their effect. We also reviewed the EAGGF Guarantee advances actually paid out to Member States or requested by them for the first 10 months of the year. The situation here is that the advances paid for the period up to the end of September amount to 13 357 million ECU. In addition, Italy has submitted a request for an additional exceptional advance for September amounting to 160 million ECU. Thus, the requirement for the first nine months of the year is 13 517 million ECU. The requests from the Member States for the month of October total 1 640 million ECU. These requests are subject to verification, but they do provide a good indication of the order of magnitude.

Now, Madam President, on the assumption — which is, I think, justified by the experience of recent years — that the rhythm of advances in October, November and December will be somewhat higher than in earlier quarters of the year, the total requirement for EAGGF Guarantee expenditure in 1984 would be 18 550 m ECU. This figure exceeds the amount entered in the 1984 budget which was 16 500 m ECU by virtually the same sum as that requested by the Commission in its preliminary draft budget. The Commission therefore considers its request for a further 1 983 m ECU for EAGGF Guarantee expenditure to be of the right order of magnitude.

I informed the Budget Council of this. I emphasized that these additional resources were required to enable the Community to fulfil obligations it had entered into in the implementation of existing Community policies. I added that if additional budgetary provisions are not made in time, the Commission will no longer be able, during the last two months of this year, to honour in full the financial demands following from obligations previously contracted, notably in the agricultural sector. These obligations are the result of decisions which the Council itself had taken in the full knowledge of the budget implications.

Indeed, both in this Chamber as well as in the Agriculture Council prior to the decisions being taken, which incidentally were agreed unanimously, the Commission indicated that a supplementary budget of the size now under consideration would be required. The Commission will, of course, continue to manage the common agricultural policy in a prudent manner. None the less, the Commission remains of the opinion that contractual obligations to third parties, be they agricultural producers or other operators, have to be honoured. If a supplementary budget has not been passed by the end of October, the Commission will no longer be in a position to guarantee this. The responsi-

Tugendhat

bility will thus pass to the national intervention agencies. Inasmuch as this would represent a partial and albeit temporary renationalization, the Commission would — as I told this House in July — deeply deprecate such a development.

In order to do all within our power to secure the passage of a supplementary budget, the Commission has urged upon the Council in the most pressing terms possible the need for that institution to take the necessary decisions in time in order to enable the full discharge of the expenditure obligations which the Community has legally contracted. The Commission considered that in view of the gravity of the situation, it would be right for such a request to be made to the Council within the framework of the invitation to act envisaged in Article 175(2) of the Treaty of Rome. A letter to this effect was sent from the Commission to the Council last Thursday.

This is the first time the Commission has invoked this article in the budgetary field, and I believe the circumstances fully justify us in doing so. In the course of the recent Budget Council the Commission also made clear its view that the draft supplementary budget had to be based on realistic and not fictitious assumptions on revenues. In the Commission's view a realistic assumption is that receipts from agricultural levies, sugar levies and customs duties would be 560 m ECU less than previously envisaged, 350 m ECU — and, Madam President, only 350 m ECU — of which could be counterbalanced through management economies. A fictitious assumption which the Commission could in no way endorse would be a 500 m ECU surplus available from the current financial year.

An amendment of the preliminary draft budget of this nature would lead to a substantial deficit as a charge on the 1985 budget for which no provision has been made. The Commission hopes the Council will base itself on realistic data in subsequent work. The possibility of an additional charge on the 1985 budget is particularly worrying at a time when there is so much uncertainty about the 1985 budget itself. In this context, I must emphasize that a 1985 budget established within the 1% ceiling, with a wholly unrealistic figure for EAGGF guarantee, would be unexecutable for the Commission unless — and I do stress the word unless — it was accompanied by a clear and unambiguous commitment to a supplementary budget of an appropriate size in the course of the year.

Madam President, Mr O'Keefe has just informed you of the Council's disposition to make supplementary financing available in 1984 on the basis of an intergovernmental agreement. I think I need hardly remind the House that the Commission has a firm preference for a Community solution along the lines of our own proposal.

Before I come to an end, Madam President, there are two other points I should like to make. The first,

which is obviously self-evident to honourable Members, is that the agreed pragmatic calendar for the establishment of the draft budget for 1985 has not been respected. On the draft supplementary budget for 1984, it is absolutely imperative that the supplementary budget be adopted by the end of October if the difficulties to which I have alluded concerning the decision on the advances for the last two months of the year are to be avoided. The delay in establishing the relevant drafts is already eroding the sound functioning of budget procedures.

Madam President, the Council intends to re-examine these issues at its meeting next Monday and Tuesday. The Commission wishes to assure the House that we, for our part, will do all in our power to safeguard the Community interest and to secure the adoption of the relevant and necessary drafts.

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Madam President, I must apologize if what I have to say seems a little rough and ready, but since Mr O'Keefe could not, of course, be in two places at the same time and so was prevented from attending, as would have been usual, the meeting of the Committee on Budgets, the time I have had for preparing and thinking over my speeches on behalf of the Committee on Budgets has been somewhat limited.

What Mr O'Keefe has just offered us is an admission of failure inasmuch as the Council, as we all know, has disappointed our hopes of having a draft budget for 1985 and a supplementary budget for 1984. In the situation we are in today, there is a danger that the institutions will get jammed, will seize up, and this prompts me to remind the Council of its responsibilities. 'Seizing up' is, in fact, the right way of putting it, because it is the result of a creeping paralysis. Did we not have to wait, after the mandate of 30 May 1980, for four years for the Fontainebleau Summit? The stumbling-block now in the path of the Commission with regard to 'own resources' and the last-minute necessity of raising additional funds demonstrate, unfortunately, the gravity of the situation.

Even the hopes born of Fontainebleau have now been cruelly disappointed. What progress has been made with regard to the Community's own resources, where have we got in our attempts to cover our financial needs? What of the call for proper management of our budgetary procedures? Mr Tugendhat's critical remarks just now concerning the time-limits that have to be observed if we are to do our work properly are sentiments which the Parliament shares. I should be grateful if Mr O'Keefe could give us some reassurance on the timetable he envisages and on what he means by recommendations next week. What we need to do our work properly, Mr O'Keefe, is, quite simply, a draft budget! That much at least!

Whatever may be said about it, we are today faced with an accumulation of serious difficulties. This

Cot

development, which seems to us to be getting out of control, is taking place to the detriment of the Commission, which is being progressively reduced to purely executive status instead of being the prime mover of Community policy and the guardian of the Treaties. This uncontrolled drift is also at the expense of Parliament, whose statutory rights — those laid down by the Treaty and by Community legislation — are in grave danger of being overlooked.

So it is only, alas, too obvious that there are budgetary problems. All the same, Madam President, I should like to insist at this point that these budgetary problems cannot be imputed to this Parliament and that a careful examination of the amendments adopted by Parliament in connection with earlier budgets will soon dispose of false arguments accusing this House of budgetary irresponsibility. We are all aware that the inflation of expenditure results in the main from decisions taken quite deliberately by the Council, from the legislative powers exercised by the Council and from the obligations thus created which then have to be honoured.

This wayward drift of which we and the Committee on Budgets are aware gives us cause to fear that, after Parliament's powers and functions, it will be the Treaty rules in their entirety that are laid open to attack. In view of the present difficulties, our feeling is — to take up a formula used a short while ago — that we must stick to the Treaty, the whole Treaty and nothing but the Treaty. At all events, it must be the whole Treaty, and we must be aware of seemingly ever more frequent abuses of procedure. It is a vicious proceeding, we agree, to call adopted policies into question by the indiscriminate exercise of budgetary powers, but it is equally vicious to call budgetary powers into question by the indiscriminate use of rules and regulations.

I trust you will permit me at this point, Madam President, to make a parenthetical remark on the subject of budgetary discipline. I dislike this term, 'discipline'. In French literature, it is associated with the idea of Tartuffian hypocrisy, in reminiscence of Molière's Tartuffe, who bids his valet, 'serrez ma haine avec ma discipline', and here, I fear, we have got pretty near to Molière. No one would deny the need for budgetary stringency, and we are unanimous in our desire to get a better grip on expenditure, to heighten the effect of political choices by means of their budgetary consequences — indeed, I would say that the CAP decisions taken so courageously in Brussels last March are an example; but we are afraid that the Council, when tackling the problem of the budgetary conflict, may be tempted to tamper with the equilibrium of the Treaties and the institutions and, more than that, with the very nature of Community finances by adopting regulations

that can only cause trouble. On behalf of the Committee on Budgets, I wish to issue a solemn warning in this regard.

I now come to the specific problems — that is to say, the supplementary budget for 1984, the 1985 budget and the problem of our financial requirements. The supplementary budget for 1984 is absolutely necessary, and we are glad to learn that the Council has recognized this obvious fact. Community rules have, in fact, created obligations that have to be honoured, the Member States must ensure that expenditure is covered by applying the provisions of the Treaty, particularly Article 5, and here we are afraid that the solution put forward may have consequences that are liable to be called into question, particularly by the savings on structural expenditure.

As regards the 1985 budget, we want it to be credible — that is to say, based on a true estimate of the foreseeable expenditure, and a budget that is accompanied right from the beginning by the announcement of a draft supplementary budget does not, perhaps, exactly fit this description.

As for the problem, raised by Mr Huckfield, of unblocking the British refund, I should like to tell him that in my view the resolution adopted by Parliament in July remains valid. Parliament has no desire whatsoever to hold things up — on the contrary, it wants to see the situation clarified, and it awaits the presentation of the supplementary budget and of a new application — and a new application will be needed — in order to take its decision on unblocking the British refund.

In conclusion, I would simply reiterate the urgent call to the Council to carry out its responsibilities. With things as they are, we share the view taken by the Commission, which has not only established the fact of default but has even instituted — or announced its intention of instituting — proceedings before the Court of Justice. I find myself wondering whether the Parliament should not associate itself with this action brought by the Commission against the Council, but I trust it will not come to that. Meanwhile, I think the time is ripe for launching consultations among all three institutions: our President might well take a step in this direction, and the Committee on Budgets would obviously wish to be associated.

(Applause)

President. — The debate will be interrupted at this point and continued tomorrow.¹

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

¹ Application of Rule 116 of the Rules of Procedure — Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX

Commission action on European Parliament opinions on Commission proposals delivered at the April and May 1984 part-sessions

This is an account, as arranged with the Bureau of Parliament, of the action taken by the Commission in respect of amendments proposed at the April and May 1984 part-sessions in the framework of parliamentary consultation, and of disaster aid granted.

A.I. *Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that have been accepted by the Commission in full*

1. Report by Mr Ghergo on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)189 final) for a directive on procedures for harmonizing the programmes for the reduction and eventual elimination of pollution caused by waste from the titanium dioxide industry

The proposal for a directive, amended under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty, was sent to the Council on 25 May 1984.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 10 April 1984, p. 45

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 10 April 1984, pp. 30-35

2. Report by Mrs Veil on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)720 final) for a directive on access to the occupation of carrier of goods by waterway in national and international transport and on the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications for this occupation

The amended proposal (COM(84)417 final) was sent to the Council on 19 July 1984 and to the European Parliament on 5 September 1984.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 21 May 1984, p. 21

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 21 May 1984, pp. 20-21

3. Report by Mr Ceravolo on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)368 final) for a directive on protecting patients undergoing dialysis by reducing exposure to aluminium to a minimum

In view of the fact that the amendments proposed by Parliament are aimed at increasing the health protection of persons undergoing dialysis and at bringing out the need for proper manufacturing practices in the preparation of dialysis products, the Commission has expressed its agreement. It will take the proposed amendments into account as far as possible in the amended proposal it is now preparing.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 29 May 1984, pp. 123-4

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 23 May 1984, pp. 39-44

4. Report by Mr Eisma on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)520 final) for a directive on the preparation of emergency intervention plans to combat accidental oil spills at sea

The amended proposal (COM(84)433 final) was sent to the Council on 2 August 1984 and to the European Parliament on 13 August 1984.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 22 May 1984, pp. 127-8

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 23 May 1984, pp. 49-51

5. Second report (without debate) by Mr Notenboom on the second amendment of the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)621 final) for a regula-

tion amending Regulation (EEC, Euratom, ECSC) No 2891/77 implementing the Decision of 21 April 1970 on the replacement of financial contributions from Member States by the Communities' own resources

The amended proposal (COM(84)465 final) was sent to the European Parliament on 13 August 1984.

Commission's position at debate: —

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 24 May 1984, pp. 66-69

6. Report by Mr Moreau on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(84) 119 final) for a decision concerning the coordination of action by Member States and the Commission with a view to carrying out a long-term programme on the use of telematics in the Community's information systems on imports and exports and on the management and financial monitoring of the agricultural market organizations

The amended proposal (COM(84)467 final) was sent to the Council on 2 August 1984 and to the European Parliament on 13 August 1984.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 23 May 1984, p. 216

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 24 May 1984, p. 151

7. Second report (without debate) by Mr Pedini on the Commission communication to the Council (COM(83)377 final) on the establishment of the JRC's Management Board

On 25 May 1984 the Commission sent the Council an amended proposal for a Council decision concerning the multiannual research and teaching programmes to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre (JRC) (COM(84)296 final). In preparing the amended proposal account was taken of:

- (a) the amendment adopted by the European Parliament at its plenary session on 30 March 1984 concerning the deletion of the last paragraph in Article 3 of the original proposal (COM(83)377 final);
- (b) the parliamentary committees' discussions, with the result that greater clarity has been introduced with regard to informing Parliament (paragraph 1 in Article 3), that a limit has been placed on the validity of the decision (last paragraph in Article 5) and that a recital concerning adherence to the budget procedure has been added (3rd recital).

On 29 June 1984 the Council session on research adopted the proposed decision.

Commission's position at debate: —

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 24 May 1984, p. 73

A.II. *Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that have been accepted by the Commission in part*

1. Report by Mr de Pasquale on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)649 final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 724/75 establishing a European Regional Development Fund

On 19 June 1984 the Council adopted the regulation on the reform of the ERDF, accepting the main points in the Commission's 1983 proposal, on which Parliament had delivered a favourable opinion, with certain changes.

Before the regulation was adopted, a conciliation meeting between the Council and the European Parliament was held in which the Commission took part. That meeting provided an opportunity for discussing all the main aspects of the future regulation in depth and for a useful comparison of the positions of the three Institutions. Following the discussion the Institutions agreed on a joint declaration (text attached).

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 12/13 April 1984, pp. 336-338

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 13 April 1984, pp. 194-213

2. Report (without debate) by Mr Rogalla on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)738 final) for a fourth directive amending Directive 74/651/EEC on the tax reliefs to be allowed on the importation of goods in small consignments of a non-commercial character within the Community

The amended proposal (COM(84)372 final) was sent to the Council on 3 July 1984 and to the European Parliament on 5 July 1984.

Commission's position at debate: —

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 10 April 1984, pp. 19-20

3. Report by Mr Dalsass on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(82)328 final) for a regulation laying down general rules on the definition, description and presentation of spirituous beverages and of vermouths and other wines of fresh grapes flavoured with plants or other aromatic substances

The Commission is still going over this point by point with the departments concerned, after which it will be presenting an amended proposal.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 12 April 1984, p. 283

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 13 April 1984, pp. 108-121

4. Report by Mr Ghergo on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)375 final) for a regulation introducing Community action to increase protection against fires and acid rain for forests in the Community

The amended proposal was sent to the Council on 16 July 1984 and to the European Parliament on 24 July 1984.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 22 May 1984, pp. 117-120

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 23 May 1984, pp. 30-31

5. Report (without debate) by Mr Ingo Friedrich on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)786 final) for a directive extending the derogation granted to Ireland in respect of turnover tax and excise duty in the international movement of travellers

Since the European Parliament's adoption at its April part-session of the resolution in question, the Council has adopted a directive authorizing Ireland to exclude goods whose unit value exceeds 77 ECU from the exemption (Directive of 30 April raising the present 210 ECU exemption to 280 ECU with effect from 1 July 1984).

In spite of this decision of the Council the Commission is maintaining its proposal for a directive. The Commission is prepared to accept the amendment proposed by Parliament, which provides for the same progressive rise as the Commission's proposal and the complete abolition of the derogation as of 1 January 1989, but sets higher percentages for each stage in relation to the normal exemption.

The amended proposal will be sent to the Council and the European Parliament in the next few weeks.

Commission's position at debate: —

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 10 April 1984, p. 25

B. *Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that the Commission has not felt able to accept*

1. Report by Mr Vitale on Regulation (EEC) No 355/77 concerning the Commission proposals to the Council (COM(83) 559 final) for:

- (i) a regulation on improving the effectiveness of farm structures,

- (ii) a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 355/77 on common measures to improve the conditions under which agricultural products are processed and marketed and Regulation (EEC) No 1820/80 for the stimulation of agricultural development in the less-favoured areas of the west of Ireland

The Council has adopted the Commission proposal. Some of Parliament's remarks were taken into consideration. The reference for the Council's decision is Regulation (EEC) No 1932/84 of 19 June 1984, OJ No L 180/84, 7 July 1984.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 12 April 1984, pp. 278-280

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 13 April 1984, pp. 96-101

2. Report by Mrs Salisch on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(84) 74 final) for a draft resolution on lines of action to combat female unemployment

The Commission has not been able to present an amended draft resolution as some of the proposed amendments do not reflect its general position on unemployment and because the Council was to state its views very shortly after the opinion was adopted by Parliament.

However, it informed the Council immediately of some of the amendments proposed by Parliament and suggested that a certain number of them should be incorporated. The Council accepted:

- (a) the reference to cooperatives, in connection with measures to encourage local initiative with regard to job creation,
- (b) the major role to be played in futhering positive action by national mechanisms for ensuring equal opportunity and employment for women,
- (c) greater stress being laid in the text on the role of the European Social Fund.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 22 May 1984, pp. 76-78

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 22 May 1984, pp. 72-74

3. Report by Mrs Maij-Weggen on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(84) 57 final) for a directive on the application of the principle of equal treatment (in agriculture also) for self-employed men and women and on maternity protection
1. The proposal for a directive closely followed the European Parliament's approach as given in the parliamentary resolution on the position of women in Europe (adopted on 17 January 1984) and the report on the subject that accompanied it.
 2. This is why the Commission does not intend to present an amended proposal.
 - 2.1. With regard to Article 7a, the Commission told Parliament clearly that the wording used by the Commission was intentionally extremely wide in scope, so as to leave couples a free choice, with regard to the financial capacity of small family undertakings also, and so as to avoid imposing a single form of pay, which at the same time meets the purpose of amendment 7a bis.
 - 2.2. The extension requested by Parliament in Article 8a is, in the Commission's view, inopportune as things stand at present, progressing by stages being called for here. This is why the Commission has kept to a single category for pregnancy and maternity that would apply to all self-employed women and assisting wives.
 - 2.3. With regard to the amendment proposed to Article 8b, although it would be legally feasible, the Commission would draw attention to its proposal for a directive on parental leave, in which self-employed persons were not

included; it considers that the time has not yet come to ask the Member States to take measures here. Furthermore, a self-employed person can always take parental leave without there being any need for a law on the matter.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 22 May 1984, pp. 102-104

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 23 May 1984, pp. 15-18

4. Report by Mr de Courcy Ling on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83) 719 final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 435/80 to extend its scope to include strawberries falling within subheading No ex 08.08 A II of the Common Customs Tariff and originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States or in the overseas countries and territories

The Commission is unable to accept the following amendment to its proposal.

Article 1 of the proposal for a regulation

The purpose of this amendment is to authorize the entry of strawberries originating in ACP States or overseas countries and territories, abolishing all customs duties and quantitative restrictions during the period 1 October — end of February.

The Commission cannot endorse the amendment proposed in the parliamentary resolution in question. It considers that a reduction of customs duties within a quota provides a better answer to the internal and external problems posed by this type of product in the Community. Such an arrangement would also prevent our ACP partners from thinking that they could increase their share of the market *ad infinitum*.

On 2 August 1984 the Council adopted Regulation (EEC) No 2247/84 on the subject (OJ No L 206/1 and 106/2, 2 August 1984).

Commission's position at debate: —

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 24 May 1984, pp. 146-7

C. *Commission proposals in respect of which Parliament delivered favourable opinions or did not request formal amendment*

1. Report by Mr Vandewiele on the Commission proposals to the Council (COM(84) 171 final) for:
 - (i) a Council directive amending Directive 83/181/EEC determining the scope of Article 14(1)(d) of Directive 77/388/EEC as regards exemption from value added tax on the final importation of certain goods,
 - (ii) a Council directive amending Directive 68/297/EEC on the standardization of provisions regarding the duty-free admission of fuel contained in the fuel tanks of commercial motor vehicles

Parliament approved the Commission proposal. It recommended that the Commission step up its efforts to harmonize VAT and excise duty rates for motor vehicle fuel.

In connection with this, the Commission would draw attention to the fact that the measures to harmonize VAT and excise duty rates that have been adopted to date relate solely to their structures and the amounts on which they are to be charged.

Only at a more advanced stage of integration will it be possible to try to bring rates in general and, in this instance, those applying to motor vehicle fuel, closer together.

However, the Commission is of the view that there must be a definite show of political will (which it is indeed trying to foster) if further harmonization is to be carried through.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 21 May 1984, p. 25

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 21 May 1984, p. 34

2. Report (without debate) by Mr Sherlock on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83) 392 final) for a directive amending Directive 70/157/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the permissible sound level and the exhaust system of motor vehicles

Ad item 5 of the resolution

A proposal for a directive amending Directive 78/1015/EEC on the permissible sound level and the exhaust system of motor bicycles is to be sent to the Council in the second half of 1984.

In the case of motor bicycles, a Community definition of this type of vehicle must first be established, and in discussions with the Member States this has not yet been achieved.

Commission's position at debate: —

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 24 May 1984, p. 89

D. *Disaster aid supplied since last part-session*

Emergency aid for third countries

Financial

Country	Sum	Reason	Distributed by	Date of decision
Antigua	200 000 ECU	drought	EEC Delegation	15. 5. 84
Uganda	250 000 ECU	displaced persons	ICRC	8. 6. 84
Mali	1 500 000 ECU	drought	EEC Delegation	9. 7. 84
El Salvador	500 000 ECU	displaced persons	EEC Delegation, Caracas	21. 6. 84
Guatemala	150 000 ECU	displaced persons	EEC Delegation, Caracas	21. 6. 84
Nicaragua	150 000 ECU	displaced persons	EEC Delegation, Caracas	21. 6. 84
Thailand	300 000 ECU	displaced persons	UNBRO, WFP	21. 6. 84
Angola	500 000 ECU	displaced persons	EEC Delegation, Congo	21. 6. 84
Morocco	500 000 ECU	drought	LICROSS	9. 7. 84

Food

Allocations decided on as follows:

3 July

Country/agency	Quantity (tonnes)			
	Cereals	SMP	BO	Other products
WFO	110 000	28 000	6 000	VO 1 000 B 4 500
LICROSS	2 000	750	500	—
Comoros	1 000	300	100	—
Zambia	20 000	400	400	—
Tunisia	—	3 000	1 350	—
Egypt	135 000	6 750	2 000	—
Lebanon	8 000	600	—	—
Haiti	2 000	—	—	—
Nicaragua	5 000	1 800	300	B 3 500
India	—	27 000	7 000	VO 1 000
Sri Lanka	40 000	—	—	—
	323 000	68 600	17 650	VO 2 000 B 8 000

VO = vegetable oil

B = beans

SMP = skimmed-milk powder

BO = butter-oil

17 July

Angola: emergency allocation of 200 tonnes milk powder + 100 tonnes butter-oil

18 July

Mozambique: charged to International Emergency Food Reserve, allocation of 3 000 tonnes cereals

WFO: emergency allocation of 1 160 tonnes beans + 975 tonnes fish

20 July

Country/agency	Quantity			
	Cereals	SMP	BO	Other products
Guinea-Bissau	7 000	100	125	—
Guinea Conakry	7 000	—	—	—
Sao Tome e Principe	1 000	—	—	VO 100
Ethiopia	—	1 400	500	—
Djibouti	4 000	100	—	—
Madagascar	20 000	400	—	—
Botswana	4 000	480	—	—
Lesotho	7 000	200	—	—
Morocco	10 000	—	300	—
UNRWA	—	1 850	1 000	S 500 OO 30 B 200 1 552
Bolivia	10 000	1 000	200	VO 800 B 1 000
Indonesia	—	1 200	200	—
Bangladesh	130 000	—	1 500	VO 700
Jamaica	—	960	160	VO 100
	200 000	7 690	3 985	VO 1 700 S 500 OO 30 B 1 200 UNRWA 1 552

VO = vegetable oil

B = beans

S = sugar

OO = olive oil

Since the official English version of the Joint Declaration issued by the Council, Commission and European Parliament during the consultation on the reform of the European Regional Development Fund had not been received at the time of going to press, readers are referred to the versions in the other official languages of this Report of Proceedings

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 1984

Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes</i> <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Pearce</i>	37	• <i>Question No 42 by Mr Habsburg: Community funding for the Innkreis-Pyhrn motorway:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mr Habsburg; Mr Barry</i> . . .	70
2. <i>Decision on urgent procedure</i> <i>Mr Cot; Mr Tolman; Mr Klepsch; Mr Huckfield; Mr Tolman; Mr von der Vring</i>	38	• <i>Question No 43 by Mr Paisley: Spanish claim of jurisdiction over Gibraltar:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mr Paisley; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Lomas; Mr Barry; Mr McCartin; Mr Barry; Mr Hume; Mr Barry; Mr Paisley; Mr Taylor</i>	71
3. <i>Budget (continuation)</i> <i>Mr Fich; Mr Christodoulou; Lord Douro; Mr Pitt; Mrs Barbarella; Mr Lowwes; Mr Pasty; Mr Bonde; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Pannella; Mr Pitt; Mr Cot; Mr von der Vring; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Pitt; Mr Mizzau; Lord Douro; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Rigo; Mr Di Bartolomei; Mr Pfennig; Mr Møller; Mr Alavanos; Mr von der Vring; Mr Langes; Mr Price; Mrs Boserup; Mr Ryan; Mr Früh; Mr Lalor; Mrs Fuillet; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr O'Keeffe (Council); Mr Cot</i>	39	• <i>Question No 44 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano: participation of the Community institutions in the UN Conference in Nairobi in 1985 for the end of the Women's Decade:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mr Barry</i>	72
4. <i>Topical and urgent debate (objections)</i> <i>Mr Huckfield; Lady Elles; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr McCartin; Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr de la Malène; Mrs Castle; Lady Elles; Mrs Castle; Mr Newens; Mr Klepsch; Mr Arndt</i>	65	• <i>Question No 45 by Mr Hutton: return to majority voting:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mr Hutton; Mr Barry</i>	73
5. <i>Question Time (Doc. 2-470/84) (continuation)</i>		• <i>Question No 46 by Mr Selva; extradition of Toni Negri:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mr Selva; Mr Barry; Mr Pannella; Mr Barry</i>	73
• <i>Questions to the Council:</i>		• <i>Question No 47 by Mr Chanterie: Directive on the information and consultation of the employees of transnational undertakings:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mr Chanterie; Mr Barry; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Barry</i>	74
• <i>Question No 39 by Mrs Dury: representation at meetings of the Council of the European Communities and the Ministers for Culture:</i> <i>Mr Barry (Council); Mrs Dury; Mr Barry; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Barry; Mr Ducarme; Mr Barry; Mrs Lizin; Mr Barry</i>	68	• <i>Question No 49 by Mr Balfé: use of plastic bullets:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mr Balfé; Mr Barry; Mr Paisley; Mrs Crawley; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr Pearce</i>	74
• <i>Question No 40 by Mr Rogalla: regard for the work of the European Parliament:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mr Rogalla; Mr Barry; Mr Habsburg; Mr Barry</i>	69	• <i>Question No 50 by Mr MacSharry: New Ireland Forum:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mr MacSharry; Mr Barry; Mr Hume; Mr Barry; Mr Paisley; Mr Barry; Mr Marshall; Mr Barry; Mr Coste-Floret; Mr Barry; Mr Raftery; Mr Barry</i>	76
• <i>Question No 41 by Mrs Ewing: expansion of the Regional Fund budget:</i> <i>Mr Barry; Mrs Ewing; Mr Barry; Mr Hutton; Mr Barry; Mr MacSharry; Mr Barry; Mr Lomas; Mr Barry</i>	69	• <i>Questions to the Foreign Ministers:</i>	

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question No 60 by Mrs Dury: visit by Mr Botha to certain countries of the European Community:
Mr Barry (Foreign Minister); Mrs Dury; Mr Barry; Mr Seligman; Mr Barry; Mr Balfe; Mr Barry; Mr Alavanos; Mr Barry; Mrs Lizin; Mr Barry 78 • Question No 61 by Mr Paisley: effective system of extradition:
Mr Barry; Mr Paisley; Mr Barry; Mr Taylor; Mr Barry; Mr MacCartin; Mr Barry 80 • Question No 63 by Mrs Lizin: the Pégard company: refusal of an export licence:
Mr Barry; Mrs Lizin; Mr Barry; Mr Alavanos; Mr Barry; Mrs Lizin 81 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community — Negotiations on the accession — Commission statement and oral question with debate (Doc. 2-438/84) by Mr Arndt; Mr Klepsch; Lord Douro and Mrs Veil;
Mr Natali (Commission); Mr Arndt; Mr Barry (Council); Mr Sutra; Mr Arndt; Mr Prag; Mr Didò; Mr Habsburg; Lord Douro; Mr Galluzzi; Mrs Veil; Mr Barrett; Mr Piermont; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Happart; Mrs Pery; Mr Penders; Mr Provan; Mrs De March; Mr Musso; Mr Christensen; Mr Almirante; Mr Ulburghs; Mr von der Vring; Mr F. Pisoni; Mr Kilby; Mr Adamou; Mr Guermeur; Mr Brok; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Marck; Mr Toksvig; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Blumenfeld 82 Annex 107 |
|---|---|

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

1. *Approval of the Minutes*

President. — The Minutes of Proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(IT)* Madam President, I notice that the Minutes do not mention a reservation I expressly raised about the allocation of speaking time. Although I have not had time to look at the Minutes in detail, I would like to raise the point of this reservation which I made known to the President yesterday. The fact is that Rule 65 has been infringed with regard to the speaking time for the non-attached Members in the budget debate. Despite the fact that we are entitled to speaking time, time has been allocated only to the political groups. I would therefore draw your attention to the reservation I made yesterday and would ask you to ensure that speaking time is allocated in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. My reservation should therefore be recorded in yesterday's Minutes.

President. — Mr Pannella, on page 29 of the English text, Item 12 has the following reference to it: 'Mr Pannella spoke on the allocation of speaking time'.

Do you wish to have this enlarged or will you accept that as an accurate official record?

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(IT)* Yes Madam President, provided the phrase 'and expressed reservations with regard to the allocation of speaking time' is added. I have just given you the reasons for this request and would ask you to reallocate the speaking time in accordance with Rule 65.

President. — The Minutes will be amended accordingly.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Madam President, I refer to page 2 of the Minutes which refers to comments that I made. The President did not really answer the question that I asked. He said that the Bureau had examined the point that I had raised earlier. In view of the question that I put down yesterday — No 24 — and the Commission's answer to this, will the Bureau please re-examine the question of whether Parliament or the Committee on Budgets is responsible for authorizing transfers from one budget line to another?

President. — I will put your point to the President, who will, of course, take his decision accordingly.

(Parliament approved the Minutes)¹

¹ For items relating to the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly and the announcement of subjects for the topical and urgent debate, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

2. *Decision on urgent procedure*

**AMENDED COMMISSION PROPOSAL
(DOC. 2-368/84 — COM(84) 384 FINAL:
'SYSTEM OF OWN RESOURCES')**

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Madam President, the Committee on Budgets is anxious to reach a decision as soon as possible, on this proposal, but it would like to have enough time to do its work properly. In view of the short time since the proposal was received, we therefore ask the House to reject the request for urgent procedure, so that we can provide the House with a full report at the next part-session. Our committee has made all the necessary arrangements to examine this matter at its meeting next week, and Mr Pfennig has been appointed rapporteur.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)

**DRAFT REGULATIONS AND AMENDED
DRAFT REGULATIONS (DOC. 1-347/84 —
COM(84) 283 FINAL: 'SPARKLING WINES')**

Mr Tolman (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. — (NL) Madam President, the Committee on Agriculture does not feel that this matter has yet been adequately prepared. We are therefore against the request for urgent procedure.

President. — Mr Klepsch, are you speaking in favour or against the motion?

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — Also against.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)

Mr Huckfield (S). — Madam President, I am a new Member and I hope that you will excuse me for my ignorance, but, certainly when I was in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom and rulings were given on what business was classified as urgent or not, we were accustomed, and I presume that this House is also accustomed, to being given some kind of reason or some kind of understanding as to what businesses are classified as urgent or not.

Many of us, for example, are associated with the resolution under Rule 48 on the miners' dispute in the United Kingdom which has been going on for at least six months. Frankly, many of us, certainly from the United Kingdom — and I hope that that would include yourself — would find it very difficult indeed to understand why a resolution, which has the support of the whole of the Socialist Group, on a dispute

which has been going on in the United Kingdom for at least six months and which is dividing the whole country cannot be classified as an urgent resolution in this Parliament.

President. — Perhaps I should point out that at the moment we are neither of us in our respective Houses of Parliament in the United Kingdom but are in the European Parliament. There is a certain procedure here that has been adopted for many years and, of course, it is contained in the Rules of Procedure concerning requests for urgent procedure by the Council of Ministers or by the Commission.

We are actually dealing at the moment with a request for urgent debate by the Council of Ministers, and that information is contained on the front page of your agenda where it says, 'Vote on the requests for urgency concerning the following consultations' and refers under II and III to regulations concerning quality wines produced in specified regions. This is what we were voting on and this was a matter for the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food to give its advice on to the House, which was given in the normal course of events. Only one person spoke. You had the floor to speak either in favour or against. I asked the House if there was anybody in favour and nobody replied. Mr Klepsch, quite correctly, in accordance with the Rules, spoke against the motion. We have now had a vote, and that vote overwhelmingly showed that the House was against granting urgent procedure for this particular proposal.

I apologize if I have taken a little time, but I know it is difficult for new members to follow the procedures of this House. Any of the staff of the Parliament would be very willing to assist in explaining the normal procedures that occur on these occasions.

Mr Huckfield (S). — After that point of order, Madam President, may I stress that I mean you no disrespect and if I am being too ignorant for this Parliament then I do apologize; but I would have thought that this House ought to have been given at least some reason why the Bureau had classified some resolutions as urgent and other resolutions under Rule 48 as not urgent.

I have read all the papers and I fully understand what you say, but are we being given to understand that we have no reason at all as to the classification of business as urgent or not urgent?

President. — Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure of this Parliament applies to requests for the inclusion of subjects in the topical and urgent debate, which are normally tabled by Members. They will be voted on at 3 p.m., when we shall decide whether they are urgent or not. That is left to the Members of this House to

President

decide. Those that are considered urgent will be debated tomorrow morning.

The urgent matters I am now referring to are special requests from the Council of Ministers for certain matters to be considered as urgent by this House and debated and voted on accordingly. This particular one is a matter for the Committee on Agriculture. We have heard the advice of the chairman of that committee, which has discussed the urgency of this matter and advised this House that it does not consider the matter to be urgent but that it should be taken in the normal course of business. Accordingly, it has been decided by the House that the matter is not urgent.

The procedures of this House are complicated to a new Member, and I appreciate the difficulty. If there are any further points, we shall, of course, be willing to speak to you after and explain them further. However, I can assure you that the procedure has been properly followed and implemented in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of this House.

DRAFT DIRECTIVE AND THREE DRAFT COUNCIL DECISIONS (DOC. 1-361/84 — COM(84) 368 FINAL: 'MODERNIZATION OF FARMS')

Mr Tolman (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. — (NL) Madam President, for the sake of convenience I can perhaps add to that the items concerning agricultural structures, salmon-fishing in the North Atlantic and the agreement with the USA on fisheries. The Committee on Agriculture is in favour of urgent procedure.

(Parliament approved urgent procedure)

DRAFT REGULATION (DOC. 2-443/84 — COM(84) 375 FINAL: 'SALMON-FISHING IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC')

Mr Tolman (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. — (NL) Madam President, I pointed out just a moment ago that, for the sake of convenience, I was recommending urgent procedure for these items as well.

President. — I presumed that the vote of the House applied to all three requests,¹ and therefore all these matters will be dealt with in debate on Thursday's agenda after the votes.

¹ The other two are the Commission proposals Doc. 1-361/84 COM(84) 368 final and Doc. 2-445/84 COM(84) 390 final, the latter concerning fisheries off the US coasts.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Madam President, I would ask you to clarify a point which is of interest to the whole House. I refer to the Friday sitting. We have more or less decided on the agenda, and you have drawn up a new timetable for Thursday. However, it is not quite clear what is going to happen, since my agenda stops with item 216 on Thursday — possibly followed by a discussion on urgent procedure. This cannot be the case. May I assume that the Friday sitting has been dropped?

President. — Mr von der Vring, I am informed that there will be no plenary sitting of this House on Friday morning. There will be some committee meetings, but that is all.

3. Budget (contd)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the budgetary situation.¹

Before calling the next speaker, I wish to inform you that I have received three motions for resolutions concerning budgetary matters: the first by Mr Langes and Mr Klepsch on behalf of the EPP Group (Doc. 2-531/84), the second by Mr Langes on behalf of the EPP Group (Doc. 2-532/84), and the third by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance (Doc. 2-554/84). These motions will be put to the vote at 3 p.m. on Thursday.

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Madam President, last July we held a debate on all the problems connected with the budget. In fact, it was mainly about the refund to the United Kingdom, but of course developed into a general budgetary debate. Now, two months later, we have another budgetary debate and one may ask why, for is there anything at all new to discuss? In my view, there is exceedingly little new to say about the situation, for in fact nothing has happened since our last debate in July. The only event one can point to is the Commission taking the unusual step of threatening the Council of Ministers with legal action unless the Council acts soon to draw up a budget for 1985 and a supplementary budget for 1984. But it can hardly be said that this is of crucial importance for our debate since it will naturally be a long time before such a step has any effect. However, we are holding this debate again and I should like to comment on the call for Parliament's support made yesterday by the Irish Presidency. I would like to say — as I did in July — that we are prepared to support the Irish Presidency in the endeavour to draw up a supplementary budget for 1984 and a budget for 1985, although there are naturally very distinct conditions attached. I shall list these,

¹ See previous day's debates.

Fich

if I may:

Firstly, the Socialist Group supports the Scrivener report, which describes how the deficits should be covered for 1984 and 1985. The Socialist Group supports the amendments tabled by Mrs Scrivener, but it is naturally just as important to consider her report in connection with the supplementary budget, which we have not yet received. Let me say straight away to the Irish Presidency and the Council of Ministers as such what we expect from this supplementary budget for 1984: first of all, we expect it to contain sufficient resources to cover the gap in the present budget. We will thus not accept anything that is known from the outset to be incorrect budgeting.

Secondly, we do not accept that part of the 1984 deficit should be financed by savings in areas that have high priority in our view, i.e. we do not accept that a large part should be financed by savings on non-compulsory expenditure, for example on the Social Fund. When this House adopted a budget last December with, for example, a specific sum earmarked for the Social Fund, we did so because we attached high priority to the fight against unemployment. We therefore find it unacceptable for the Commission then to take administrative action to cut 10, 15 or 20% from a series of items without a political decision having been taken. We have been informed that the savings amount to around 1 000 m ECU; this is not just a technical effect, for the Commission is of course cutting back deliberately to finance part of the deficit in the agricultural sector, and this we will not accept.

On this point, I also heard yesterday to my amazement that it is planned to spend 200 m units of account from the sugar levy in the current year, even though expenditure in the sugar sector is not due until next year, as far as I understand. This too we regard as a poor way of budgeting. Revenue and expenditure relating to the same items should of course be entered for the same year. As regards the 1985 budget, which we of course cannot consider today as it is not available, I would like already at this stage to set out some of the Socialist Group's principles.

Firstly, we want the 1985 budget to remain a budget covering the whole year. In other words, we do not accept the presentation of a budget that, as everyone here knows, only covers 9, 10 or 11 months of 1985. We want a budget for the entire year. It is clear that if such a budget is not presented, we shall find this unacceptable. That is to say, we will not accept a budget presented in the knowledge that there will later be a supplementary budget because the money has run out.

A second question relating to the 1985 budget is the issue of the refund to be paid to the United Kingdom. Under the Fontainebleau agreement, the United Kingdom is to have its contributions reduced, i.e. the method used in recent years to compensate for the United Kingdom's alleged deficit in relation to the

Community budget is to be changed. The Fontainebleau decision is not acceptable to the Socialist Group. Although we do accept that there is a British problem, we believe that this is a problem of compensation, which should be resolved via the expenditure side of the budget; that it is to say, the United Kingdom should pay its full contribution, which must then be offset by budget expenditure. The entire amount will, as it were, be in the budget. In other words, we find the abrupt reduction in the budget's revenue side at Fontainebleau unacceptable. For when we actually look at the budget, we will note that its revenue side is in fact perfectly healthy. We can see that the contribution per inhabitant in the various countries in general reflects the wealth of these countries, although — and this can be discussed — there are naturally problems on the expenditure side of the Community budget which need to be corrected.

Finally, let me say about own resources — although we do not want an urgent debate on this issue today, it does naturally have a bearing on the 1984 and 1985 budgets — that the Socialist Group advocates an increase. It is clear, however, that conditions are attached to any such increase. It should not be used only to cover a budget deficit, which we have, as we know, both this year and next year, but also to finance new policies. Not the least of these is the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal. We shall come to this debate later on today, but in the opinion of our Group these two issues are related: the enlargement of the Community and an increase in own resources are closely linked and cannot suddenly be separated here.

Mr Christodoulou (PPE). — (GR) Madam President, the debate on the 1984 supplementary budget has already begun to read almost like a novel. Everybody everywhere is waiting for the *dénouement*, articles in the press constantly report a continuing dispute between the three main institutions of the Community and, in general, elements which are totally alien to the substance of the question keep creeping into this whole debate. In many cases there is rivalry between the Member States of the Community on the grounds of national prestige and, lastly, to judge by the way in which the question is dealt with by the mass media, the last thing all of us care about is Europe. Fortunately Mr O'Keeffe told us yesterday that the need for a supplementary budget for 1984 was recognized and that there was thus no longer any disagreement on the principle.

However, many of us do not agree with some of the things Mr O'Keeffe said. The main thing which I think we should keep in mind is that we must adopt Mrs Scrivener's motion in its final version, which pays special attention to covering expenditure. This means that it must be covered by advanced payments, as provided for in this motion, and not by the separate distribution of new contributions from the Member

Christodoulou

States. The reason is that if we get involved in a new debate on covering expenditure by a proportional increase in contributions from the Member States, we shall never finish and shall still be discussing this subject after the end of 1984. So the sooner the better, so that we avoid the negative effects on public opinion which are damaging to the concept of a united Europe and serve its opponents, who maintain that this institution will drown in a sea of haggling.

On the other hand, it is encouraging that the Commission supports the rapid solution. Furthermore, in accordance with the letter of amendment which we adopted in connection with the 1984 supplementary budget, the Commission is ready to proceed as regards both documents and procedures. As Mr Tugendhat stated yesterday, the responsibility lies with the national governments, and this responsibility is much broader because, while the immediate adoption of the decision in question is the main matter we should be dealing with at the moment, it is also necessary to take a decision not to touch the regional programmes, and if there are to be any cuts, they should not be made to the regional programmes, nor to the items covering the development of European advanced technology, nor to the items for the protection of small producers. And above all, the spirit which will preside over the final drafting of the supplementary budget will have to make us try to ensure that the economically disadvantaged countries of Europe, wherever they exist, attain at least the average level in the Community so that there is no need to discuss such things as a 'two-tier Europe', which by definition are contrary not only to the spirit of the Community but also to the letter of its Treaties.

Lord Douro (ED). — Madam President, with your permission, I should like to comment now on the statement by the President-in-Office of the Budget Council and later, after you have called Mrs Scrivener, speak on the specific resolution put to the House today by Mrs Scrivener.

I am most grateful to the President-in-Office of the Budget Council for the very detailed report he gave us of the proceedings of last week's Budget Council. I think we should be pleased that there is now agreement in principle on the need for a supplementary budget and indeed on the amount of a supplementary budget — 1 000 m ECU. I understand, however, that the Commission does not think that that is a large enough sum, but the Council in its wisdom has agreed 1 000 m ECU and that does seem to me to represent a major progress since the last Council meeting in July.

I think we should also be encouraged by the fact that there is provisional agreement on the 1985 draft budget, but as the President-in-Office of the Council said, one of the difficulties about 1985 is that agreement has not yet been reached in the Council on bringing forward the increase in the Community's own

resources. Eight governments, apparently, are now in favour of increasing these resources during 1985, which would have the effect of providing sufficient finance for a 1985 budget, but two Member States are not prepared to increase them before January 1986. I hope that those two Member States will reconsider their attitude. Both Member States are amongst the six original members of the Community, and surely they of all countries must realize how much easier it would be to solve this complicated series of budgetary problems we now face if they were prepared to advance the date at which the new 'own resources' would come into effect.

Since, as the President-in-Office of the Budget Council told us, the Council has not been able to establish the 1985 draft budget, I hope Members of this House realize that we shall have to be flexible on our procedural arrangements between now and the end of the year. The timetable is very seriously wrong already. By now we should have been considering the 1985 draft budget in committees, and that, of course, will not be possible this year. So I hope Members will realize that we may have to change certain of our procedures; we may even have to have an extra plenary part-session or something like that.

Finally, I would like to support the request by the President-in-Office of the Budget Council that Parliament commit itself to unblocking the British refund as soon as the draft 1984 supplementary budget is established. There are all sorts of problems at the moment. There are many difficulties which all have an effect on each other. But a step in that direction by Parliament would certainly help to resolve the current stalemate. There has been a considerable change in attitude by the British Government since July — that is apparent to members of the Council and Members of this House — and I think it would be a positive step forward if, during this week, Parliament were able to commit itself to releasing the UK refund for 1983 upon presentation of the 1984 supplementary budget.

As I said, Madam President, I should like to speak again later on the Scrivener report.

Mr Pitt (S). — Madam President, a point of order! Could you tell us whether the amendments which have been tabled to the resolution in the Scrivener report will be taken immediately after the presentation of the report or on Thursday? You have not yet commented on the amendments, but only said that Mrs Scrivener's report will be moved at something like 10.20 a.m. Now a long, very important amendment was tabled in the name of Mrs Castle, Mr Tomlinson and myself. The secretariat has chosen to put this in the form of five amendments, but it is actually a single amendment. I have not this morning seen these documents, but I want to be assured that we shall not be asked to vote on the resolution which we have all seen without having an opportunity to debate the alternative, simply

Pitt

because, with great respect to my colleague, Ove Fich, it is not true that the Socialist Group as a whole supports the Scrivener report. The British Members of the Socialist Group have the most immensely grave reservations and oppose the substance of it.

President. — That was not entirely a point of order, Mr Pitt. The procedure of this House is that amendments to a resolution are put to the vote at the same time as the resolution itself. In fact, amendments take precedence over the text itself. The vote on the amendments will therefore take place tomorrow at 3 p.m., the time scheduled for the vote on the Scrivener report.

Mr Pitt (S). — Will Mrs Castle be invited to move the amendments?

President. — No, we do not have that procedure in this House. Those who wish to speak on the amendments must do so in their speeches on the report. We do not have formal proposal of amendments as such. In your speeches during the course of this debate you will have the opportunity to refer to the points contained in the amendments.

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, I should like to make one or two brief remarks on what we heard yesterday from Mr O'Keeffe and Mr Tugendhat. I say brief because really the situation that we had in July is still with us, i.e. the Council has not taken any decision so that in theory there is little else to be said.

However, it is not our intention to embark on a detailed assessment.

My first remark concerns our immediate anxiety that the lack of a Council decision, the supplementary budget for 1984 and the budget for 1985 might seriously affect all the other institutions and, first and foremost, this Parliament.

We find it extremely worrying to have to face farmers, towards whom the Council and the various governments all have obligations, and face public opinion and the citizens of Europe and give them the impression of a Community which cannot manage to take decisions even on such obviously important things as the budget and its funding.

I should like to remind you that this expenditure, which has to be covered and set for next year has, for the most part, already been decided by the Council. It is therefore expenditure which the Council should honour.

Our concern, may I repeat, is that in this atmosphere of indecision, which amounts to a public demonstra-

tion of the inability to assume responsibility, the whole image of the Community is at risk.

We were surprised yesterday when Mr O'Keeffe announced, as if it were something of a success for the Council, that the governments had finally reached agreement with regard to the submission of a supplementary budget. In my view the state of affairs now is totally absurd! The supplementary budget is a duty — it contains expenditure which must be honoured and it is for this reason that a supplementary budget was submitted. Let me just voice once again our extreme concern that this lack of responsibility on the part of the Council can prejudice the image of the Community.

Another cause for concern also stems from this indecisiveness on the part of the Council or from piecemeal and half-decisions, from this sham battle that the Council and the governments are waging. It is a concern which also involves even more important aspects, if I may put it that way, in that I feel that the whole situation is prompting a trend which calls into question the institutional balance within the Community, in other words the power-sharing between the various institutions and also throws open rules and criteria which apart from having become accepted day-to-day practice as the established facts of Community life, are also rooted in the Treaty itself.

I refer to two specific facts. Firstly, the attempt by the Council of Ministers to reduce the Parliament's budgetary powers by introducing a dubious new phrase — 'budgetary discipline'. Mr Cot yesterday pointed out quite rightly that the term 'discipline' was unacceptable given that the rule governing the budget should be that of exactness, all the more in an economically and financially difficult situation such as that in which we now find ourselves. What does it mean to speak of discipline? It means, somewhat ambiguously, that the discussion on principles and powers which hitherto were firmly established is again thrown open.

I believe there is a need to state again now, as we did in July, but let it be said again — that we shall not tolerate any interference by the Council in our powers. We respect the Council's powers and we require the Council to respect ours.

The second cause for serious concern is on a more general point and relates to the Fontainebleau agreements, and in particular the decision on the introduction of different levels of VAT. This in fact calls into question the very nature of the Community's own resources and consequently the provisions of the Treaty itself. Here again we wish to call upon the Council of Ministers unequivocally to respect established Community rules and principles.

Madam President, we have made these points in the past but we feel it necessary to reassert, with possibly greater resoluteness, our firm resolve not to allow the Council to encroach on our rights.

Barbarella

The third brief point concerns the content of the budgets to be submitted and the fact that the Council must know as of now — and I think it already does know — that this Parliament is not prepared to accept just 'any' budget, neither in the case of the supplementary budget for 1984 nor in that of the budget for 1985.

As far as the 1984 budget is concerned we consider it a scandal that haggling is still in progress on the figure and amount to be covered. The expenditure stems from exactly defined legal obligations on the basis of regulations and I am therefore at a loss to see how 'cuts' can be made here and there. I really feel that an approach of this type, even for the budget, in other words for a standard financial procedure, is incomprehensible.

How can 'cuts' be made and where can 'cuts' be made? The proposals to which Mr O'Keeffe and Mr Tugendhat yesterday referred are also absurd. Is the intention to cut expenditure on structural policy? This has already begun but we will oppose it firmly, as we have already said, both with regard to the 1984 budget and that for 1985. We cannot deprive the Community of its function and role by abandoning structural policies.

The effect of this would be to enshrine a trend which is taking shape at least as far as a number of governments are concerned. We want the Community to continue to retain its most essential elements, namely its scope for development and to consolidate its approach with regard to structural policies.

As regards the common agricultural policy, we all know that it is the cause of differences of opinion. It is good that the problem is being tackled with a genuine reform of the common agricultural policy. One aspect of this reform has already been launched but we criticized the instrument in the case of milk production not because we felt it unnecessary to make serious comments but because we believed that the instrument in question would not have proved successful, and today we are faced with a budget in which expenditure on milk is extremely high.

Madam President let me sum up by saying that it has been our intention to point out that basic questions such as the honouring of the obligations which the Community has towards third parties and the respect which the Community owes itself by keeping structural policy at an adequate level should not be tampered with.

One very last point — the question of the British refund. I feel there is nothing to add on this point. Parliament adopted a clear position in July. We feel that we should agree on this position and draw the Council's attention to it.

In conclusion I should like once again to condemn the lack of responsibility which the governments are

showing today and remind them of their duties and powers. I hope that on Monday and Tuesday the Council of Ministers will finally be in a position to submit to us the supplementary budget for 1984 and the budget for 1985.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

Mr Louwes (L). — (NL) Madam President, listening to this debate here today, two things are immediately obvious. For one thing, we are dealing here with a highly complex matter — that we have long been aware of. At last week's meeting of the Committee on Budgets, Mr Tugendhat referred to it as a 'complicated exercise'. After the events of the end of last week, it seems to me that that was something of an understatement.

The other striking point is the broad consensus which exists in this House on how we should approach these problems, something which is not only matched, but bettered, by the general agreement on the need to stand firm in the face of any attack on Parliament's powers. This broad measure of agreement is something the Council would be well advised to take note of.

Moving on from the general to the specific, I should like, on behalf of my group, to try to bring a little order into this complicated business — only then can we tackle the problems one by one. Let us start with the supplementary budget for 1984, on which my group is in full agreement with the views put forward for the Committee on Budgets by Mrs Scrivener.

We shall support the idea of dealing with the two financial deficits in a single regulation. We take the Commission's point that there is a difference between the supplementary budget for 1984 and the anticipated shortfall in 1985. There is indeed a difference in that we already have the 1984 shortfall, whereas next year's may not yet be upon us but will be sooner or later. We believe none the less that, for reasons which include expediency and continuity, it would be a good idea to deal with the two deficits together. Of course, we support the rapporteur and the committee on the point of not entering any specific amounts into these regulations. That is an impossibility, seeing as neither years nor amounts are laid down in the regulation. The amounts in question are fixed as part of the normal budgetary procedure, and there is no need whatsoever to do things any differently.

On the question of the legal basis, we are again in agreement with the committee. We go along with the committee and the rapporteur in thinking that the procedures provided for in the Treaty articles we have quoted are adequate for the purposes of financing these deficits, and that the procedure in question leaves Parliament's powers intact.

Louwes

So much for Parliament's position; as far as the Council's position is concerned, all that I can say is that the Council is being irresponsible. No decision has so far been forthcoming, and the Council has, for political reasons, arbitrarily reduced the amounts estimated by an expert committee. Instead, in an attack of parish-pump bookkeeping mentality, it added 200 million units of account last week to a sector of the CAP which is no burden whatsoever on the budget because it has long been self-financing. How the Council can go round doing things like that is beyond my comprehension: petty parochialism, nothing more. Nor can I follow the bit tacked on the end linking the whole thing with the Fontainebleau issue. The supplementary budget for 1984 is indeed concerned with making savings, and it is only right to save money wherever we can. But what we are also talking about is fulfilling our obligations, and we wish to dissociate ourselves from the way the Council went about this last week.

I would not deny — as Lord Douro said just now — that some progress has been made in that agreement has now been reached over the amounts in question. Since we all know perfectly well that these amounts will be inadequate, it seems to me somewhat hypocritical, and without wishing to cast a moment's doubt on Lord Douro's competence, I think he has deliberately and knowingly been too optimistic.

Moving on to the 1985 budget, I think the same comments apply as to the 1984 budget, although I shall refrain from making those comments yet, as we still have no draft budget. We have another month before the situation becomes serious. Let us hope that the Council will repent and present us with a draft budget before 5 October, although what I have gathered of the Council's deliberations does not exactly fill me with pleasure. Here again we have the somewhat hypocritical attitude of desperately abiding by the 1% ceiling. We are told that, if this is clearly not going to be enough, we shall be sure to get the own resources ceiling raised to 1.4% in October. But we all know — and the Council knows too — that, even if the regulation were to be adopted right here and now, the ratification procedure would take a year. In other words, it is an absolute racing certainty that the own resources ceiling will not be raised before 1 October 1985. I believe in saying what I think, and that is that the Council's attitude testifies to the exact opposite of a sense of reality.

Allow me to mention in conclusion the three connected aspects of the Fontainebleau agreement: deblocking of the British contribution, the financial issue — the increase in own resources to 1.4% — and the accession of Spain and Portugal.

My group's standpoint is sufficiently well-known for me not to have to reiterate it here. There is no need for this House to go over the first point again, i.e. the question of deblocking the British contribution. The attitude we adopted in July was definitely not illogical

and certainly not unreasonable, and I see no point in bringing it up again. Our position remains unchanged from July, and that goes not only for the question of the British contribution and the ancillary matters but also to the other two subjects.

My group will continue to work towards ensuring that the stance adopted by this House *vis-à-vis* these budgetary difficulties remains consistent in the interests of strengthening the Community, maintaining Parliament's powers and ensuring the continued viability of the Community.

Madam President, I should like to pass the remaining few minutes' speaking time available to me to my colleague Mr Di Bartolomei.

Mr Pasty (RDE). — (*FR*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, ever since the beginning of this year and indeed ever since the initial budget for 1984 was adopted we have constantly stressed the seriousness and urgency of the budgetary situation in the Community and we have made one proposal after another as to how it may be put right.

Now we see, to our deep dismay, that the most recent Budget Council has once more ended in deadlock, owing to an inability to reach a compromise and produce a draft supplementary budget for 1984 in spite of what is at stake, i.e. that it will not be possible for the Community to function between now and the end of this year, unless the necessary supplementary funds are released.

So far, none of the major financial problems facing the Community have really been solved, be it the problem of the 1984 deficit, the steps necessary if we are to cover the requirements for 1985, or the implementation of the procedure for increasing own resources which, as we know now, will in any case be inadequate right from the outset.

Ever since the European Council in Athens, we have gone from one failure to another, from false solutions to stalemate, with the result that the Community has ended up in a virtually permanent state of budgetary crisis.

We are in a state of budgetary crisis now, and it is more than likely that we will remain in this situation for some years to come. This crisis has existed, I would say, ever since the adoption of the 1984 budget, in which the EAGGF requirements were deliberately underestimated. We in our group were the first to draw attention to the dangers of an inadequate budget at that time.

There can be no doubt that if a more adequate budget had been adopted for 1984 we would have been spared certain difficulties. Now, not only are we short of nearly 2 000 million ECU to cover agricultural

Pasty

expenditure between now and the end of the year — and the Commission has already announced that it will have to stop payments at the end of October if these funds are not forthcoming — but, what is more serious, the Council of Ministers is absolutely unable to come to any agreement on the measures to be adopted to meet the commitments which the Council itself entered into *vis-à-vis* the farmers on 30 March last.

Today, the crisis is more serious than one might think. Let us make no bones about it — the Council's deadlock implies a questioning of our common policy and the Community's achievements. This is not merely a simple technical problem concerning agreement on the amount to be financed by calling on the Member States for additional funds and the methods to be used.

A compromise had in fact been put forward. It would have involved supplementary funds amounting to 1 000 million ECU which would have meant that the amount proposed by the Commission in its preliminary draft amending and supplementary budget could have been reduced by half. One could reasonably assume that the Council's shillyshallying in July was nothing more than delaying tactics in the hope that the Commission would lower the figure requested so that, once this had been achieved, the Council could come up with a draft budget at the last minute.

As we all know, nothing came of all this, and the attitude adopted by certain Member States meant that no Community solution whatsoever could be found, even though one had been so close. In fact, the crisis is more serious because it goes deeper and is more insidious, and because it is a political crisis.

Today we are faced with a particularly serious situation. Not only are we in a position of stalemate in the absence of a draft supplementary budget for 1984, but also, and in particular, the Council's approach clearly demonstrates that it is retreating from the common policies themselves, i.e. the common agricultural policy and the other policies advocated by this Parliament.

The Council is moving away from Community-level solutions to all the budgetary problems facing the Community and is getting bogged down in the false solution proposed at Fontainebleau, as we have unremittingly been pointing out ever since this Council was held.

Surely it is clear for all to see that this constitutes a danger to the *'acquis communautaire'* and the common agricultural policy, which is still one of the cornerstones of the Community and, as we all know, one of the most highly developed of our common policies.

The Council's deliberations clearly demonstrate the wish of certain Member States to renationalize certain agricultural expenditure and this is particularly dis-

turbing since as we already know — and as the Commissioner responsible confirmed yesterday — the 1985 draft budget will be 2 000 million ECU short as far as the EAGGF is concerned.

These governments are sacrificing any agreement on the draft supplementary budget to a binding commitment on the part of the Council to budgetary discipline — the Chairman of the Committee on Budgets said yesterday that he was not very fond of this term and we are not either — in other words, the assurance that the increase in agricultural expenditure will be less than the increase in Community own resources, and what this really means, let us make no mistake about it, is that a ceiling could be imposed on agricultural expenditure, regardless of developments in the agricultural sector. This is something we cannot accept.

The Community today is like a company in which 10 shareholders were all in favour of distributing the dividends, while one had managed, by a totally arbitrary method of calculation, to be largely relieved of its share of the burden for any losses while at the same time — strange as it may seem — presuming to dictate to the other nine what course of action they should take. This attitude could be summed up in the phrase 'I do not want to pay, but I want to call the tune'.

We cannot go along with attitudes such as this, which, as we see it, constitute a serious obstacle to the running and future development of the Community. There can be no progress in the Community without, first and foremost, a respect for what has been achieved already and the fundamental principles on which this Community has been built up.

This is why we call on the Council to draw up, at its next meeting, a draft supplementary budget for 1984 in conformity with the proposal by the Commission and Parliament and its previous commitments. It is also why we support the proposals put forward by Mrs Scrivener and the Committee on Budgets which, as we see it, constitute the best possible guarantee for Community interests.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Bonde (ARC). — *(DA)* Madam President, the stage is set for a bumper ceremony at which the rebate for the United Kingdom, the supplementary budget and the draft budget for next year will all be settled at the same time. But no matter who wins the tug-of-war with Mrs Thatcher, one loser can be singled out with certainty: the Danish farmer. For the United Kingdom will not accept a budget solution unless it receives a sizeable budget rebate, to be paid by the other Member States — apart from the poor West Germans, who are to get a rebate on the rebate payment, presumably to compensate for Greece and Sicily overrunning large parts of the West German market and outcompeting large sections of West German industry.

Bonde

It is the United Kingdom that is calling the tune, for Mrs Thatcher can afford to wait. There is no hurry at all as far as she is concerned when it comes to increasing Community funds. The longer she waits, the closer she is to achieving her goal: a drastic pruning of the common agricultural policy. We are the ones who are stuck, because we have made our farmers hostage to the Community, and Denmark is either too small or too polite to play its cards to good effect. Why, for example, don't we block any expenditure as long as there is any doubt that farmers will receive what the common agricultural policy says they should get? Why do we accept spending on new policies that divert resources from agriculture and prompt the Commission to administer agricultural policy in a way which conflicts with previously adopted decisions? The record harvest, which ought to be a boon to the hard-pressed farming community, has become an economic slap in the face. It coincides with a world and Community harvest record that will provide us with 15-20% more grain this year than last year. This can only mean a drastic fall in world market prices and hence such a drain on Community resources that the coffers will be emptied in good time for Mrs Thatcher. The Danish grain industry is already dealing at prices well below the officially fixed minimums. Selling unlimited quantities of agricultural produce at fixed minimum prices is a thing of the past. The Commission has set about adjusting prices to world market prices by means of administrative measures, though this is in fact also the Community's declared objective. The sooner this goal is achieved, the sooner will Denmark's advantage in belonging to the Community disappear, for this consists of the difference between the Community price of grain and the world market level.

In the dairy sector, the quotas are so effective that we will have to import West German butter to meet world demand for the Lur brand. With respect to pigmeat, agricultural policy has for many years been administered in such a way that we have got right down to 70% of the officially set price. One would have to be exceptionally optimistic to see a return to the times when the Community paid officially set minimum prices for unlimited quantities of agricultural produce. This new bumper budget ceremony will inevitably amount to a fresh attack on the fundamentals of agricultural policy.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — (FR) It goes without saying that the Group of the European Right supports the proposals set out in Mrs Scrivener's well-thought-out and reasonable report, and will vote in favour of it.

The common agricultural policy first got off the ground some 22 years ago. On 14 February last this Assembly adopted, subject to ratification by the Member States, a draft treaty on European Union, which constituted a new step in the unification of the Community. Now we are in a state of crisis. However, this has not come as a surprise to many of us, since we

have seen it coming ever since last year. One only had to work out how much the Community had already spent to know that we would not have enough money to meet the requirements of the common agricultural policy, that the problem of the British contribution had not been settled and that temporary proposals were not enough to solve a fundamental problem. On top of all this, the preparations for enlargement also had financial implications. We are called on to take stock of all these things today.

Obviously, ladies and gentlemen, it is easier to build up a common policy and a Community and to unite the people during a period of economic growth. It is infinitely more difficult to do so in a period of unemployment and inflation such as we are currently going through. However, we all have a common wish to save Europe.

I was one of those — and perhaps, I think, the first French representative — to say that, in my view, the British contribution was unfair. It is particularly my British colleagues, therefore, that I would like to speak to today and say that sacrificing the common agricultural policy is no way to go about maintaining or enlarging the Community. The Community is based on the Treaty of Rome which accords priority to the common agricultural policy. It was this policy which provided the six founder members of the Community with a rallying point, since it is the only agricultural policy in existence. We have been told that, provided the Member States ratify the documents, the resources of the Community will be increased on 1 January 1986, i.e. the VAT resources will be increased from 1% to 1.4%. However, I would say even today that this increase is already outdated in that it will not be enough. What is needed is the courage to face up to the real problems and not dissipate our efforts.

What are these problems? Firstly, the contributions of the various Member States to the financing of the Community must be redefined. We cannot use temporary measures to evade this issue. A better balance must be struck between the efforts of all the Member States without exception. Furthermore it is vital that this vast and important piece of legislative work which we are doing should be put into practice, and we do not have the means at our disposal. In a word, we must have a way of enforcing our directives which are too often disregarded. And what do we hear now, in the middle of this debate and this crisis? The Commission simply comes up with proposals to reduce the Mediterranean areas under vines by some 25% in six years.

Imagine how people will react to proposals of this kind. It is simply not serious to make such proposals without even consulting the Committee on Agriculture.

It is against this backdrop that we are conducting today's debate and that I say to my British colleagues

d'Ormesson

that I was one of those who affirmed the need to acknowledge the fact that your contribution was excessive but that we would not manage to solve this problem without taking up an overall approach, i.e. we must totally rethink Community financing and we would say to our British colleagues, with whom we French have such strong emotional and intellectual links, that we intend to save the common agricultural policy and uphold it undiminished and that it is not by ruining the French farmers that the Community is to be enlarged. These are the important facts and I should like to conclude by saying that the Roman empire is no more, not so much as a result of internal strife as of its reliance on foreign imports at the expense of its agriculture. We will not build up a united Europe, the heir to the European Christian tradition, by sacrificing its agriculture. This is the problem facing us.

Mr Pannella (NI). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on each of these occasions when the views of the various contingents in this Parliament have apparently or in fact tended to converge — either out of conservatism or in self-defence — we have, I think, nevertheless drawn attention to the increasingly pressing need to deal with these problems in depth before the crisis in Europe becomes total.

One thing is certain, and that is that the institutional question to which the budgetary wrangling has given rise is of a fundamental nature. We in Parliament have said what we think on the subject, i.e. that immediate reforms are vital at the legal and institutional level, since otherwise our institutions themselves will inevitably engender another crisis instead of providing solutions to the existing one. It is a structural as well as a political problem.

Even if these reforms were to be introduced tomorrow — which will unfortunately not be the case — the policy involved would probably not be sufficiently ambitious. We cannot merely point to the crisis in the common agricultural policy and, in particular, the fate of the farmers in the Community. What is in fact happening is that we are giving up any possibility we might have had of conducting large-scale European policies in the world and in Europe itself and, in view of this, we could even spare ourselves our existing expenses, since if money is spent badly, it would be better not spent at all.

We must deal with the problem of inheritance, and political, economic and financial investment in Europe, not only in terms of the Member States as such, but also of the citizens themselves. There are a lot of millionaires in Sicily — officially this is not the case, even though there are many in the United Kingdom and Germany — but all the citizens have to fork out the same amounts, regardless of the region they come from or other considerations. What we should take as our basis, however, is how much the citizens of

Europe can really afford to contribute to the Community, and not, as we usually do, think only in terms of the Member States as such, and their budgets. Unless we make this qualitative leap we will get further and further into a situation where both national egotism and an inability of the various Member States to realize when they are going too far will be at odds with the wishes and demands of the European voters and citizens.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is only right and proper, as the rapporteur of the Committee on Budgets suggests, that we should seriously and resolutely get down to defining our rights. And let us also stress, as far as the economic situation is concerned, that the Council's attitude is just not good enough. But, let us make no mistake about it, this is not going to get us out of this situation, which is becoming progressively unacceptable, and it is for these reasons that, in itself, I have nothing against the kind of unanimity we can witness here today. However, this is not the sort of unanimity which will solve our problems. It is rather a conservative sort of unanimity which, as it were, sets the seal of approval on our failure.

Mr Pitt (S). — On a point of order, Madam President, before Mrs Scrivener moves this report, may I draw attention to an inaccuracy on the first page? My colleague, Mr Tomlinson, and I attended the meeting of the Committee on Budgets and participated in all of its voting. Indeed, a document on the legality of the position and status of the Committee on Budgets has been distributed to the committee as a result of our intervention.

Could I ask that we be recorded properly as having been present and having participated, especially since we fundamentally disagree with the motion for a resolution contained here and have tabled a major amendment opposing it?

President. — Mr Pitt, that is not a matter for this House but rather for the Committee on Budgets. This is a committee document. When you have your next meeting of the Committee on Budgets, I would ask you to raise the matter there and have the document amended.

Of course, this House has taken note of what you have said. Mr Cot, the chairman of the committee, is here — I wonder whether he would like to make a comment.

Mr Pitt (S). — I will take note of your point if you will take note of the fact, Madam President, that the document is headed 'European Parliament working documents'.

President. — I have taken note of that point, Mr Pitt.

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Madam President, I should just like to apologize to our colleagues, since the lists of persons present at last week's meeting of the Committee on Budgets do contain a number of inaccuracies which must be put right. Once more, I hope that Mr Pitt and Mr Tomlinson will excuse me.

President. — I hope Mr Pitt is satisfied with that and that this document will therefore be amended.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (FR) Madam President, I should like to point out, with all due respect, that for the sake of those Members who are new to this Parliament — and particularly the British — the President should stick to the rules, in that it is quite correct that this proposal should not be referred back to the Committee on Budgets for amendment, but put to the vote right away in this House. Obviously, before the vote is taken the Assembly must be informed of the corrections to be made but, as I see it, Mr Pitt was quite right in what he said, and your correction of him struck me as somewhat anti-Labour.

President. — Mr von der Vring, I am not anti-anybody. I am here to serve the purposes of this House and all the Members in it. This document will be amended, as I have said. Mr Cot has apologized to the Members concerned. Parliament has taken note of what has been said.

Mrs Scrivener (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Madam President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, we are debating the coverage of financial requirements for the 1984 and 1985 budgetary years according to the urgency procedure requested by the Council. However, do you not agree, Mr President of the Council, that it is somewhat paradoxical that you should now be calling on the Parliament to act swiftly while, at the same time, the Council is taking no decisions and is, moreover, insisting on the basis of what has come to be known as budgetary discipline, on hindering Parliament in the exercise of its powers, contrary to the provisions of the Treaty?

Having made this point, I should like to go into the question before us this morning.

Even when the budget for 1984 was originally adopted, Parliament had stressed that additional resources would be required. As long ago as April, the Commission drew the attention of the Council and this Parliament to the inadequacy of the budgetary appropriations. It is quite clear, even if the precise extent of the deficit has yet to be determined — and this will be done when the budgetary authority comes to discuss the supplementary budget required for 1984 — that the appropriations available are by no means sufficient to meet the commitments which the Com-

munity has entered into, particularly in the agricultural sector. Similarly, it is unrealistic to think that it will be possible to cover expenditure for 1985 without increasing own resources, as is also reflected, moreover, in the Commission's preliminary draft budget, in which it is estimated that the expenditure required would necessitate a VAT rate of 1.12%. The Council also confirmed yesterday that it already expected that a supplementary budget for 1985 would prove necessary.

With a view to dealing with this situation, the Commission has tabled two proposals for regulations.

The proposal for 1984 is partly based on the report drawn up in May by the Committee on Budgets. The Commission has rejected the original idea of loans with interest and has accepted the idea of interest-free advances on future own resources. This reflects a significant change of attitude.

The aim of the proposal for 1985 is different, according to the Commission. It is designed to enable a budget to be adopted for 1985 in which the 1% VAT ceiling is exceeded while coverage of expenditure is guaranteed, even if the new system of own resources were not to enter into force on 1 October 1985 as the Commission hopes — perhaps too optimistically.

The Committee on Budgets has examined these two proposals in depth from both legal and political angles. It has put forward a number of amendments concerning three aspects of the Commission proposals, on which this House is called on to vote. The three aspects are as follows: the introduction of a single regulation for the entire period before the increase in own resources comes into force, the deletion of any reference as to the amounts which might be involved when own resources are increased and the modification of the legal basis for these regulations.

Firstly, the Committee on Budgets advocates fusing the two regulations proposed by the Commission into a single regulation, even though at first sight they would appear designed to meet different needs, i.e. an inevitable deficit in 1984 and a probable deficit in 1985. We are not, however, convinced by this argument, which is, incidentally, the Commission's own.

It will not be possible to implement the 1985 budget, any more than the 1984 budget, within the limits imposed by the 1% VAT ceiling unless, of course, we want to call a halt to the development of common policies and move towards a renationalization of agricultural policy. Thus, the problem facing us is how the Community is going to be financed from now until the new system of own resources is introduced, and this problem calls for an overall solution.

There is no way in which the Community can operate efficiently unless it can rely on the funds necessary to cover the expenditure agreed on by the budgetary

Scrivener

authority. Furthermore, Community policies depend for their continuity on guaranteed financing, which is not possible if it is organized on a year-to-year basis. Finally, if a single regulation is adopted, this would in no way rule out the possibility of real new own resources taking the place of the advances in 1985 since it is intended that the single regulation would cease to apply as soon as the new system of own resources came into operation.

The Committee on Budgets also thinks that another aspect of the Commission proposals should be amended, i.e. the ceilings for the advances indicated in the two proposals for regulations. The Commission has, of course, assured us that these ceilings were only intended as rough guidelines, but I do not think this assurance is good enough, based as it is on a very free interpretation of the text. What this really amounts to is a provision which could be a real danger to the budgetary powers of this Parliament, since it would involve transferring an important part of the budgetary powers to the legislative authority, i.e. the Council, and the budget would be fixed by means of regulations and not by means of the budgetary procedure as we know it. This would be particularly true in the case of the 1985 budget, since it would no longer simply be a matter of finding extra financing for agricultural expenditure, as in the case of 1984, but rather of financing the whole budget. If the Council were to follow the Commission's recommendations, it would be perfectly at liberty to set a ceiling for the budget in line with its own interpretation of Article 203 of the Treaty — and we know how delicate calculations of this kind are. Thus, the ceilings indicated in the proposed regulations should be deleted, and the amount of supplementary financing required decided under the budgetary procedure in accordance, I repeat, with the provisions of the Treaties. I would like to draw Parliament's attention to the Council's plan, which is to make use of the structural funds for an amount even greater than originally proposed by the Commission — which had already been the subject of strong reservations on the part of this Parliament.

Finally, the legal basis. The Commission's reference to Article 235 of the Treaty strikes us as inappropriate and dangerous and, as regards revenue, somewhat dubious. However, the main thing is that it would leave the task of deciding on Community resources to the Council — whose decisions would not be binding and would have to be taken unanimously. This is a dangerous approach, since the Council would be under no obligation to act. As matters stand, the Member States are under an obligation to provide the Community with the resources it needs. Article 5 of the Treaty is very clear on this point:

It states that: "Member States shall take all appropriate measures, whether general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of their obligations arising out of this Treaty or resulting from action taken by the institutions of the Community."

This constitutes a binding obligation on all the Member States to act. Furthermore, this obligation is reinforced by Article 199, which stipulates that there must be a balance between revenue and expenditure, and by Article 203 (10). It is for this reason that the Committee on Budgets, having heard the Commission's opinion, nevertheless feels that the legal basis for the regulations should be changed, i.e. that instead of Article 235, they should be based on Article 5, 199 and 203 of the EEC Treaty and the corresponding Article in the Euratom Treaty. This, ladies and gentlemen, is not so much a formal or procedural question, but an important political question. These then were the principal modifications to the Commission proposals recommended by the Committee on Budgets.

Finally, I should like to say a few words for the Council's benefit. The own-resources ceiling has been increased, on the terms you are familiar with. This has taken far too long and will not enter into force for another year at least. However, we already need supplementary financing. If the Community is to continue its work — indeed, if we want the Community simply to continue to exist, it must be provided with the necessary funds. It is the duty of the Council to get Europe out of the mire. In the final reckoning, it is the Council's job to decide.

(Applause from the right)

President. — Before calling Mr Pitt I would just like to inform him that I have had a corrigendum prepared which will be circulated immediately in order to record the attendance at the Committee on Budgets correctly during this part-session.

Mr Pitt (S). — Madam President, I am most grateful for your correction of the document before us to make it accurate.

I speak as a new Member of this Parliament but ask for no special favours on those grounds. I speak as someone who participated in a direct election, the nature of which was rather different from the elections in some of the other countries of the Community. I make this point as a preamble to reflecting on the budget because in some ways it is a reflection of why we are here. It helps us to go to the kernel, I think, of what we ought to be discussing today as opposed to what we are discussing today. In Britain, of course, we have constituency representation. We are not voted to this Parliament on party lists. We go back on Friday not to comfortable flats in Paris or Rome or wherever it might be — and as someone who has spent a very good holiday this summer in Florence and Siena, I should very much like to do that — but to shop in the supermarkets on Saturday and on Sunday to talk in the clubs, pubs, cafés and restaurants to the people who actually participated in the direct election to send us here. We are not here because someone decided

Pitt

that we were numbers 1 to 32 on a list of 81 Labour Members presented to a national British electorate. I think this is a quite fundamental point and may help some of our comrades in the Chamber understand the rather different view of many things that British Members take from the views that they might take. We have a view of a Parliament which would cause us to believe that you have to step back somewhat before voting on statements and documentation that are put before you, and first ask yourself why you are here. We believe that we are here to represent the people who elected us, to raise their concerns, to raise their fears and to talk about the issues which affect them in today's difficult world.

We believe, moreover, that it is the function of a Parliament to speak on behalf of those people, and to scrutinize an executive legislature. We do not believe, as some people in this Chamber do, that the function of a parliament if a Council gets itself into difficulty and finds that it cannot agree on something, is to solve the Council's problems for it — any more, I might add, than they believe that it is their problem to solve this Parliament's difficulties if this Parliament gets itself into difficulties — as, incidentally, it may well have done in July by the absurd vote to block Britain's rebate. We have the view that the function of a Parliament is to raise the voices of the people, to talk about the issues that affect them, and, where the budget is concerned, I believe that those issues are as follows — and none of them has been raised in this debate.

The budget is not a question of legality, of mechanisms, of articles, treaties and regulations. The budget is a matter of people's taxes, people's direct payments and how that money is spent — whether it is spent on the things that concern the taxpayer or whether it is spent on other things. That is what a Parliament's function is, in the view of the British Labour delegation to this Parliament. We find that the people we represent are put off the notion of a unified Europe by the trivia that are raised by so many Members from so many countries, including our own from time to time. The harmonization of beer, the harmonization of sausages, driving on the left-hand side of the road are not the issues that people are affected by in their supermarket, at their work or in their homes.

Let us start to talk about the things that do affect them, because then we should see the shape of a budget that we ought to have! We represent a Community of 100 million industrial workers and 10 million agricultural workers. Yet how is our budget disbursed? 70% of that budget goes to subsidize a minority of the 10 million farmers — and I stress that it is a minority. I have a great deal of sympathy with those farming in difficult circumstances; but 70% of our budget goes to waste, to major surpluses, to absurd profits often for multinational corporations and not for farmers. It is spent on wasteful mountains and lakes of food and drink. It is spent to promote the selling off of those surpluses at absurdly low prices to

countries outside Western Europe, and those surpluses are frequently destroyed instead of being used to help a starving world outside the industrial and the socialist bloc in the world in which we live. These are the things that really affect people.

Secondly, we have in the European Community countries at this moment something like 14 million people unemployed. Yet how much of their taxes, their money, is spent on our structural funds — the European Social Fund and the European Regional Fund? The answer is something like 15%. So 70% of our expenditure is consumed by a tiny minority of the 10 million people and only 15% goes to the problems of the 100 million people working in industry and the 14 million people who want to work in industry and cannot get jobs. Those are the things that people talk about and those are the people we represent and those are the issues that we in the British Labour Group want to raise in this Parliament and those are the issues which we believe are relevant to the budget — not the issue of which legal article should be used as an instrument to ease the problems that the Council has got itself into.

I now turn to a point made in a very reflective and helpful speech by my comrade, Mr Fich, at the beginning of the debate this morning. Mr Fich said: 'Why are we debating the budget, because nothing has happened since July?'. With great respect, that is simply not true. Four things have happened which I believe are of immense significance and which I believe we must take into account. The first thing is that after Fontainebleau, which by news management and not by accountability or public debate was presented as a great triumph, we have had two meetings of the Council which have failed to agree what the leaders of the nation States thought and said they had agreed at Fontainebleau. Now I do not call that 'nothing happening'. I think that is of immense significance.

Secondly, I thought there was a very interesting sentence at the end of the speech made on behalf of the presidency yesterday by Mr O'Keefe. Mr O'Keefe said, and I try to quote his words exactly: 'It would be very helpful to the Irish Presidency if this Parliament agreed to unblock Britain's rebate'. He did not go on with any qualifications. I think that is a very important second thing that has happened. This Parliament has been asked to change its mind on its vote in July.

Thirdly, we had Commissioner Tugendhat telling us yesterday — and it was a very serious point indeed — that the Commission has taken the unprecedented step of taking the Council to Court to make it face its responsibilities on the budget. I do not call that either 'nothing happening'.

Fourthly, we have learned that if there is no agreement in the Council by 20 October on further resources, then the responsibility for agricultural disbursements will fall on the national intervention agencies. Now I

Pitt

do not call that 'nothing happening'. I think these are fundamental points that are arising in the budgetary procedures, and they have to be addressed.

If those payments have to be made by national agencies, then we in the UK may be OK. However, I ask you to reflect, Mr President, that if that does happen, it will be a very capricious and unfair system. If a crop comes to fruition and is harvested in the months of November and December, say — and this will, after all, depend on geography and weather and when the crop was sown — then the country in question will find itself, from 1 November onwards, paying its farmers from its own national allocation and national taxes and not with Commission resources.

I think all of these things have been terribly important.

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

Mr Mizzau (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, may I begin with a remark in reply to the statement just made by Mr Pitt.

It is possible for 100 million industrial workers to survive because there are 10 million farmers. The 10 million farmers, on the other hand, would probably survive without the 100 million industrial workers.

As I say, it only a remark, but those of us who are steeped in Latin culture are well aware of the fable of Menenius Agrippa who said, 'a man's arms, legs, mind and his whole body are essential to him, and when he speaks he should do so in harmony with his entire being'. In matters concerning economics or society it is necessary to take complete social harmony into account.

Having said this, I remember that yesterday at 4.35 p.m., at a meeting of the Committee on Budgets, Mr Tugendhat stated that: 'if we do not receive more resources we shall not be in a position to honour the commitments made by the Community — and by commitments I mean those agreed upon unanimously for the agricultural sector'.

The British Prime Minister, Mrs Thatcher, in the document presented to the Heads of Government at Fontainebleau, made a statement concerning the common agricultural policy which should be remembered and which I personally welcome. I will read it in the French version as forwarded to us by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom; 'la politique agricole commune a réussi dans son objectif de fournir à l'Europe une solide base agricole; de remarquables accroissements de la productivité ont été réalisés'.

Any reduction in funding, especially for non-compulsory expenditure, would thus run counter to the spirit of the common agricultural policy which, even according to Mrs Thatcher, has been successful.

I repeat, if the non-compulsory headings were to be reduced, there would inevitably be a freeze in agricultural spending, and for us this is quite unacceptable.

There are two other issues to be considered: first, adherence to correct policy with regard to commitments which have been made, when spending on budgets items is being approved by Parliament; secondly, the tax burden, which has become intolerable all over Europe, and hence the need to reverse this trend by actually lowering taxation.

Thus, spending on budgets items should not be reduced either directly or indirectly by means of transfers and carryovers, etc. Nor should this expenditure be shifted to national governments — and this is a very important point, since this would be a mortal blow to the whole Community ideal. Besides, these expectations are justified when the budget items provide for the expenditure.

My second point. I am not being inconsistent with what I have already said about the excess of tax burden when I state the following. The 1984 deficit and the revenue for 1985 must be covered by imposts.

The 1.4% rate of VAT, and the 1.6% from 1986 onwards, will result in a transfer of financial resources from national governments to the Community and not in an increase in taxation. These transfers constitute the true philosophy of the Community policy. What is more, in saying this I am only repeating what was established at Fontainebleau, where it was said that the next Council would take suitable measures to cover the requirements of the 1984 budget, in order to guarantee the normal functioning of the Community. We therefore call upon the Council to translate this commitment into positive action. -

In the name of my native region, Friuli, which was struck by an earthquake in 1976, I must thank the representatives of the European peoples gathered here in Parliament. Many villages were destroyed and many people died, but the people of Europe stood by us. I will speak in my own dialect and then translate.

'Il Friùl a gnò miez al dîs, a vuatrîs colegas, rapresentans de int d'Europe, un grazie, de cûr e no'l dismentearâ tan gjenerôs jutori'.

Friuli, through me, expresses its heartfelt thanks to you, my colleagues, who represent the people of Europe, and it will not forget all your generous help.

And I would like, Mr President, a delegation from this Parliament to come to Friuli, which is now more beautiful than it ever was before the earthquake, in order

Mizzau

to see how hard my native region has worked and what it has achieved with the aid from Europe and from the Italian government.

(Applause)

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, I would like to start by congratulating Mr Pitt on his maiden speech. It was a strong, powerful speech, and I am sure we shall hear many more from him over the next five years of similar quality.

What we are principally considering in this part of the debate is the motion for a resolution tabled in Mrs Scrivener's name from the Committee on Budgets and the amendments to the draft regulation. I think it is unfortunate that the Committee on Budgets at this moment has decided, in effect, to amend the draft regulation to give the Community a blank cheque whenever it overspends its budget. There are of course special circumstances at the moment. We all know the budgetary problems. However, the Commission has proposed two regulations, one for covering 1984 and one for covering 1985.

In the opinion of my group, the two sets of problems for 1984 and 1985 are completely different. For 1984, there is a clear inevitable overspend. It is now accepted by all the governments of the Member States that there is an overspend of approximately 1 000 m ECU — the Commission thinks it is greater — but there is an inevitable overspend. Clearly, that does have to be financed. For 1985, the position is completely different. If two Member States would agree to bring forward the increase in our own resources, there is not actually a problem about 1985. But the problem is not so immediate with 1985 either.

What the Committee on Budgets has decided to do is to join those two draft regulations together and, worse still, to delete the dates so that the text recommended by the Committee on Budgets simply says that whenever there is a spending greater than the income in a year, the Member States should be required to advance the overspend. When the Community is about to ask national parliaments to ratify an agreement to increase 'own resources' from a 1% limit on VAT to a 1.4% limit on VAT, surely it is the height of irresponsibility for this arm of the budgetary authority, just before that major decision is taken by national parliaments, to propose a mechanism within the Community whereby when there is an overspend the Member States simply have to fork up the difference.

We are, I remind Members of the House, part of the budgetary authority. Any budgetary authority in any system of government, be it national, international or local, has a responsibility to control the spending of taxpayers' money. But this, in effect, removes the control on the spending of taxpayers' money through the European budget.

So, I must say, my group will be unable to support the proposals made by the Committee on Budgets through Mrs Scrivener.

I also want to introduce another element, not directly connected with this report, but nevertheless relevant to this discussion. In deciding whether its own resources should be increased, the Community has decided to institute a new set of procedures to control expenditure in the future, broadly described as budgetary discipline. That was agreed upon at Fontainebleau, and a high-level committee is, even this week, putting the finishing touches to a document to be considered this weekend by the Finance Ministers. Surely, in light of that additional circumstance, it would be immensely foolish of this Parliament to persevere in its opinion that wherever there is an overspend, it simply has to be financed by the Member States.

Therefore, Mr President, we much regret the decision of the Committee on Budgets and the report presented by Mrs Scrivener. We shall have to vote against it, and I urge Members of this House to realize that they may, indeed, by supporting the wording of the Committee on Budgets, be putting in jeopardy the whole process and procedure by which the Community's own resources are about to be increased. We, in this group, certainly support the need for an increase in these resources; I think everyone in this House does, but this is a particularly foolish path to travel just as that important decision is about to be presented to national parliaments for their ratification.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, we are currently faced with a new episode in this apparently interminable budgetary procedure. Certainly, all the various protagonists have taken up the positions, but one may wonder what sort of interest the public has in these debates. As you know, the public has other things on its mind, what with the increasing unemployment, the general worsening of the crisis and the austerity policies.

The warning sounded by the election of 17 June, which betrayed an increasing disaffection from European affairs and the European Institutions on the part of the people of the Community, appears to have gone unheeded. Instead of taking a firm grip of the problems and trying to solve them, the Council is getting bogged down in endless budgetary wrangling which would leave any accountant totally bewildered.

However, the situation would appear to be quite simple. The budgetary resources available are inadequate to cover requirements, particularly in the agricultural sector for 1984 and in all probability for 1985 too. This is an incontrovertible fact, even if opinions may differ as to the underlying causes.

With a view to making up the deficit, the Commission has proposed a system of advances from the Member

Chambeiron

States, after rejecting the idea of repayable loans with interest, as requested by Parliament. I am sure the Commission could have been a bit bolder and more imaginative and provided for new revenue by means of greater respect for Community preference or by transferring, completely by way of exception, certain under-utilized appropriations, i.e. what the Court of Auditors refers to as 'sleeping funds'. However, we must not get bogged down in detail since time is pressing. If no decision is reached, there is a danger that a few weeks from now the Community will have to halt payments and will no longer be able to honour the financial commitments deriving from its policy decisions. This would have serious implications for agricultural incomes and would speed up the breakdown of the common agricultural policy. In spite of the urgency of the situation the Council failed to reach any conclusions on 7 September. The shine has already worn off the great success of Fontainebleau and there can be no doubt that it is the British Government which bears the greatest responsibility for the setback by trying to hold the Community and the farmers to ransom in order to serve its own interests. By rejecting, last July, the proposal to release the compensation to the United Kingdom which figures in the 1984 budget, Parliament registered its disapproval of Britain's attitude and stood out against these attempts at blackmail. Whilst realizing that additional funds will be required for 1985, what we nevertheless regard as the most important thing at present is to cover the requirements for 1984 with the least possible delay so that the Community farmers will not be penalized.

Is there not a danger, therefore, that the procedure proposed by the Committee on Budgets might make it even more difficult to get out of the present budgetary mess? However, I repeat, the Commission has entered into certain commitments in the agricultural sector and it should meet these commitments and eliminate any possible obstacle standing in the way of a swift solution to the various problems.

Mr Rigo (S). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the July resolution and today's debate on aspects of the budget reintroduce in their entirety to the new Community legislature the problems affecting the process of European integration.

Regularly during every discussion on the budget various points of view emerge and the differences between the roles of the institutions become manifest. Evidence of these differences was to be seen yesterday evening in the speeches of Mr O'Keeffe and the Chairman of the Budgets Committee, Mr Cot.

Mr Cot, on behalf of the Budget Committee, by fully supporting the Scrivener report on budgetary requirements for 1984-1985, has attempted to safeguard the function and role of Parliament *vis-à-vis* the Council. The Committee on Budgets is convinced that the financial crisis and the pressing need to find solutions

must not involve the risk of seeing Parliament's privileges undermined and this risk is not by any means an imaginary one for, as we have seen, the Commission has been obliged to initiate proceedings against the Council at the Court of Justice.

On a more general note the points I shall make are, I think, valid in the context of the budget debate because they have to do with the Community's financial problems, ranging from the budgetary allocations for 1984-1985 to the decision on new Community resources, in other words problems on which we shall have to form an opinion in the weeks to come.

This Parliament, it must be clearly stated, also in the light of what Mr O'Keeffe had to say yesterday evening, cannot allow the dismantling of the Community's financial independence, the redistributive character of the Community budget, and the European ideas underlying the proposals submitted by the Committee on Budgets to cover the deficit in 1985.

This is where the political element of the reply lies which, in my view, Parliament must quickly address to the Council in the next few weeks concerning all the financial and budgetary questions to which we shall have to devote our attention.

Two further points on the main amendments arising from the Scrivener report concerning the single regulation to provide funds to offset all possible future budgetary deficits in the event of a shortfall in the Community's own funds and the non-inclusion in the budget of the 1984 and 1985 deficit items. The first amendment relates to the problem of the 1984 deficit and provides for the legislative measures to cover the budget to be a partial measure, in other words limited to 1984 and not included in the general context of possible future Community deficits.

The Committee on Budgets obviously cannot accept this sort of solution and consequently it has decided to support the Scrivener motion for a resolution which provides for a single adjustment to be applied until the Council adopts the decisions on own resources.

We are convinced by the spirit of Europeanism that the Member States are consequently duty-bound to cover the requirements of the budget which they wanted as in almost all circumstances the decisions derive from formal acts of the Council unanimously adopted or emanate from duly approved regulations. The legal basis for this document are the articles of the Treaty relating to the prescriptions on the general budget of the Community.

Put in a different way, what we are seeking is that the solution to the problem of the budget deficit is found not on the basis of intergovernment agreements (we are and will remain resolutely against any such solution) but rather in accordance with the current provi-

Rigo

sions of the Treaty and in accordance with Community procedures.

The deletion of the amount of the deficit for the two financial years 1984 and 1985 should also be seen in this light.

Allow me to be more explicit — it is inadvisable, and a weak move to refer to the deficit measure in the Scrivener report, which expresses Parliament's opinion on two proposals for regulations, i.e. those for the 1984 and 1985 deficits, at the very moment when Parliament is unable to exert any real influence on the final decisions on the two measures.

If, however, Parliament's participation in the definition of the deficit is expressed in the context of an examination of the budget, i.e. at the point when the budget is decided jointly by Parliament and the Council, in other words by the budgetary authorities as provided for by the Treaty, there can be no doubt that the statement would have more weight and be more effective.

This is the approach advocated by the Committee on Budgets.

Summing up I wish to say that this report, although consistent with the spirit of the Community, is strictly limited in one aspect and that is the correct use of budgetary resources. It is here that differences and disagreement with the British delegation emerge. It is here that all together we must rethink the role of Parliament in order to avoid welfare-type hand-outs and to channel funds towards those industries capable of becoming more competitive *vis-à-vis* other economically strong countries and consequently capable of boosting employment. This is the other aspect to be clarified in the months to come if we are to ensure that conditions are right for real Community growth.

(Applause)

Mr Di Bartolomei (L). — (IT) Mr President, since a number of other authoritative Members have already put to the House the official opinion of my group, and in view of my full support for Mrs Scrivener's proposals, I feel I can make a few remarks of a more general nature on the dialectics of power within the Community as they affect the problems of the budget.

It is regrettable that in a certain way this discussion is an academic one. We do not have before us an official document from the Council or the Commission, in other words a proposal which would allow us to balance the budget for 1984. As regards 1985, we know that a document has been submitted which no longer reflects the current state of expenditure and may also not reflect possible revenue given that new revenue has to be found. We know as well that, if an agreement is not reached by the end of October on the covering the

required 1 300 million ECU, the deficit will be passed on to the national budgets, and the process of renationalizing the common agricultural market will have begun.

And yet, in this situation, we the Parliament do not have the powers which every Parliament has to avert the dangers which are pushing the Community into an irreversible crisis, and we are jeopardizing any current attempt to relaunch it, including those on an institutional level. These powers that we do not have are held by the Council of Ministers, which is the voice of the national and sovereign Member States. However, it does not heed our call, is not answerable to us as it is under no constitutional obligation to be so. The representatives of the Member States can agree or not, rescue or sink the Community, and in doing so they need pay no attention to this Parliament.

However, I do not believe that in this situation we should today relaunch the discussion of the merits of these matters because we have already done so and not only once. Parliament has stated that the 1984 budget deficit will be made up while at the same time some of the United Kingdom payments can be reimbursed although the political steps authorizing the repayments still have to be taken. Parliament has also said that for 1985 the new budget must take account of this year's experience with shortfalls in funds. It has also recognized the need to review some procedures and eliminate waste by ensuring greater supervision. Parliament has said all this and it is now up to the Council of Ministers, which has the power and the duty to find the solutions and establish the agreements which will allow firm proposals to be submitted to Parliament for discussion and an opinion.

Democracy is, after all, the formal dialectics of power in that everyone forms part of an overall equilibrium with rights to exercise and duties to perform. I feel, however, that in this House a strange climate has arisen, a feeling that those seeking to re-establish the missing equilibrium should not be disturbed. Voices can be heard saying yes, but we are also part of the whole thing. Let us remain alert and not force the situation too much but wait for the decisions.

However, first and foremost, we do not represent the same interests, institutionally, historically or politically as those represented by the Council of Ministers. That body represents the national States and it is often deadlocked by national selfishness, by the concerted application of economic pressures on the part of large interest groups trying to protect or increase the advantages which they have secured over the years. We on the other hand represent all the people of Europe and their permanent interests which are inseparable from the spirit of agreement and economic and political integration.

We are not here today to resubmit proposals for compromise between the contenders but rather to call for

Di Bartolomei

an explanation for the delays and the lack of clarity in their action.

It is said that the governments are now realizing — and it was said in committee yesterday that there are early indications — that the limits are about to be reached and that an irreversible crisis lies beyond.

Meanwhile, however, these governments continue to wrangle and postpone decisions. Common sense indicates that a budget out of balance should be readjusted, and readjusted by the quickest means possible, which is to issue a directive binding on Member States. This would be the quickest procedure and it would also be a procedure which makes the most of the role of the Community and the Parliament. This does not mean that the question of reforming the CAP should be ignored. The CAP will be reformed. But in the meantime the correct functioning of the Community bodies must be ensured. Our next immediate task will be to take a firm line on wastage and distortion which unfortunately too many governments and national political lobbies ignore. However, we must not forget that we must take effective action on excess production, not by protecting the already protected but by protecting the unprotected. We must also take strict measures to eliminate wastage while establishing those who need protection and when.

I feel we ought to be very understanding with regard to the difficulties facing national governments and be equally understanding about the problems of the Commission. But we must also remember that the Member States and national governments have great responsibilities which they have assumed by treaty and which they must fulfil and it is our duty to remind them of these obligations. We must also remember that the Commission is the Community's executive body. It sees its own proposals blocked and cannot administer the necessary funds because it does not have them. The Commission must find more persuasive arguments to convince the Council. Apart from those already launched or announced, the Commission could even give notice of resignation so that the Member States will finally agree to adopt decisions.

Mr Pfennig (PPE). — (DE) Ladies and gentlemen, I do not know whether I should be pleased or otherwise to see that we have in fact ended up in the situation which the European Parliament has been predicting for a long time now, i.e. that the Community funds are inadequate to cover payments to which the Community is legally committed. We not only predicted this situation but also proposed two possible solutions, both within the terms of the Treaties. The first solution would have been to produce a supplementary budget, after which the Commission, on the basis of Article 5 of the EEC Treaty, would call upon the Member States to provide the amounts necessary to finance it.

The second possibility would have been to produce a supplementary budget and finance it by means of advances on own resources from the Member States, on the basis of a regulation under Article 203 (10).

We in this Parliament opted for the second solution since it would have made it possible not to revert to the system of contributions.

What has happened in the meantime, however? The Commission wants a *third* solution. It wants to produce a supplementary budget in which the amount to be covered on the revenue side is precisely specified — to seven places of decimals — even though, as we all know, forecasts of this kind made by the Commission are always off beam, let alone correct to seven places of decimals. It wants to introduce a regulation for 1984 and another regulation for 1985 specifying a precise amount to be obtained from the Member States in the form of advances. It wants to introduce these regulations on the basis of Article 235, which states that where the Treaty has not provided the necessary powers, the Council may, acting unanimously, take appropriate measures. As we see it, this proposed solution constitutes a threat to the system of own resources, since it is impossible for the Member States to tell whether or not the Commission is hoping in this way to exceed, on a permanent basis, the VAT ceiling laid down — I must unfortunately remind you — by the Treaties.

However, this proposed solution poses another problem in that it requires unanimity, which would appear to be impossible to achieve in the Council at the present time, since one Member State does not think we need a supplementary budget and that we need not worry about the deficit until 1985. On the strength of this, the European Parliament has called a halt to all expenditure which is not immediately essential — particularly the refunds to the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic for 1983. That is how things stand at the moment.

Obviously, we are wondering what will happen next. I can tell you on behalf of my group that we intend once more to propose, by means of a motion for a resolution, releasing these payments — particularly the refunds to the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic — if the Council of Ministers makes the necessary funds available by means of a supplementary budget.

However, I should like to accompany this repeated offer with two warnings, the first of which is addressed to the Commission. The Commission must realize once and for all that both the Council and Parliament are responsible for legislation in this Community, in spite of the minor role which Parliament has played in the past. The Commission, on the other hand, has no legislative powers whatsoever, and unless the Commission tailors its regulations according to the wishes of this Parliament, they will not get past this

Pfennig

House and the Commission would then be faced with the problem of finding the funds required. I can tell you right away that if the Commission fails to fall in with Parliament's wishes it will know about it, since the discharge debate is yet to be held. This will give us an opportunity to show our dissatisfaction with the way the Commission has conducted its affairs and you can imagine for yourselves how that will turn out. I should also like to sound a warning for the benefit of the Council. Unless the supplementary budget has been drawn up and submitted to Parliament by October, and if the risk of the Community being unable to meet its legal obligations, particularly in the agricultural sector, should become imminent, this Parliament will have to give some thought to the question of whether or not other methods can be found of restoring the Community's ability to meet its commitments, since it is not as though there was not enough money in the Community coffers. The problem is that it is not available for the expenditure to which we are committed by law.

This is all I wanted to say and I hope that everyone has understood my warnings.

Mr Møller (ED). — (DA) Mr President, the thing that concerns me most today is not really the lengthy discussion of budget technicalities, which the members of the Committee on Budgets master to perfection; I believe that most of us ordinary Members do not understand a great deal of all this talk about what is or is not legal. What worries me is the crisis we find ourselves in, both the purely economic aspect, in that we do not have the resources we need, and the fact that this crisis reflects the lack of what should be the basis of our Community, namely mutual confidence, confidence between the Member States, confidence that an agreement will be respected by the other party when one party has fulfilled its part. It is this lack of confidence that is rocking our Community and it is this too that is causing many people to lose faith in the Community.

On one side, there stands the United Kingdom with its demand for a refund. The others are willing to comply, but not before the United Kingdom agrees to approve the extra revenue required. This the United Kingdom is prepared to do, if it gets its refund. Which side will give way first? Any horse trader knows the problem. Should one pay before getting the merchandise? Or should one have the merchandise before paying? Our Community's prospects are not good at the moment, as a consequence of the unfortunate decision taken by Parliament on that Friday morning in July when it voted to block the British refund. Accordingly, the United Kingdom now says 'if you block the refund, we will block an increase in own resources'. The result is the present financial situation, where we do not know whether we can carry on with the Community at all, or whether it will all end in a free trade area, which of course nobody would want to do with-

out. But what will happen to agricultural policy? What will happen to regional policy? And what will happen to the funds set up in the confidence that a budget will be adopted and resources made available?

Mr President, I wanted to make these comments because I believe it is much, much more important for us to restore confidence between our Member States than to find out whether we need some paragraph or other, or some rule or other. I do not intend to discuss any of these technicalities, which are best handled by the experts. Those on the Committee on Budgets can solve these problems. The problem that we have to resolve is the further development of the Community, and the Community cannot be developed unless we restore confidence between the Member States, which is the basis of any community. Without mutual confidence it is impossible to build such a community, because there would then be no faith in its ability to last. This issue centres around people, politicians, ministers. We must tell our British friends — I myself belong to one of the groups that include British members — the following: we will pay the refund if you increase own resources; there is no need for you to have any doubts. I myself, as I said on that Friday, before that unfortunate vote, do not doubt that own resources will be increased the day that Parliament adopts the refund.

Before the Commissioner keels over, I would like to make this observation, and I thank the Commissioner for his willingness to hear me out: I believe Mr Pfennig is correct to say that this matter is not the Commission's concern. It is a question of confidence between Council and Parliament. The Council must be able to rely on Parliament adopting this budget; indeed it is its duty to do so in order to follow up the Fontainebleau compromise. We were all pleased with the Fontainebleau compromise, but now we should fulfill our obligation, as I see it, to pay the refund, so that we can move forward and obtain the increase in own resources. As a member of my group, I know that the British Government will fulfill its obligation once Parliament has adopted the refund, which is necessary if we are to be able to break this deadlock and restore confidence.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, with regard to the problem of the lack of funds for 1984 and 1985, it seems that there is a particularly violent and bitter dispute between three Community institutions, namely the Council, the Commission and Parliament. Beneath the surface, however, we believe that beyond the obvious problem of the budget there are very important changes going on in the balance and interrelations between the countries — and of course between the socioeconomic forces — in the European Community, changes which are particularly unfavourable for a country like Greece.

So from the Greek point of view we have the following comments to make.

Alavanos

Firstly, this is the first time that the form of blackmail being applied is not the postponement of payments but the non-payment of appropriations amounting to 11 000 million drachmas, while the Community has given Greek farmers a clear undertaking that it will pay these appropriations.

Secondly, this is the first time there is such a likelihood of the Greek Government's granting aid from the national budget according to Community rather than national criteria.

Thirdly, Greece, which has an enormous public debt and whose trade balance with the other nine countries of the EEC is getting worse and worse, is being called upon to increase in relative and absolute terms its contribution to the Community budget, while Mrs Thatcher's contribution is being reduced by about 60%.

Fourthly, while Greece is being asked to increase its contribution, the Commission turns down every Greek application for funding under both the Mediterranean programmes and the five-year programme. I refer you to the interview with Mr Tugendhat in the Greek periodical *Oikonomikos Tachidromos* of 6 September 1984, in which he states that according to the Court of Auditors Greece already takes too much and that from 1986 there will be new priorities in the Community budget.

Fifthly, the Greek Government bears a great deal of responsibility for this course of events, since it permitted the unanimous decision at Fontainebleau on the refund to the United Kingdom without even ensuring the basic funding of the Mediterranean programmes or the five-year programme; because at Fontainebleau it put its signature to the overthrow — unfavourable to Greece — of the *acquis communautaire* in budgetary matters and yet is looking on uncomplainingly while the Commission and the European Court of Justice, by dozens of recent interventions, impose the very same *acquis communautaire* in matters such as the internal market, competition, etc.

Lastly, the members of the Greek Communist Party demand the immediate payment of Greek farmers, but not with new contributions from the Member States but by a reconsideration of, mainly, the refunds to the United Kingdom, which would provide the necessary funds or the greater part of them. The solution does not lie in implementing the Fontainebleau decisions but in reconsidering them. This is true at least for Greece, and if it cannot change the policy, if it continues to accept the compromises of the large countries, unless it adopts a militant policy in defence of its national economy and workers, and if it continues to play the game from the sidelines, it will keep on losing, and even the present terms of our membership of the European Economic Community will get worse.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President! There is a smell of bankruptcy in the Community air; the

creditors are already thinking of ways of safeguarding the cake, and the question remaining is how to distribute the crumbs.

The crux of the matter is a gap in the constitution, a structural error which means that binding decisions on expenditure can be taken by the Council without legal guarantees of income. What we have here is a built-in crisis: the Council is entering into binding commitments for which the funds cannot be guaranteed. The word 'compulsory' loses its meaning as soon as the one per cent barrier is reached and the powers of national parliaments become involved.

We call this irresponsible. If someone in private life takes on commitments in the full knowledge that he cannot afford to pay, this is called fraud. The Socialist Group voted against the 1984 budget because it was fraudulent: the figures may have looked as if they were within the one per cent limit, but we knew that they did not cover the expenditure.

We now find the Council trying the same manoeuvre for 1985: its wants to present another draft budget within the one per cent limit and it explains not to us, the Parliament, but to its own members that, if the money runs out in the agricultural sector in 1985, there will be a supplementary budget presented in October 1985 — and it will use this as a basis for yet another regulation on advances.

The consequence of this is that it ceases to be a serious proposal because it is making a fundamental distinction between agricultural and structural policies. Let us put it quite plainly: the issue here is the struggle against unemployment. Savings are being made in terms of structural policies, but the saving in the 1985 EAGGF budget estimate will be fictitious. What we are really being asked to ratify is a 10-month budget with the 11th and 12th months relegated to a supplementary budget.

The problem is that the savings which are now being fought over and are to be adopted in December will in practice affect only the regional, social and developmental policies, and we cannot agree to that.

The Council's reason for taking this line is that there is no legal basis for exceeding the one percent VAT limit on expenditure. At the same time it is refusing to deal simultaneously with the 1985 regulation. This is why we are insisting in the Scrivener report that the authority to ask for this payment in the form of advances from the member governments be conferred as part of a general regulation for 1984 and 1985, so as to secure the groundwork for a respectable, honest 1985 budget and to remove the need for this type of manoeuvre.

It follows logically from this that the regulation should not specify any upper limit for advance payments by the member governments, as stated in the motion

von der Vring

tabled by Mrs Scrivener. This amount should be stipulated in the 1984 supplementary budget and the 1985 budget, and Parliament is involved in determining what it should be. No sum should therefore be specified in the regulation, and the Commission would have been well advised to take account of this basic attitude of Parliament when it drafted its proposal.

If we are to prevent a strangulation of regional, social and developmental policy by the 1985 budget we must insist on being presented with a respectable 1985 budget, but first we need a regulation which raises the one per cent limit for their purpose. We cannot therefore refuse to authorize such a regulation for 1984, nor can we avoid linking the 1984 problems with those of 1985.

The 1984 supplementary budget itself is quite another matter: we ought to be given a draft of this. We do not intend to let it go through on the nod; on the contrary, we intend to use our full budgetary powers even to the extent of rejecting the 1984 supplementary budget outright if it does not fit in with our plans. As to the consequences, I would go along with my colleague, Mr Pitt.

A draft budget for 1985 which fails to include the whole range of the Community's foreseeable spending commitments for 1985, as correctly listed by the Commission, on the other hand, is not a real budget as far as the agricultural sector is concerned, but is one more step towards releasing agricultural policy from budgetary control. The Council of Ministers of Agriculture passes laws and regulations incorporating obligatory expenditure, and the Commission writes the cheques. This is the common agricultural policy which has led us into this quagmire. It would actually be better if we had an honest provisional twelfths system and dispensed with a budget for 1985. This House would be acting quite logically if it rejected the sort of budget the Council is planning, i.e. the one per cent limit swindle: then at least we would be seen to be operating a proper budget next year with the provisional twelfths of what we had in 1984.

That is one option we should like to keep open, but let us first take a look at the drafts: this both concludes my argument and brings us back to my original point. The source of our problems is a contradictory financial framework which allows the Council of Ministers unlimited scope for taking on commitments for which it cannot guarantee the funds because Parliament's powers are involved, and because the powers of national parliaments over the Community's resources restrict the Council's omnipotence in this area.

If we want to avoid the continuing recurrence of this problem, there are two ways of making the necessary changes to the financial framework. One logical means of avoiding future crises would be to give the Council of Ministers the right to withdraw as much money as it wishes from national exchequers. The log-

ical opposite step would be to deny the Council the right to pass laws and regulations with expenditure commitments unless such spending is guaranteed by the budgetary authority. This is the structural logic we must strive for if we want to avoid jeopardizing the Community with a lot of basically silly structural flaws and conflicts and being incapable of formulating policy. Our new colleagues will be having understandable difficulty in comprehending the arcane goings-on of this Parliament and may well ask why everything has to be so significant and complicated. This is why we must get on with changing the financial framework. Since the Council is still unwilling to grasp the initiative, we shall have to use our only effective weapon: I think we shall discuss and consider carefully whether or not we should use our power to reject the budget or the supplementary budgets for 1984 and 1985.

Mr Langes (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, numerous Members have spoken yesterday and today on the subject which will dominate our thinking in the weeks and months to come. Our debates have been based on the statements by the President-in-Office of the Council and by the Member of the Commission responsible for the budget. The President-in-Office considered the Council's deliberations unsatisfactory, and I think this debate has already made it clear that your verdict, Mr President-in-Office, coincides precisely with ours.

We are not satisfied with the Council's proposals and consider them a positive danger to the Community, because the Community is fast losing its power to take any action at all. What Mr von der Vring has just said in his conclusion was correct: we shall consider very carefully whether the Council is in a position to present the draft budget for 1985 by 5 October within the terms of the Treaties. I do not say this lightly, and in this respect I differ slightly from Mr Cot, who said yesterday: We are considering the possibility of supporting the Commission's position if the Council is unwilling or unable to present the budget on time.

I no longer believe in the Commission, nor do I believe the strongly-worded statement I read in the papers about Mr Tugendhat's threat of possible proceedings before the European Court of Justice. Parliament should pay no heed to such notions. We should tell the Council representative here in plain terms that we are aware of the Council's difficulties but cannot, as a Parliament, allow the Council to shirk its duty. Parliament will have to decide on its own whether or not to bring proceedings before the European Court of Justice if the Council fails to carry out its obligations. Quite apart from any action the Commission may be considering, the powers of the Parliament as one half of the budgetary authority are implicated here. This is not intended as a threat, Mr President-in-Office, but as a statement which we ask you simply to convey to your nine colleagues, the Finance Ministers, to let them know that Parliament is not prepared to countenance such a dereliction of duty.

Langes

Secondly, we know that the Council is attempting to find a solution to the 1984 supplementary budget. Such a solution is necessary because the Council, with its obligations to third parties, decided to authorize more expenditure in 1984 in the agricultural sector, for example, than can be guaranteed by income. The Council hardly discovered this fact yesterday; we have been talking about it for six months. The Council must therefore do its duty and present a supplementary budget. Your proposal, Mr President-in-Office, which has apparently already been discussed or decided upon in the Council by the Nine, or perhaps even by the Ten, requires the Member States to pay money directly to the European Community. This is a feasible approach, certainly, but not one which is in keeping with Community funding or based on the Community's own resources system. You must recognize that you are straying from the path of political virtue — in so far as there is ever virtue in politics, but be that as it may — if you attempt to organize the Community's finances in this manner. When Parliament discusses this matter with the Commission it will press its view that Articles 5, 199 and 200(3) offer a means of financing the Community without the need for subsidies from the Member States. You can rest assured that this point is important to Parliament.

My third point is as follows: we in this House have voted by a large majority to block the so-called rebate to the United Kingdom until the supplementary budget has been decided upon by the Council. I should like to make it clear to my British colleagues that we did not do this with the intention of punishing the United Kingdom and that a large majority of us are prepared to discuss this issue — indeed, we shall be debating it again in more detail later today in the Committee on Budgets. Let me once more emphasize what Parliament has always maintained: when the Council has decided on the supplementary budget, Parliament will agree to release Britain's rebate. You, Mr President-in-Office, have put this to us in the form of a request. You may be sure that we Christian Democrats will meet your request subject to the terms I have just stated.

Mr Price (ED). — Mr President, I think that this debate shows that there is general recognition in the House both of the need for action by the Council of Ministers to deal with the present situation and the urgency of it.

I think we are introducing, perhaps, an unnecessary difficulty in reaching a solution by talking in terms of too long a period when trying to find the solution for a temporary problem. It is much easier to solve this problem if we look at it as a short-term problem. If you look at what has gone wrong, it is manifestly a short-term problem. What has gone wrong is that there has been delay on the part of the Council of Ministers in deciding on the increase in the Community's own resources. They have now taken that

decision in principle, but the delay in taking the decisions relating to the agricultural policy has affected the expenditure side. Again, on 31 March they took some of the most important of those decisions and although, just as with the 'own resources' increase, there has yet to be full implementation, the decisions of principle have been taken. It is for that reason that this problem is in essence a short-term one. The more its short-term character is recognized, the easier it will be to find agreement in solving it.

I welcome the fact that the United Kingdom Government has moved its position between July and September and has recognized the need for a supplementary budget and for extra financing this year. Therefore, all 10 Member Governments recognize that need. What is perhaps unfortunate now is that two Member Governments — the German and Dutch Governments — seem to feel that this matter can be left until the new 'own resources' come into effect in 1986. I must say, Mr President, that I think it would be much easier to solve the problem if it were limited to a single year, and if, before the end of 1985, we could have the benefit of these new resources which everyone has agreed are necessary. A solution needs only to be found now for a single year.

The legal basis for the proposed action has become a question of considerable controversy. The attitude of Parliament is that, first of all, there is an obligation to act. We are dealing with a temporary situation, and the Member States must act to deal with it rather than allow the Community to run out of funds to meet its obligations. It is not just an option open to them; there is a compelling obligation. I believe that Article 5 of the Treaty provides a legal and not just a moral obligation to act. It states that Member States shall take all appropriate measures, whether general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of the obligations resulting from action taken by the institutions of the Community. Quite clearly, the actions of the institutions have given rise to financial obligations. Those obligations must be met.

What I think has been overlooked around this Parliament, in the Council of Ministers and in the Commission is that the Treaty actually goes further as to the means. This is to be found in Article 209(b) which states that the Council shall

determine the methods and procedure whereby the budget revenue provided under the arrangements relating to the Communities' own resources shall be made available to the Commission, and determine the measures to be applied, if need be, to meet cash requirements.

Now surely that is precisely the situation that we are in today, and what the Parliament is asking for is not that new 'own resources' be created now to deal with 1984 but that 'own resources' which will become due should be paid earlier than they would otherwise be paid. If you look at Article 209(b), you have the measure

Price

which must be applied to meet cash requirements. The methods and procedure under which the revenue is to be provided are just the sort of thing which Article 209 requires the Council to adopt.

Mr President, I have put down amendments to the report by Mrs Scrivener aimed at introducing Article 209 into the legal basis, because I believe first of all that this strengthens the Parliament's argument that the Treaty requires Member States to act and, secondly, because in any event the means of action are stipulated in that article and one simply cannot avoid using it if that article is there in the Treaty. I hope the Members of this House will support those amendments.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — (DA) Mr President, it may seem superfluous for me, as a representative of so little political power and such a small country in this assembly, to take the floor. However, I wish to do so to explain why I was evidently the only one on the Committee on Budgets to vote against the Scrivener report. I did so because I preferred the Commission's approach as the least of many evils. Under no circumstances can I accept the drafting of a general regulation without any indication of the year or amount, giving the Community the opportunity to write post-dated cheques to be paid for later by the Member States. Such a method is improper. I can accept the adoption of a payment for 1984 with a precisely specified amount shown in an adopted supplementary budget. I am no advocate of theories of doom, nor am I a party to the series of threats that were broadcast about the House this morning. We have heard that the budget is to be rejected, the Community will disintegrate, non-compulsory expenditure will be used to finance agricultural spending, the Council will be hauled before the Court of Justice, and what have you. This will get us nowhere. I have nothing against our country being part of a free trade area, and I would be glad in my old age not to have to take part in the theoretical hairsplitting about this subject.

However, the situation is different. Our country has been dragged into this and we will have to pay up, but we would ask to be allowed to pay an exact, fixed amount for one year at a time and not a blank cheque.

Mr Ryan (PPE). — Mr President, knowing his considerable ability and the dedicated efforts which the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr O'Keefe, has already made to get other Members of the Council to agree to a realistic supplementary budget for 1984, I am very sorry for him that he had to come into this House to apologize for the lack of progress. We were led to believe some months ago that the Fontainebleau Summit was the harbinger of a new dawn. All I can say is that the sun is very slow to rise.

One good development which resulted from Parliament's action in July in freezing rebates to the United

Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany was that the British Parliament devoted a day to debating European affairs, and particularly our actions. That debate was a remarkable one — less remarkable for the many insulting condemnations by British parliamentarians of all the Members of this House than for the depth of ignorance of the Treaty of Rome and European institutions displayed by the British MPs. Amongst the more refined things said about us were that we represent nobody but ourselves, that we like to promote our own importance by exceeding our powers and that we do not deserve to be called a parliament at all! It is possible to forgive an inexperienced backbencher such inelegant sentiments, but they are intolerable coming from one of her Britannic Majesty's ministers. To his credit, Mr Edward Heath, former Prime Minister of Britain, scolded his colleagues for their unhelpful intemperate abuse and from his experience and knowledge confirmed that the European Parliament had acted properly.

We can all subscribe to the principle of budgetary discipline. This Parliament, particularly through the Committee on Budgetary Control, has been the leader in matters of budgetary discipline. Britain, which is loud in its demands for budgetary discipline, might practise what it preaches by refunding to the Community some 1 000 m ECU which the UK irregularly obtained from the EEC through its milk marketing boards. If the UK were to pay that conscience money now, it would go a long way towards covering the deficit in the 1984 budget — a deficit caused by the unanimous vote of the Council of Ministers, which has responsibility for the level of 1984 expenditure and therefore, under the Treaty, for the revenue required.

I recall the work of Parliament in relation to the 1984 budget. Notwithstanding the anxiety of parliamentarians to allocate more funds to the relief of unemployment, regional development, transport policy, energy resources, research and development and many other worthy objectives, Parliament cautiously adopted a modest budget which was in balance. Subsequently, the Council made decisions which upset that balance by increasing expenditure and ignoring the necessity to provide revenue. That was the height of irresponsibility on the Ministers' part. Parliament had a clear obligation to take corrective action. *Nemo dat quod non habet*. The refusal to date by Parliament to sanction rebates to the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany stems from this reality: that the Community cannot give what it does not have. It would be an act of bankruptcy and reckless budgetary indiscipline for the Community to pay massive refunds to two Member States, knowing that giving such bonanzas to two lucky recipients would bring many EEC schemes to a halt for want of funds sooner rather than later.

If and when the Council of Ministers produces an acceptable supplementary budget for 1984, realistically providing the cash to close the 1984 shortfalls, Parlia-

Ryan

ment, as many speakers have said, will release the blocked funds to the UK and Germany. The Irish presidency can be assured that Parliament will not put any obstacles in the way of its efforts to achieve a settlement of the budgetary crisis. I am sure that the Irish presidency would not wish any settlement to be a mere camouflage on a framework of fictitious figures and presumptuous expectations. The Irish presidency, the Council as a whole and the Commission can be certain that the parliamentary arm of the budgetary authority will fulfil its responsibilities to the full. The sense of duty pervading Parliament causes us to favour the articles of the Treaty which compel the Council of Ministers and Parliament to keep the budget in balance rather than support the Commission's proposal for a regulation based upon Article 235 which would involve the individual Member States. We should act as a Community, a Community of agreement, and not a club of disagreement.

Mr Früh (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! The voice of agriculture obviously has to make itself heard in such an important debate on the budget situation. It is no secret that agriculture takes a major share of the main budget, chiefly because of our integrated policy and the great contributions agriculture has made to Europe in the past. Yet we know that this is precisely why there is so much disquiet out there in the agricultural world and in the Community as a whole, because this crucial slice of the budget can no longer be guaranteed.

What I do not intend to do is emulate the budgetary experts we have been listening to and recite some more patent remedies; we have had enough of this from the Christian Democrat spokesmen. My intention is merely to point out that we must take great care to preserve the trust which has been placed specifically in the agricultural policy of our European Community. You know that it is important to avoid undermining this trust, particularly at a time when we are crossing such difficult terrain and have been attempting to find better ways of managing the budget. If we jeopardize this trust we could well destroy it entirely, and the European Community would be severely damaged as a result.

We could of course take the line of least resistance — a view which is not unheard of outside this assembly — and simply say that the Council of Ministers takes decisions and we have to be able to rely on its decisions, because what else is there left to rely on? If the decisions do not provide enough money — and others have already voiced this possibility — the Member States will have to revert to their individual responsibilities. This is the whole point, and it is on this point that I believe agriculture to be making a genuine contribution to Europe. People at large do not want to go back to national contributions; they want a proper Community solution, and I ask you to bear this in mind when we attempt to find this vital solution.

There is a second consideration: there are also people and circles who argue that there is nothing to worry about — after all, what happens is based on ministerial decisions, the expenditure is compulsory, and there is other expenditure which is not so binding or so compulsory, so why shouldn't the cuts be made elsewhere? We reject this view as well. We do not want the European Community to be seen as an agricultural community and nothing else. On the contrary, we have a vital interest in seeing the European Community finally expand beyond this agricultural community to embrace other sectors and develop other policies. We are well aware that many of the aims of agricultural policy cannot be realized without a meaningful regional job-creation policy and other supplementary measures. This is why it would be extremely damaging to agricultural policy as well as to other areas if we opted to follow this naive path and pretend that we can cut expenditure in other areas and everything will be all right. That way lies disaster.

I should like to end simply by appealing to everyone, but particularly to the Council, to finally put the 1984 finances into order with a supplementary budget which will restore people's trust in Europe and its agricultural policy. One concluding thought: our European Community cannot carry on stumbling from one budget crisis to the next! The permanent budget crisis is all we can offer people to talk or write about. We have just held the elections which were supposed to achieve something for Europe, and yet we are still obstructing ourselves, all our various policies and progress in Europe. I therefore appeal to all those involved — you can see that the European Parliament also has the will to reach a solution — in the interests of the European Community to put an end to the current difficult budget situation by means of a supplementary budget, so that we can tell the farmers in the weeks and months to come that the common agricultural policy and the Community will not leave them in the lurch.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS*Vice-President*

Mr Lalor (RDE). — Mr President, may I first ask the House to bear with me while I take the opportunity of welcoming my colleague from my own country, the President-in-Office of the Council, and to say that he has inherited quite a sizeable problem. I hope that he can make a success of solving it. I have no doubt that he will, and one of the ways that can help him to a great extent is to listen to all the advice he is being offered today, and to try and put it together and get the message across to his Council colleagues in the Budget Council.

Lalor

There is no doubt whatsoever that the Community is confronted with a major budgetary crisis. All of its financial problems are still unresolved, and a solution becomes more difficult to find with each passing day. Each colleague in this debate so far has recalled the serious failure of the last Budget Council, which took place in Brussels. I agree with all of them. It was a failure, and I share Parliament's surprise and disappointment. I am not at all satisfied with the report of the Council on the situation. Given the urgency as clearly explained by Mr Tugendhat of the Commission, given the importance of the amount of 2 million ECU needed for the 1984 supplementary budget, and considering also the common policies involved — mainly the agricultural policy — we had hoped that the Council would reach an agreement.

I should like to dwell for a moment on the Council's incapacity to take the necessary measures which are the consequences of its own decision. I am referring to the agreement of 20 March on agricultural prices for the 1984-85 campaign. How can 8 million farmers continue to trust a Community which does not want to pay any more to implement the agricultural policy? This is evident through the disputes at Council level. In this regard, we wonder how the Commission could have been so wrong when it evaluated the supplementary budgetary credits at 2 000 million ECU, although the Council agreed that 1 000 million ECU should be sufficient thus cutting unjustifiably the Commission provision by half.

What this reveals is an awkward situation in which the Council postpones its decisions and proves incapable of implementing the Fontainebleau conclusions. Basically, we see that the Fontainebleau Council has arrived at false solutions. It has, as I said, been a failure. It did not solve any problems whatsoever, but it did give immediate satisfaction to some Member States, the UK especially, cherishing the hope that the other pending problems would consequently be solved or dissipated. In fact, the conclusion of the Fontainebleau Council on the financing of the 1984 deficit was very short and laconic, stating that the next Council of Ministers would adopt the necessary measures. From July to date, everybody knows what has actually happened, and that is absolutely nothing.

For our group, the main issue is to fulfil the expenditure commitments of the agricultural policy as quickly as possible on the basis of a supplementary budget — that is to say, on the basis of a Community solution. My group cannot understand how the Council could claim to make progress on the budgetary problems which will be on the agenda in 1985 and perhaps successive years by damaging the common policies which have been built and which, like the common agricultural policy, assure the functioning of the Community.

I share the views expressed a few moments ago by my colleague, Mr Ryan, in connection with the UK approach. Yesterday we heard Mr Pitt criticizing the

heavy spending from the European budget on agriculture and saying that the benefits to the 10 million European farmers were at the expense of the 100 million industrial workers. We also heard him outlining his commitment to minorities. Here we have a minority of 10 million unfortunate farmers in this Community, and Mr Pitt's solution to the present employment problem in Europe is to sacrifice that minority of 10 million farmers on the altar while at the same time offering no solution. He was backed later by Lord Douro, who complimented him on his approach. In the UK all sides are out to bash the common agricultural policy, and although we have little Westminster wars going on in this House, there is unanimity in the UK for the bashing of the common agricultural policy. This is most unfortunate, and it is giving the British Prime Minister at Summit meetings the most improper back-up service from her own people. It is to the detriment of the European Community.

We now ask for a draft supplementary budget and for an agreement at the next Council. I appeal to the President of the Budget Council to do his damndest, as I know he will, in an effort to resolve this. My group will fully support Mrs Scrivener's proposals, which are relevant to the basic regulations required. We are fully behind her in this regard.

(Applause)

Mrs Fuillet (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not intend to dwell on the wide measure of agreement accorded to the report by the Committee on Budgets: other colleagues in my group will expand on the reasons why we have given our backing to this report.

I should, however, point out that there was a problem of choosing between two regulations for 1984 and 1985 and a single all-embracing regulation. We opted for the second, since the risk of extending the deficit situation beyond a calendar year meant that rules of principle had to be adopted. I am sorry that this had to be the case.

It is to be hoped, on the other hand, that this regulation will go as far as possible towards serving the interests of the Communities. Because of the risks we run in making budgetary predictions, too, it seems sensible to me if we refrain from fixing specific levels for existing or future deficits. Moreover, it is difficult at this opening of Parliament for me to avoid commenting on the general budgetary situation on which the future of the Community depends.

It comes as a real shock if one compares the political efforts which were made over several months during the French Presidency, the content of the debates which marked the campaign for the European elections and the progress made at the European Council at Fontainebleau, with the deplorable state of affairs

Fuillet

we have today as a result of the indecision of the Council of Ministers — my apologies, Mr President.

This state of affairs is threatening to become critical for several sectors of the Community economy, including the farmers. Although we are arguing about amounts which are very small by national standards, our discussions are couched in terms of book-keeping and are threatening to undermine the principles which have guided the activities of the European Parliament up to the present time.

One could yield to the temptation of holding the United Kingdom solely responsible for the present deadlock. The UK does indeed bear some responsibility for this state of affairs, chiefly in terms of its attitude which is dragging the Community ever closer towards adulterating its fundamental principles — but we should remember also that certain other Member States appear to be trying to use methods which are still totally rejected by the European Parliament, such as the financing of deficits by reductions in non-compulsory expenditure.

I am, however, prepared to recognize that, if non-compulsory (regional, social, development aid, etc.) expenditure cannot be reduced for obvious political reasons, problems arise with the actual use of the funds concerned. It is doubtless possible to make economies in these areas, but let us not lose sight of some of our primary aims: the need to bring policies to fruition and to make better use of the funds available. Parliament too must tackle this aspect of the budget question.

Certain basic political questions have to be asked in this debate on the budget: what is the role of the European Parliament's efforts to give the Community a new impetus indirectly by developing certain new policies? What political significance should be attached to declarations made at the highest level, and what credibility does the European Council retain if its policy guidelines yield no concrete results?

We, for our part, attach great importance to the implementation of the Fontainebleau agreements. It is particularly urgent for the draft supplementary budget for 1984 and the budget for 1985 to be adopted as quickly as possible, to enable deadlines to be met, the necessary action to be taken, and the own resources ceiling to be raised by 1 January 1986 at the latest. The ball is in the Council's court now, and it is up to the Council to state whether it is prepared to implement its own policies within the existing rules. The Council has very little time left to demonstrate this, and we await the outcome.

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, I have already set out the Commission's general position on the budgetary situation in the Community in my speech yesterday evening. I think I

could now merely comment briefly on the amendments proposed by the Committee on Budgets to our proposal for a regulation and on some of the points that have been raised during the course of this rather wide-ranging debate.

The Commission has already, in July, amended once its proposal for a draft regulation in response to those of Parliament's known concerns which we felt able to endorse. We explained at that time why we felt unable to remove the reference to Article 235 as a legal basis for the regulation. These reasons remain for us valid. We must, in seeking an appropriate basis for a Community regulation for this purpose, take into account the realities and the constraints of Community law. Parliament and the Council must make their own decisions, but the Commission is an independent body and it must take its decisions on the basis of *its* interpretation of *its* responsibilities.

We are asking the Council to impose on the Member States an obligation to make available to the Community advances of future 'own resources'. Under existing Community law, no provision for making such advances exists and there is no article of the Treaty other than Article 235 which, in the Commission's view, can suffice on its own to require the Council to impose one. I listened with great care to Mrs Barbarella's speech this morning and she gave the impression — I may have misunderstood her in the interpretation — but she gave the impression that there was somehow something completely automatic about this, that the Community needs money and that people have to pay up. Now, we do say the Community needs money and we are asking the Member States to make it available. But I think it is important to remember that there is no automaticity about this procedure. Certainly, the people to whom we are going in order to get the money do not regard it as automatic, and if we are to get the money we need, it is important to couch our request in such a way as to make it more likely than not that the funds will be forthcoming. I did not myself, I must say, feel that the approach which she was taking was likely to be the one which would bring about the result which both she and I desire.

Some of the other articles of the Treaty which have sometimes been cited in this context are certainly relevant to the proper functioning of the budgetary procedures of the Community, but they cannot be adduced as placing an obligation on the Council to adopt a regulation for an extraordinary advance of this kind. The Commission continues, therefore, to feel that it is necessary to maintain the reference to Article 235 for this purpose. I recognize that others may have different views, but we are, I think, duty bound to put forward what we regard as the best in both the political and legal sense, a proposal to secure the object which we have in mind for the Community as a whole.

As regards the two new amendments suggested in Mrs Scrivener's motion for a resolution, the Commission

Tugendhat

does not have strong views as to whether the dispositions in respect of 1984 and 1985 should be contained in one regulation or two. Given the different nature of the circumstances affecting the two years, the Commission's initial proposal was for two separate regulations. I have explained the thinking behind that in the Committee on Budgets; but we would not have any great objection to their combination in a single one.

As for the suggestion that the regulation should contain no reference to the amount of additional resources involved we have a different approach. The Commission's original proposal reflected not a position of principle, but one of political realism. I make no apology for that. To use a rather colloquial phrase, principles do not always butter parsnips. If one is to get the parsnips, one needs to show a certain amount of political realism. We are asking the Council to adopt a regulation which will impose upon Member States an obligation under Community law to make advance payments of 'own resources' available to the Community in circumstances where national parliaments have not yet ratified the decision bringing new 'own resources' into effect. It is no small thing. In order to fulfil their obligations under the regulation, many if not all Member States will have to seek some form of authorization from their domestic parliaments. I have to say that it does not seem to the Commission reasonable or politically realistic to expect Member States to undertake this obligation on the basis of an entirely open-ended commitment. Some indication of the scale of the additional resources involved needs surely to be given. In saying that, Mr President, I do feel that if honourable Members of all parties and all nationalities considered for a moment some of the things that they have heard and some of the resolutions that have been passed in their domestic parliaments — the *Bundestag* comes very much to mind in that respect — they would, I think, realize that what I say has a great deal of truth in it.

Reference has been made by several speakers during this debate to the issue of budgetary discipline. I can reassure the House that the Commission is acutely aware of the implications of this issue for the powers and prerogatives of this Parliament. It is something which has been very much in our minds ever since this question first arose. The Commission has not made and will not make any proposal in the field which is incompatible with the powers and prerogatives of Parliament.

Finally, we have noted the request of the Irish Presidency concerning the transfer embodying the special measures in favour of the United Kingdom and Germany as well as Mr Cot's reply and that of other speakers to the effect that Parliament would be disposed to unblock this transfer if a new proposal were presented together with the supplementary budget. The Commission will, of course, make the necessary proposal to this effect.

Mr O'Keefe, President-in-Office of the Council. — Mr President, the debate last night and this morning has served a dual purpose. It has centred on Mrs Scrivener's report, on which you will vote tomorrow and which will allow you to send to the Council Parliament's opinion on the Commission's proposals for supplementary financing in 1984 and 1985. It would, I feel, not be appropriate for me to comment on that part of your deliberations. It is safe to say that I shall ensure that the opinions I have heard are reported to the Council.

Your debate has also served to allow the spokesmen of the various political groups to react to the statement which I made on behalf of the Council yesterday evening. It is to this part of your deliberations that I would like to devote these few concluding remarks.

On a point of information, Mr President, from the remarks made by a number of speakers it seems that my speech yesterday may have given rise to a misunderstanding. In respect of 1984, I said that 'the Council has concluded that indispensable additional financing required in 1984 is of the order of 1 000 million ECU'. That does not mean that the Council does not intend to cover the rest of the obligations resulting from the CAP which it estimates at a level only a little lower than the Commission's estimates. The Council envisages that the totality of this sum will be covered by a combination of 1 000 million additional finance and 850 million coming from savings and other revenue.

Some speakers — notably Mr Cot and Lord Douro — have regretted the fact that it will no longer be possible to follow the pragmatic calendar for the establishment of the 1985 budget. As I said yesterday, I too regret this fact, but would like to reinforce the assurances of cooperation I gave yesterday. Once the draft 1985 budget is established, the Council will do its utmost to put Parliament in possession of all the relevant documents as soon as possible and will cooperate fully to ensure that Parliament's examination of the draft is as complete as possible.

Some speakers have, furthermore, vigorously maintained that Parliament's powers must be respected. It is important that I should reply to that particular point put by Members of this House. In my statement I said, unambiguously, that Parliament's powers would be respected. On behalf of the Council let me repeat what its Presidents-in-Office have said many times in this House. The Council respects and will continue to respect the powers of both branches of the budgetary authority.

In general, Mr President, despite certain criticisms I was pleased to note the basic good will of the Assembly and its earnest desire to see the present budgetary *impasse* resolved. As I indicated yesterday, the Irish Presidency is determined to do everything possible to bring matters to a satisfactory conclusion. What you

O'Keeffe

have said here has rightly underlined the extremely urgent nature of the 1984 budget problem. The Council shares this view, and I hope that very soon I can come back to this House and outline to you the details of a draft supplementary budget for 1984 and, of course, of the draft budget for 1985.

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) I should like to begin by thanking Mr O'Keeffe, the President-in-Office of the Council, for his comments and for his efforts to appreciate the position of the European Parliament. I am well aware of the unrewarding nature of his presidential duties, and in this context I should like to pay homage to the Irish Presidency, which has the formidable task of piloting the ship of Council through increasingly rough and dangerous waters.

He will allow me to voice my regret on procedural grounds — since he has just confirmed some of my fears — that the abandonment of the proposed timetable, as far as one is able to guess it, and since it is already somewhat behind schedule, is causing Parliament to examine the draft budget for 1985 in circumstances which will be singularly fatiguing for Members, but we shall yield to necessity in view of the importance of this task.

I should like also to thank Mr Tugendhat for presenting the Commission's analyses with his customary talent and with a resolution which is all the more admirable in view of the fact — if I have understood Mr O'Keeffe correctly — that the text reported on by Mrs Scrivener has been overtaken somewhat by events and by the agreement on intergovernmental financing of advance payments which is apparently now being finalized. Nevertheless, it is important to be reminded of the principles every so often.

The Committee on Budgets will now examine the resolutions submitted to it and will invite Parliament to give its views on the matter and on the issues raised by this debate, and particularly to reply to Mr O'Keeffe's inquiry about the rebates to the United Kingdom and to the Federal Republic of Germany. I should also like to repeat, or rather state — since my pronouncement yesterday may have been slightly premature — our determination not to obstruct or delay these proceedings or to show signs of ill-will, but rather to assist in solving this and any other budgetary problems we may have to face. True to the saying 'sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof', we shall deal with these problems one by one.

That being said, I trust that we shall by tomorrow evening be in a position to give a straight answer to a straight question.

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

(The sitting was suspended at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

*Vice-President*4. *Topical and urgent debate (objections)*

President. — In accordance with the second indent of Rule 48 I have received the following written reasoned objections to the list of items to be included in the topical and urgent debate tomorrow.

(The President read out the list of objections)¹

I would remind you that the vote will be taken on these objections without a debate.

Mr Huckfield (S). — Point of order, Mr President. I do not want to trespass on your generosity, but I did try to raise this point with Lady Elles this morning when she was in the Chair. Unfortunately, I think that the information she gave me was misleading. The information that she gave me was that reasons did not usually have to be given for urgent procedure because that was a matter for the House. However, I find that, on page 26 of yesterday's Minutes, reasons for urgency are given pursuant to Rule 57. I submit — and I hope that the Bureau will take account of this — that the reason for the urgency of my resolution, which is Doc. 2-499/84, ought to be classified alongside the reasons for the urgency of the resolutions listed there. I hope you will give me a fair ruling on this because I am a new Member and I am seriously studying the points of procedure of this Parliament and trying to understand them. I hope you will enable us to understand why the reasons which we have submitted for the urgency of our resolution are not included in the Bureau's decision, since they are as important as the reasons submitted in connection with the other resolutions.

I will just make one final point before I take my seat. I repeat I do not want to trespass on your generosity. One of my colleagues had a constituent killed last night as a result of this dispute. Now if that does not serve to underline the urgency of the matter and the need for a debate tomorrow morning under Rule 48 on the resolution I have submitted, then I do not know what would underline the urgency. I ask once more that the Bureau give this matter consideration. It is a dispute which has been going on for six months and if this Parliament cannot debate it, then where can we debate it?

President. — Mr Huckfield, I have let you finish — although the last part of your speech was hardly a

¹ See Minutes.

President

point of order — because you are a new Member. I am absolutely delighted to hear that you are studying our Rules of Procedure. You are setting an example which I would recommend other Members of this House to follow.

Let me explain, once more, as Lady Elles did this morning. I was in the Chamber when you spoke and I remember what Lady Elles said when she was in the Chair. There are different types of urgent procedure in this House. This morning we were concerned with urgent procedures requested by the Council of Ministers for documents submitted to us for an opinion. This afternoon we are operating under a different section of our Rules. We are operating this afternoon under Rule 48, which concerns urgent motions presented by Members. The procedure there is different. There, any Member can submit a motion with request for urgent procedure during the one-and-a-half hours reserved for that. As there are usually many more requests than can possibly be acceded to, the chairmen of the groups make a tentative selection which is submitted to the House for approval without debate. That is what we are concerned with now.

There is a whole list of requests for urgent procedure. The chairmen of the groups have made a selection, which is submitted for your approval and to which you have the right to propose amendments. I have just read out a whole series of proposals to that effect, i.e., to alter the proposals by the chairmen of the political groups. According to our Rules of Procedure, we can have no debate on this in this Chamber. If you wish to change these Rules, you are free to make a proposal to that effect. However, until they are changed, I am here to ensure that the Rules are respected as they stand. There is going to be no debate, but we are going to have a vote.

Lady Elles (ED). — Mr President, I am grateful that you were in the Chamber this morning and heard my explanation and maintained that explanation.

Mr C. Jackson (ED). — Mr President, when you were reading my request for urgent procedure in respect of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Klepsch and myself concerning the appointment of the new European Commission, there was unfortunately a serious confusion in the interpretation. In English the word 'Commission' became 'committee' throughout. I would be grateful if you could just read that again in case the same confusion occurred in other languages, so that the Members may be quite clear that the resolution and the reason for urgency referred to the appointment of the European Commission.

President. — Mr Jackson, when we come to the vote on your proposal, I will read it out again and I will read it out in French to see if perhaps that will help.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Mr President, notwithstanding the explanation you have given on the matter of urgent procedure, I want to protest. I believe that Rule 48 is being abused. We have the Bureau accepting motions that are not urgent or that were just as urgent a year ago and will be just as urgent in a year from now. They have been discussed *ad nauseam* already in this House and are only old subjects introduced under new names.

I had a genuinely urgent motion for a resolution about the supply of natural gas to Northern Ireland. This concerns two Member States in the Community and is a matter that we have already expressed interest in and concern about. I believe that it could be resolved by the mediation or intervention of the Commission. Yet it has been rejected in favour of motions for resolutions that are not urgent, certainly are no more urgent than they have been on other occasions and will continue to be. I believe that this rule is being abused and has been abused here today.

President. — Mr McCartin, unfortunately opinions as to what is urgent and what is not urgent number exactly 434 in this Parliament. By your vote in a few moments you will be able to express *your* opinion on what you think is most urgent.

Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, on a point of order. The vote on which motions should be regarded as urgent should not be taken regardless of the content. The President should read out the reasons for the urgency of each motion so that we are not forced through procedural tricks to rejustify the urgency — for instance because someone has just been killed in a constituency or because some teacher or postman in Germany has been dismissed because he is standing as a candidate for the Communist Party, or because a member of parliament has had to resign to avoid the 'berufsverbot'. I would therefore ask you to read out the reasons for the urgency of each motion.

President. — I cannot change Parliament's Rules of Procedure. All I can do — and all I have to do — is apply them. That is my duty as long as I am in this chair. The Rules do not provide for a debate. All they say is that I have to read out which motions have been tabled and for what reasons. That is what I have done, and that is all I can do.

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, I am not asking to speak. I would simply call upon you to apply the Rules and take the vote without calling people on pretexts.

(Applause)

President. — That is precisely what I am doing.

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, on a point of order. I have no doubt personally that you are seeking to apply the current rules of this Parliament, but that does not quite meet the point of my colleague Mr Huckfield and, indeed, of other people who have intervened. What they are saying is this: ought there not in this Parliament to be some explanation of the reasons why the Bureau, meeting in secret, has chosen certain matters to take priority over other matters? It is not only Mr Huckfield who has raised this question. He is a new Member, and I think he is entitled to the answer. How does he set about changing the Rules so that there is no vote on requests for urgent procedure until the Bureau has given a reason for its selection of priorities?

President. — Mrs Castle, I have already answered that point, but I will do so again. I cannot change the Rules, I can only apply them.

If Mr Huckfield, or any other Member, wants to change the Rules then he can find the procedure for doing that in our Rules themselves. All he has to do is to submit a motion to change the Rules. At this moment, the Rules do not provide for the Bureau or the chairmen of the political groups to give detailed reasons for what they propose to do. If you want to change that, you have a perfect right to submit a proposal and it will be sent to the appropriate committee.

Lady Elles (ED). — It is a point of order to correct a false impression conveyed by Mrs Castle. I must point out that it is not the Bureau meeting in secret or in public which decides which motions on urgent procedure come before this House at this time at 3 o'clock. It is decided by the chairmen of the groups meeting with the President of Parliament, and presumably her group was represented by Mr Arndt. If she is going to complain, would she at least get her facts right? She used the word 'Bureau', and she can check it in the report of proceedings tomorrow. It is the chairmen of groups, and it is for the Parliament as a whole at this time to vote in plenary sitting as to which resolutions they wish to have.

I have said in this House that the sovereign will of this Parliament remains sovereign, and we can decide at this time, at 3 o'clock on a Wednesday, which resolutions we wish to debate tomorrow and which we do not, regardless of what the chairmen of the groups decide at their meeting on the Tuesday. You are free and we are free to decide, and please, Mr President, may we get on with this decision now!

President. — I will give Mrs Castle the opportunity to answer and then we shall vote.

Mrs Castle (S). — If Lady Elles listened to other people's speeches she would have realized that what I

asked for was an explanation of the reasons why a certain order of priority was presented to this Parliament. When she says Parliament is sovereign, she is asking us to vote blind without reasons being given and to allow the majority to steamroller common sense.

President. — I have already answered you, Mrs Castle: if you want these explanations to be given in future, you will have to propose an amendment to our Rules of Procedure, but at the moment we are operating under the present rules and the present rules require me to ask you now to vote. I will allow no more points of order.

(Applause from the right)

After the vote on the first objection.¹

Mr Newens (S). — I am sorry, Mr President, that this particular voting machine, although I voted against, is not working, because the red light did not come on.

President. — It is customary in this Parliament for someone whose voting machine is not working to stand up — just as you have done — and say 'My machine is not working, but I voted for or against'. That is recorded here and the result changed accordingly.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I am afraid I must contradict you, since this kind of thing has happened several times before. If anyone complains that he wanted to vote differently, this is recorded only in the case of a vote by roll call. This has happened on several occasions in this House. Several of my neighbours — new Members — were too late in voting. They would, however, have voted if you had not already closed the voting.

(Interruption)

If we start doing that now we will repeatedly be faced with this problem. Up till now we have never repeated a vote for that reason. Have it your way.

(Applause)

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, the mistake is most probably in the release of the voting system. When you declared the voting open it was a further 45 seconds at least before the yellow light went on — the very moment you were declaring the voting closed. And that was exactly the same moment the Chairman of the Christian-Democratic Group shouted 'Too fast!' Because of the delay in releasing the voting

¹ Votes on all objections: see Minutes.

Arndt

machine, some Members had finished voting before others' yellow light went on.

Since the Chairman of the Christian-Democratic Group himself considered the procedure too fast, I would therefore be grateful if you would repeat the vote.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that in difficult situations it is always best to get someone to be the scapegoat, and I am prepared to take on that role. Although I know very well that I waited some time between declaring the voting open and declaring the voting closed, I am prepared to say that was not the case and that I declared the voting closed too quickly because my machine here does not show whether your light is on.

This is something that should be seen to. Exceptionally therefore — and this is the first and last time — I shall take that vote again.

5. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 2-470/84).

We shall deal with the questions to the Council and the Foreign Ministers.

I call Question No 39 by Mrs Dury (H-92/84):

Subject: representation at meetings of the Council of the European Communities and the Ministers for Culture.

At the 939th meeting of the Council of the European Communities and the Ministers for Culture meeting within the Council, held in Luxembourg on 22 June 1984, Belgium was represented by the State Secretary for Agriculture and European Affairs, not by the Walloon and Flemish Ministers for Culture who have sole responsibility in cultural matters. Was the Council aware of this serious political incident and does it intend to protest to the Belgian Government so that in future Belgium is represented at these meetings solely by the Walloon and Flemish Ministers?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — The honourable Member is well aware that it is up to the competent authorities of each Member State to appoint the person or persons who are to represent it at Council meetings such as the meeting of the Council and the Ministers responsible for cultural affairs meeting within the Council held on 22 June 1984 in Luxembourg.

It was not for the Council therefore to question the Belgian Government on the composition of its delegation to the meeting in question.

Mrs Dury (S). — (*FR*) Listening to the answer given by the President of the Council, I got the impression that I had read it somewhere before. I knew what sort of answer he was going to give. However, he only described the legal situation. Even if the Treaty of Rome is our bible, as it were, it should not be an excuse for rigidity. Things have changed since the Treaty was drawn up, particularly in Belgium. There have been changes in the Belgian constitution in this respect and it is now the Ministers of Culture who are responsible for their respective linguistic communities. However, I do not want to get bogged down in a legal question.

Since Ministers are turning up to deal with matters for which they are not competent I should like to ask the Council what it expects to come of their decisions since, Mr President, it is a question which concerns the responsibility of the Council if Ministers take decisions on subjects for which they are not competent, and I do not see how, under such circumstances, Community policies can be properly implemented.

Mr Barry. — I and the Council of Ministers can only act within the Treaties, and if the Treaties say that member governments are responsible for the composition of delegations to various councils, then the Council of Ministers must accept that position.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — (*NL*) This question does not only concern Belgium. Spain and Portugal are soon to accede, and a number of regions have been granted a degree of autonomy in Spain too. I should like, therefore, to ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether the Council of Ministers is prepared to include this problem, which will become more acute with the accession of Spain, on its agenda, so that it may be possible for any necessary changes to be made to the Treaties.

Mr Barry. — I think that the Treaties will remain binding when the Community is enlarged. It does not matter whether there are six Member States, as there were in 1972, or nine as there were in 1978, or 10 as there are now, or 12 in two years' time: the Treaties will still apply, and the Council of Ministers can only act within those Treaties.

Mr Ducarme (ED). — (*FR*) The question raised by Mrs Dury is, I think, extremely relevant from the point of view of future relations between the European institutions and the national institutions, and I think it would be very useful if the Council were to draw the attention of the Belgian Government to the need for representation with a direct effect on the citizens of

Ducarme

the Community and, in this connection, I should be grateful if you would tell us whether or not this subject will in fact be discussed at a future Council meeting. This is, I think, an important issue and I would be grateful for a precise answer. Is the President of the Council prepared to bring up this problem with the Belgian Government, yes or no?

Mr Barry. — 'No' is the answer to that, because, as I said in reply to the first supplementary question asked, the representation of any national government is a matter for that government and is not a matter for the Council of Ministers under the Treaties, to which we must all pay heed. In those circumstances, I do not think it is the function of either myself as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, or as the Council of Ministers acting as a body, to make representations to individual governments as regards the composition of their representation.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) I should like to ask the President-in-Office whether or not he feels that, in such cases, modifications to a constitution may lead to abuses of power in connection with that constitution.

This is exactly the situation we are faced with as regards cultural relations and the representation of the various cultural communities. It is an abuse of power.

It would really be in the Council's interests to bring up this problem. Do you think that, at least in theory, the Council could look into the question of whether or not power is being abused?

Mr Barry. — My feelings on the matter have nothing to do with it. The Treaties are there, they must be obeyed, and they say that the composition of delegations to committees is a matter for the national governments. Therefore, neither my feelings nor the feelings of the Council of Ministers have anything to do with the matter.

President. — I call Question No 40, by Mr Rogalla (H-99/84):

Subject: regard for the work of the European Parliament

Does the Council share my view that no reference has been made to the preparatory work and suggestions by the European Parliament in the decisions taken by the European Council particularly at Fontainebleau?

How does the Council account for this and what steps will it take to rectify this regrettable failing and to ensure that it does not recur?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — The European Council has usually considered that its role

should be one of laying down broad and general guidelines for future detailed work by the Council and providing political impetus when necessary. The texts which emerge from the European Council and which in some cases take the form of conclusions drawn up under the sole responsibility of the President do not, therefore, as a rule contain references to preparatory work carried out within the Council or to contributions made by the other institutions of the Community. This does not, of course, mean, however, that such contributions are not fully studied and taken into account in the course of the many stages of preparatory work which take place in the Community *before* the European Council meetings as well as during the European Councils themselves.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) The President-in-Office has just described the *status quo*. However, I regard this *status quo* as unsatisfactory, particularly in view of the Act of 1976 on direct elections to the European Parliament. I should like to ask, therefore, whether or not he agrees that it would be a good idea to change the situation so that, in future, not only will the recommendations and preparatory work of the European Parliament be taken into account in the work of the European Council and of the Councils of Ministers, in their capacity as preparatory bodies for the European Council, but that this work should also be acknowledged and made known to the public. Is he, moreover prepared, in his capacity as President of the Council, to make efforts during his term of office to bring this about?

Mr Barry. — The various documents referred to by the honourable Member are taken into account in the preparation for the Council. The fact that they are not specifically referred to in the conclusions of the Council does not mean that the points of view put forward either by Council or by other organs of the Community are not fully studied when the conclusions of the Council are being drawn up.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Are not the events in Fontainebleau and the points just made by the President of the Council really just aspects of the Council's systematic attempts to play down the role of this Parliament and to prevent it playing its rightful part, as directly elected representatives of the people of Europe?

Mr Barry. — I'm afraid I could not agree with that, Mr President. In fact, the Council feels you are trying to take over our role.

President. — I call Question No 41, by Mrs Ewing (H-103/84):

Subject: expansion of the Regional Fund Budget

President

Will the President-in-Office give an assurance that the Council will look favourably on demands for substantial increases in the ERDF budget following the outcome of the Fontainebleau Summit?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — Discussion of the budget, including the section regarding the ERDF, is continuing in the light of the European Council guidelines concerning both the structural funds and the questions relating to budgetary discipline on which decisions were taken at the European Council at Fontainebleau.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — May I say that that answer does not take me very much further, as I do not think the President-in-Office will be surprised to hear me remark.

Could I simply make the plea, then, that in these ongoing deliberations the demand I have made for an increase is looked on favourably, bearing in mind the costs of inflation and the problem we have in trying to get structural programmes well and truly off the ground? It seems that the one we have tried out in the Western Isles has been a proven and admitted success.

Mr Barry. — I want to confirm that with regard to the consideration of the 1985 preliminary draft budget, as proposed by the Commission, the Council is fully mindful of the desirability of substantially increasing the provision of the Regional Fund.

May I also say, wearing my hat of Irish Foreign Minister, that I would fully subscribe to any enlargement of the Regional Fund, which I believe is one of the instruments that will fulfil the dream of the founding fathers of the Community of achieving convergence amongst the States of Europe.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Would the President-in-Office confirm that, since the Commission's proposed figure in the preliminary draft budget is actually marginally less of an increase than that proposed last year and that in order to double the fund in five years we shall need an increase of something like 25% this year to see a real increase, the Council will substantially increase the Commission's figure on commitment appropriations in the preliminary draft budget proposed for 1985?

Mr Barry. — I do not think we can say at this stage what the budget for 1985 will be as the Budget Council has not yet adopted it, nor has the General Affairs Council had a chance to study it. I think it would be premature to say what size the increase will be for 1985 over 1984.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — In view of the fact that he said it was the wish of all concerned to have the

Regional Fund increased, can the President-in-Office tell the House whether discussions have taken place at Council level or whether it is expected they will take place on the question of changing the percentage share for each country, whatever the size of the new Regional Fund?

Mr Barry. — I did not say that it was the desire of everybody to increase the Regional Fund. I said, wearing my hat as Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ireland, that it was very much my desire to see the Regional Fund increased. It is quite obvious, as I know from inside sources and as Members will know from newspaper reports, that there are some members of the Community who do not want to see the Regional Fund increased. We are not one of those members.

There is a proposal before the Council, which has not yet been fully adopted, to restructure the Regional Fund so that the division will not be on the same basis next year as it has been for previous years.

Mr Lomas (S). — Is the Council considering trying to help those deprived areas in the Community which, unfortunately, do not, for one reason or another, qualify for regional aid? An example is my own constituency in the East End of London, in parts of which there is 30% unemployment, yet we do not qualify for aid. Could the Council give the people in those areas any hope that an inner city fund might be established which could help to provide jobs in those areas of high unemployment?

Mr Barry. — There is a proposition before the Council to strengthen the non-quota section of the Regional Fund which, I think, could apply to areas such as those mentioned by the Member, though I stand subject to correction depending on the circumstances.

President. — I call Question No 42, by Mr Habsburg (H-106/84):

Subject: Community funding for the Innkreis-Pyhrn motorway

Has the Council authorized the Commission to negotiate with the Republic of Austria on the subject of Community funding for the Innkreis-Pyhrn motorway?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — Austria has been asking the Community for a financial contribution towards the construction of transit motorways since 1977. On 15 September 1981, the Council adopted a decision authorizing the Commission to open negotiations with Austria in collaboration with the Member States aimed at pinpointing the specific problems and finding solutions. The Council decision specified that the Community had not at that

Barry

stage taken any decision on the principle of a financial contribution towards the building of the motorway.

The result of the first phase of the negotiations in 1982 and 1983 was a Commission report to the Council in May 1983 on the outcome of those negotiations. At its meeting on 20 December 1983, the Council widened the mandate to include in the next stage of the negotiations the drawing up of a comparative balance-sheet of road-transport traffic and costs between the Community and Austria. On that basis, the Community should seek solutions with Austria making it possible to eliminate discrimination as regards taxes and tolls paid by Community hauliers, to decide without prejudice to any decision that the Council might take whether a better balance between the costs could be arrived at and to solve the problems posed by the vehicle taxation systems in the Community and in Austria.

These problems were examined at the meeting with the Austrian delegation on 16 and 17 May 1984. A further meeting is scheduled for the end of September or beginning of October 1984.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — I warmly thank the President-in-Office for the detailed and interesting answer he has given. However, I should like to ask one question. Is the Council aware of the tremendous importance for the Eastern Mediterranean and for the German and French industrial areas of having a rapid link between the Eastern Mediterranean and Western Europe — i.e., the Common Market area of Western Europe — which could only be attained by improving traffic through Austria, whereby it is not only a matter of motorways but, as was discussed yesterday and taken very rightly as a supplementary question of Mr Schwalba-Hoth, of improving rail links, which are in a pretty bad state at present?

Mr Barry. — I think the honourable Member will realize the importance which the Council attaches to this question by the very detailed answer I gave to his original question and by the series of consultations and negotiations that have been conducted between the Community and Austria over this matter. I think that in itself is an indication of the importance of the subject and the seriousness with which the Council is treating it.

President. — Question No 43, by Mr Paisley (H-111/84):

Subject: Spanish claim of jurisdiction over Gibraltar

In view of the prospective entry of Spain into the European Economic Community, can the President-in-Office state whether the Spanish claim of jurisdiction over Gibraltar has been discussed by the Foreign Ministers and what decisions have been taken?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — This is a matter which does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Community and the Council has therefore at no time discussed it.

Mr Paisley (NI). — I wonder if the President-in-Office of the Council could define the present position of Gibraltar in relation to this Common Market. Does he envisage that any change will take place when Spain becomes a member of the Common Market? I am sure he is aware that the frontier between the Rock and the rest of Spain has been closed for long periods. If Spain is going to come into the Common Market, surely this is a matter that must be resolved. Does he affirm that the Council of Ministers agree that the citizens of Gibraltar have the right of self-determination?

Mr Barry. — I am in some difficulty here, because, as I said, this matter does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Community and the Council has therefore at no time discussed it. Obviously, of course, it has been a matter for discussion between the two countries involved, one of which is an applicant for accession to the European Community and the other is a full member. In that sense the solution of this is of concern to the Council.

With regard to the latter part of the honourable Member's question about the right to self-determination of the inhabitants there, I think I should say that it depends on whether 100% of the inhabitants of the territory in question accept the rule of government which is in place in that area at this time. I think it is fair to say that if a sizeable minority of that unit does not accept the rule of government nor feels any allegiance towards it then there is a serious problem for the country concerned.

Mr Taylor (ED). — Is the President-in-Office aware that Gibraltar is the only part of Europe belonging to the European Economic Community where the citizens were denied the right to vote in the recent European elections? Does he not agree that the universal franchise should be extended to all citizens within the EEC, and will he now direct this matter to the attention of the Council in parallel with the discussion on Spain's accession to the EEC?

Mr Barry. — I shall take note of the point raised by the honourable Member.

President. — I have on my list of speakers the names of two Members of the same nationality who belong to the same group. As the House knows, that is not the practice we usually follow. Would Mr Ford and Mr Lomas choose between themselves who will put the supplementary question?

Mr Lomas (S). — I know that the Council realizes that there will be many problems for Gibraltar if Spain joins the Community. The question I want to raise concerns the free movement of workers. I understand that at the moment a seven-year transitional period with regard to Spanish workers moving into Gibraltar is under consideration. That would simply delay the problem. Would the Council consider permanent quotas in view of the fact that Spain has a very large number of unemployed workers and Gibraltar has only 10 000 workers? The results of completely free entry would be absolutely devastating, and I would ask you to consider permanent quotas.

Mr Barry. — I do not think that it would be appropriate at this stage to discuss matters that are the subject of very delicate negotiations between the applicant country of Spain and the European Community, except to repeat what I said in my original reply, namely, that this matter does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Community. At no time, therefore, have we discussed it in the Council.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — The President-in-Office said that a solution to the problem of Gibraltar was naturally of concern to the Council of Ministers. Would the Council, if and when it gets around to discussing this problem, recommend to the British and Spanish Governments that a settlement of this problem be pursued along the same amicable and constructive lines along which a settlement of the Hong Kong problem is being pursued? I think that there is a parallel there and that in the way in which this longstanding problem in the Far East has been resolved there is a lesson for European countries on how to solve some of their own internal problems.

Mr Barry. — I take note of what the honourable Member has said. Again I must point out that this matter does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Community and that the Council, therefore, has not at any time discussed it.

Mr Hume (S). — Could the President-in-Office invite the questioner, Mr Paisley, to follow the logic of his own question, which is that if a territory is in dispute between two Member States, it ought to be a subject of discussion in the Council of Ministers? The territory of Northern Ireland is in dispute between two Member States and should therefore be a subject of similar discussion.

Mr Barry. — I think the question is not primarily addressed to me but to the honourable Member who put down the original question, so I cannot add anything further to the replies I have given already.

Mr Paisley (NI). — Point of order, Mr President. Seeing that the honourable gentleman from Northern

Ireland has put the question to me, I had better answer it. As far as the vast majority of people in Northern Ireland are concerned, there is no dispute whatsoever. Northern Ireland has voted over and over again to remain an integral part of the United Kingdom, despite the campaign of terror, bombing and killing, and the agitation of the honourable gentleman.

President. — Mr Paisley, I am awfully sorry, but during Question Time Members *ask* questions and Ministers answer them.

Mr Taylor (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. You announced earlier that only one Member of a particular nationality from each group could ask a question. Am I not correct in saying that two United Kingdom Members of the Socialist Group have now asked questions?

President. — Mr Taylor, I was misinformed about the nationality of one of the Members who wanted to ask a supplementary question. Otherwise it would not have occurred. I will stick to my earlier decisions, and I apologize for making a mistake. I will allow no points of order on this, because there is no earthly reason why points of order should be raised simply because I was misinformed about the nationality of one of the honourable Members!

I call Question No 44, by Mrs Cinciari Rodano (H-134/84):

Subject: Participation of the Community institutions in the UN Conference in Nairobi in 1985 for the end of the Women's decade

In view of the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on the Community's participation in the United Nations conference in Nairobi in 1985, how will the Community institutions be represented at the Conference and will a Community document be prepared on the problems under discussion, as specifically requested by the European Parliament?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — The Council has noted with interest Parliament's resolution referred to by the honourable Member. The Community will be represented at the conference in accordance with the usual rules for participation in international conferences, that is to say, jointly by the country holding the presidency of the Council and by the Commission. Furthermore, coordination of the Community's position on the problems under discussion, which are within its jurisdiction or which are of Community interest, takes place in accordance with the agreed arrangements, either beforehand in Community bodies in Brussels or on the spot.

The Council will ensure that such coordination continues to take place under the best conditions, notably

Barry

on the basis of any working documents which might be submitted by the Commission with a view to defining the Community's position and the contents of its contribution to the plenary session of the conference.

Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM). — (IT) I am not satisfied with the response of the Council representative to Parliament's very precise request to the effect that the Community institutions, and hence Parliament too, should be represented at the Nairobi conference.

I must point out that there has already been a precedent since a representative of this Parliament was sent to the conference in Copenhagen, if only following a somewhat informal last minute decision.

During its last period of office, this Parliament made — I think — a major contribution to the questions regarding the position of women, discussed in the United Nations and at the Nairobi conference, and is one of the few Parliamentary institutions which has set up a permanent committee on women's rights.

I think, therefore, that the Council should review its position and not persist in ignoring this Parliament as a Community institution.

Mr Barry. — This is primarily a matter for the President-in-Office at the time of the conference, which takes place next July. The Council has not considered it, but I understand that Parliament has passed a resolution to this effect, although the Council has not yet received it. But when it does receive it — and I have no doubt that it will appear — we can consider it at that stage. But so far we have not had an opportunity to discuss the matter.

President. — I call Question No 45 by Mr Hutton (H-113/84):

Subject: return to majority voting

To what extent will the Irish Presidency follow the policy of the French Presidency in attempting to reach decisions in the Council by a majority where this is provided for by the Treaties?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — The Irish Presidency favours the application of the principle of majority voting in as wide an area as the provisions of the Treaties allow and circumstances in Council permit. The policy of the previous Presidency in that regard had our full support.

The policy of promoting the widest possible use of majority voting, as applied by the then President of the Council of Ministers, Dr Fitzgerald, was a feature of the Irish Presidency in 1975. I assure you that we shall continue to be guided by that policy throughout our current Presidency.

Mr Hutton (ED). — May I emphasize to the President-in-Office the accession of Spain and Portugal and ask him if he will ensure that his Presidency will make the widest possible use of majority voting in the Council, since one of the biggest criticisms of the Community I heard during the last election campaign was the slowness of Community decision-making, owing to the Council's being hamstrung by slavish adherence to unanimity?

Mr Barry. — I fully support what the honourable Member said about the wider use of majority voting. We shall certainly be trying to ensure, as I said in my reply, that it is used as widely as possible. I also think there is a possibility that the new *ad hoc* committee to examine the institutions which has been set up as a result of the Fontainebleau European Council may look at this matter and produce some new proposals that could be adopted for the wider use of majority voting.

President. — I call Question No 46, by Mr Selva (H-119/84):

Subject: extradition of Toni Negri

Following the discussions at the Fontainebleau Summit concerning extradition, the questioner asks what concrete measures can be taken in the case of Toni Negri, sentenced to 30 years' imprisonment for acts of terrorism in Italy. Toni Negri took advantage of the elections to the Italian Parliament to evade the authorities and take refuge in a country of the Community from which he has been giving interviews and making statements.

The questioner asks whether the Council of Ministers cannot do everything in its power, including persuasion of another Member of the Community, to put an end to this serious anomaly.

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — The question put by the honourable Member does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Community.

Mr Selva (PPE). — (FR) It is, as I see it, quite right that the European Parliament should take an interest in a question as important as this and, furthermore, the problem of extradition was discussed at the Fontainebleau Summit. Nevertheless, it is quite remarkable that two Member States should adopt diametrically opposed attitudes to this specific case. Italy has condemned Toni Negri to 30 years imprisonment while France has granted him asylum. Even if this question does not fall within the competence of the Council, I nevertheless think it is relevant to the question of setting up a European judicial area.

Mr Barry. — I did not say that it did not fall within the competence of the Council, even though it does

Barry

not. What I said was that it does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Community.

Mr Pannella (NI). — (FR) Is the Council familiar with the facts of the matter? Contrary to what Mr Selva has just alleged, France has never granted asylum to Mr Negri. The fact of the matter is that Italy is very pleased that Mr Negri has fled the country since this gets it off the hook. Were you aware of this, Mr President of the Council?

Mr Barry. — I do not think I have anything to add to my previous reply.

President. — I call Question No 47 by Mr Chanterie (H-122/84):

Subject: Directive on the information and consultation of the employees of transnational undertakings

Following his exchange of views with the Commission of 4 July last, can the President state how he intends to get underway again the current negotiations on the directive concerning the information and consultation of employees of undertakings with complex structures, in particular transnational undertakings?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — Following submission of the proposal in question, the Council began work on examining it. The pace of the discussions was stepped up even further when the Commission submitted an amended proposal in July 1983 following the opinion given by the European Parliament. As there has not been sufficient progress, the Irish Presidency of the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs has taken the step of setting up an *ad hoc* working group of high-level representatives of the Member States to help achieve progress on the technical matters involved in the proposal for a directive and to produce a clear definition of the positions of the Member States both on those questions and on the proposal as a whole. The results of this work will be submitted to the Social Affairs Council in December, when it will take up this matter again.

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — (NL) Thank you for your answer, from which I understand that this matter has been under consideration for some time now, since the original text of the proposal for a directive was, I believe, submitted some four years ago in 1980. The examination over this period has resulted in substantial improvements to the original text. Since the President-in-Office of the Council tells us that this question has been included on the agenda for the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs in December, I should like to ask him whether it will be finally settled before the end of the Irish Presidency and whether the decision

will be reached by a majority vote, if necessary, so that this important proposal may finally become Community legislation in the interests of the workers.

Mr Barry. — Even though it would be the wish of the Irish Presidency that it should be dealt with, I do not think that I can give a categorical assurance that that will be the case. It is coming up in the Social Affairs Council about mid-December. It cannot be done by majority voting; it needs a unanimous vote before it can be adopted.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) To what extent does the directive in question provide for genuine information to the workers in connection with the complex structure of the transnational undertakings in question, not only in their own country, but also in the country where the companies have their head offices and where policy decisions are ultimately taken? As you know, this is of vital importance during the period of crisis. Apart from that, to what extent does this directive, as mentioned by Mr Chanterie, differ from the previous Vredeling Directive and does it constitute an improvement over this previous directive, which also called for information and consultation of workers?

Mr Barry. — The work has been carried out on the basis of the resolution passed by Parliament on 15 December 1982, and it was because the Irish Presidency was not satisfied at the speed with which that work has been done that it set up this *ad hoc* committee to report to the Council of Social Affairs Ministers in December. I do not think that we should pre-judge either what the *ad hoc* committee will recommend to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment or the decision which the Council will arrive at on the basis of the report received.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 48 will receive a written reply.¹

I call Question No 49, by Mr Balfe (H-125/84):

Subject: use of plastic bullets

Will the President-in-Office seek at the next Summit either in public or in private to raise the matter of the continued use of plastic bullets by the UK Government?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — This matter does not come within the Community's jurisdiction.

Mr Balfe (S). — I am sorry to hear that answer from, of all people, an Irish President-in-Office, and, even

¹ See Annex.

Balfe

more so, from a representative of the Fine Gael party, which has taken a considerable interest in this matter. The President-in-Office presumably was here earlier on when this Parliament voted by 158 votes to 135 to debate this issue, last debated two-and-a-half years ago, and he will have noted the motions for resolutions, one of which was drawn up by myself, Mr Seal and Mrs Crawley.

Could the President-in-Office tell me whether he proposes to put any pressure on the governments of the Member States to implement a resolution of this Parliament and a resolution which political parties in his own country have taken a considerable interest in saying should be implemented? Finally, will he ask that this matter be discussed in the Political Affairs Committee next week when it meets in Dublin, or is he prepared to say in Dublin that this is not a matter of concern to the European Communities?

Mr Barry. — The reply I read out as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers stated that this matter does not come within the Community's jurisdiction. However, may I speak in my capacity as the Irish Foreign Minister?

First of all, let me say how gratified and pleased I was earlier on to hear that this matter is to be debated in this House tomorrow. As a Minister in the Irish Government, I wish to say that we are aware of the need for the security forces to be able to defend themselves in riot situations. In that context we know the arguments advanced in favour of the use of plastic bullets. We also know that in Northern Ireland there are rules concerning their use to which the security forces are expected to adhere. I have to say, however, that, whatever the rules governing their use, the fact is that in Northern Ireland these rules have not been adhered to and have proved inadequate. The use of plastic bullets has led to fatalities and to serious injuries. Six of those killed by plastic bullets were children.

The conclusion is inescapable: either the rules should be changed to ensure that there are no more deaths and no more serious injuries from plastic bullets, or they should be withdrawn from use and alternative adequate measures of crowd control found. In the circumstances existing in Northern Ireland, we see no alternative but to withdraw them from use.

Mr Paisley (NI). — Mr President, I must ask for your ruling. Is the President-in-Office of the Council in order in answering questions as the Foreign Minister of one of the Member States of this Community, or is it his duty at Question Time to answer solely as the President-in-Office of the Council? Has he a right to come into this House as Foreign Minister of the Republic of Ireland and put to us views that are the views of his own government and not the views of the Council of Ministers? If that is so, then we have

arrived at the position where any government can put forward its own views at Question Time and Members of this House are not given the opportunity to have an answer from the President-in-Office of the Council. If that is so, I, as a representative of Northern Ireland, would not want to take any further part in any such charade in this House.

President. — Mr Paisley, I can give you your ruling straight away. It has been the longstanding custom in this House that when the President of the Council answers questions he does so as President of the Council; but if he wishes to do so he may add a few words in his capacity as a Minister in his own country. This has been a longstanding habit and I think it is a good one. In any case I must tell you, in case you do not know, that this custom was instituted at the express wish of this House because the House became a little tired of always hearing answers by the President of the Council in which he said nothing at all or very little. It was in accordance with the wishes of the House that some Presidents of the Council have added a few words in their capacity as Ministers of their national governments, but only after having answered officially on behalf of the Council of Ministers.

I now have, for a further supplementary question, the names of two members of the Socialist Group both coming from the UK, Mrs Crawley and Mr Hume, and I must ask them to decide between themselves which of the two is going to ask the supplementary.

Mrs Crawley (S). — First of all, many of us, including Mr Hume, Mr Balfe and myself, will welcome the words of the Foreign Minister of the Irish Republic contained in his answer.

(Interruption)

In the light of the evidence that numbers of people have already been killed by plastic bullet wounds and 15 police divisions in Great Britain have ordered increased stocks of plastic bullets, will the President-in-Office make every effort to represent the growing concern expressed by people in Great Britain and Northern Ireland at the increase in plastic bullets used both in training and on the streets of Northern Ireland? The President of the Council has already stated that within his term of office matters on Northern Ireland will be to the forefront of his mind, and therefore I would say that that is a legitimate request.

Mr Barry. — I would like to thank the honourable Member for that question, and I have to take off my hat as President of the Council of Ministers when I answer it because, as I said, it does not come under the Community's jurisdiction.

As the Irish Minister of Foreign Affairs, I shall certainly be continuing, as I have done and as my prede-

Barry

cessors in office have done for a great number of years, to point out the danger in the use of plastic bullets in the matter of riot control, particularly where the rules that have been laid down for the use of these bullets are not being adhered to and, in fact, are being ignored, as was the case a month ago where one bullet was fired at a range of six feet even though the rules state it should be a considerably greater distance than that.

Mr Taylor (ED). — It is regrettable that for the next six months we are to endure Irish Republican propaganda from the so-called spokesman of the Council of Ministers.

Let me make it clear to him, wearing his Republican hat — because that is all he is as far as we are concerned in Northern Ireland — that we pay no attention to the views coming from him or anyone he represents in Dublin. And let me, elected by the majority of people in Northern Ireland, who reject Dublin and who reject the Minister here today, ask him: Does he know that out of the 10 Member States of the EEC, only two use plastic bullets — namely, Belgium and the United Kingdom — while most of the other 10 use live bullets? Which would he prefer to defeat the IRA? And will he take this opportunity to condemn the IRA, which he carefully avoided doing in his earlier reply?

Mr Barry. — I regret that someone whom I should like to call a fellow Irishman should come into this Chamber and engage in abuse of me in my role as the Irish Foreign Minister. If he intends the term 'Republican' in the best sense of that word, in the Wolfe Tone sense of that word, of treating all people equally, as an insult, then I reject it and I wear the term as a badge of honour. I certainly accept his point that only two countries in the European Community use plastic bullets, but they are not in use throughout the entire jurisdiction under the control of one of those countries, only in a portion of it.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, as you said, it is a custom that Presidents-in-Office can add a few words as the President-in-Office at the moment did, making clear that these views are not the views of other Member States. However, since the President-in-Office chose to use this House as the place to make an attack on the administration, the government policy, of another Member State, which is an unusual step in this House, I wonder if you would care to invite a representative of the United Kingdom Government to come to this House at the next part-session and put views so that the House may be able to take a balanced view of both sides of the argument.

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!' from the European Democratic benches)

President. — Mr Pearce, I am not sure whether this is actually a point of order, but I must tell you that when the President of the Council of Ministers appears before this House and chooses to add a few words, as a national minister, to what he has already said officially in his capacity as President of the Council, he does so on his own political responsibility. This is what the Minister has done, knowing full well, I imagine, that there might be reactions. I do not think that anything that any Member or any Minister visiting this Parliament says on his own political responsibility should then give rise to points of order of the kind you have raised.

Question No 50, by Mr MacSharry (H-126/84):

Subject: New Ireland Forum

Will the President-in-Office indicate what efforts he has made since the holding of the constitutive meeting of the newly-elected European Parliament to ensure that the report of the New Ireland Forum be examined by the Council and that the United Kingdom be invited to treat this report with the urgency and the importance that it merits and demands?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — The competence of the Council of Ministers of the EEC is confined to those matters covered by the Treaties.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — The reply of the President-in-Office is very disappointing in view of the fact that the Northern Eastern part of Ireland — your country and mine, Mr President-in-Office — is the only real area of conflict within the Community. I would ask you whether you made any effort or took any initiatives in the Council — and if so, what they were and whether there were any objections. I would ask you, Mr President-in-Office, whether you are prepared to use your good offices and to request the Council to examine the report of the New Ireland Forum?

Mr Barry. — As President-in-Office of the Council I have already stated that the competence of the Council of Ministers of the European Community is confined to those matters covered by the Treaty.

If I can speak as Minister of Foreign Affairs in Ireland and wear my national hat, I can say that immediately after the report of the New Ireland Forum was published, I personally brought it to the attention of a number of Heads of Government and Foreign Ministers of Member States of the Community (and, indeed, to countries outside it), explained the intention and the reasoning behind it, the uniqueness of the approach that had been adopted by the parties in Ireland in drafting this report and said to them that we requested their support. We quite clearly did not ask

Barry

them to intervene in any way in a matter that concerned two member governments. We saw that this could be embarrassing for some other States in the Community. However, we did ask them to lend their support to encourage both the United Kingdom Government and the Irish Government to come together to devise solutions that would achieve what the Forum report established as its first priority: to bring about peace and reconciliation on the island of Ireland.

Mr Hume (S). — Would the President-in-Office agree that the international impact of the New Ireland Forum report reflects a widespread international concern about the continuing conflict in Northern Ireland? Would he further agree that the Haagerup report of this Parliament, which was referred directly to the Council of Ministers, reflected the widespread concern within the European Community about the continuation of a conflict which flies in the face of the very ideals on which this Community was founded?

Mr Barry. — Yes, Mr President, I would fully endorse what the honourable Member has said.

Mr Paisley (NI). — Mr President, you said in a ruling that you gave to me that the President-in-Office could from time to time add a few words as a Foreign Secretary of whatever government he represents. Now we have the precedent where the few words are in his capacity as President-in-Office of the Council and the brunt of his reply as a Foreign Minister of the Irish Republic. In what way can a Member of the United Kingdom have the other view put? You ruled out of order my colleague from the United Kingdom who tried to put forward a reasoned view. Today we are receiving one viewpoint only. I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council, who consulted all the people outside Northern Ireland, what degree of importance he attributes to the majority of the people within Northern Ireland, and to their view? Are they to be steamrolled into an all-Ireland settlement? Are they to be denied their right to self-determination? Is not one of the ideals of this Community the right to self-determination? Is that idea also to be set aside in the interest of bringing about an all-Ireland solution, so-called? I put that to the Minister. Does he accept any right of individuals elected in Northern Ireland? I happen to have the largest Unionist vote sending me to this House. Have I no right to speak on behalf of that majority, or is that majority to be hammered into the ground and is it to be rejected? Yet on another question he talked about majority voting in the Council of Ministers and he stated he would be trying to bring that about. I would like to hear his explanation on those two points.

Mr Barry. — I think it is most regrettable that on the first occasion I have seen in person the honourable

Member who has just spoken from across the floor of this House he is less than satisfied with the replies I am giving to questions here. I think that it is regrettable that on a small island like that of Ireland we cannot live in peace together in the tradition he represents and the tradition I represent. When the New Ireland Forum was established in the spring of 1983, because we wanted to hear the voices of the majority of Northern Ireland, because we wanted to hear the voices of Mr Taylor and Mr Paisley, both their parties were invited to take part in the deliberations of the Forum so that when we drew up a document for peace and reconciliation on the island of Ireland, that tradition would be represented together with the Nationalists' tradition. I regret that that did not happen.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Would the President-in-Office of the Council confirm that the majority of the people of Northern Ireland have always indicated that they wish to remain part of the United Kingdom? Would he defend their right to do so, and in calling for peace in Northern Ireland would he condemn the actions of those terrorists who use real bullets to kill real policemen? Would he also condemn the actions of those Members of this House who encourage terrorism, be it by Sinn Fein or by Colonel Gadaffi?

Mr Barry. — I admit that when referenda were held in the area referred to by the honourable Member the people who voted in those referenda said they wanted to remain part of the United Kingdom. I believe that a united Ireland in which both traditions can live in peace and harmony is the ideal solution to the problems that now face all the people of Ireland. But I believe that that can only be achieved by peaceful means. I am much more vehement in my condemnation of the men of violence than the honourable Member who has just spoken, because I believe that what they are doing further postpones the day when the people of Ireland from both traditions can live together in peace and reconciliation. Therefore my condemnation of them is much louder and more vehement and spoken with greater conviction since, in contrast to the Member who has just spoken here, it is based on first-hand knowledge. I absolutely agree with him about the men of violence who take lives and who postpone the day when the people of Ireland can be united. I agree with him on that point.

Mr Coste-Floret (RDE). — (*FR*) One of the tasks of the European Parliament is to try and maintain peace between Member States, and for this reason I regard Mr MacSharry's question as very appropriate. I should like to put the following supplementary question to the President-in-Office of the Council. Bearing in mind that circumspection may well be a political virtue, but that it ceases to be such when it leads to evasiveness, can the Council tell us, yes or no, whether it intends to deal with this question and make proposals?

Mr Barry. — In my very first reply, when I spoke as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, I answered that question. Since then I have been answering supplementary questions speaking as Irish Foreign Minister. The reply I gave as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers was that the competence of the Council of Ministers of the EEC is confined to those matters covered by the Treaties.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — I understood the President-in-Office to say that he had brought the work of the New Ireland Forum to the attention of the various Member States of the EEC. Perhaps he could enlarge on this, please?

Mr Barry. — I was quite careful to say that the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers had not done that. It was the Irish Foreign Minister as Minister for Foreign Affairs for Ireland that took it to various member governments in the Community, not the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.

President. — We proceed with the questions addressed to the Foreign Ministers. I call Question No 60, by Mrs Dury (H-93/84):

Subject: visit by Mr Botha to certain countries of the European Community

According to Mr Tindemans, Belgian Minister for Foreign Relations, in an address to the Chamber of Representatives on 8 June 1984, 'no concessions were made during the talks with the South African Ministers'.

The Minister also stated: 'nevertheless, I believe that our position has been made clearer'.

Did those Foreign Ministers who had talks with the South African Ministers confer with one another following Mr Botha's visit and if so, on what points?

What action do they intend to take to exert continued pressure on South Africa?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — The 10 Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have not discussed the visit to Europe by Mr Botha. The Ten have made known their abhorrence and opposition to South Africa's apartheid policies on numerous occasions. They have also expressed their conviction that peaceful change in South Africa is urgently necessary. To this end they maintain a critical dialogue with South Africa and exert the collective weight of the European Community to influence South Africa to end the apartheid system and to build a society based on the principles of freedom and justice for all.

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) I am very pleased that you find it possible to answer my question, as there have been certain events in South Africa that lead us to believe that what Mr Botha referred to as a relaxation of the situation is in fact a red herring. As we see it, Mr Botha has no intention of reducing apartheid. Thus, it strikes us on the basis of the boycott of the elections in South Africa and the recent rioting, that the Community should take certain action.

Obviously, I was very disappointed by your reply since I feel that the European Community is responsible for Mr Botha's actions in so far as it has done nothing to restrain him. Not only has it failed to bring its political pressure to bear, but we also get the impression that the moral pressure which it should bring to bear in the interests of those suffering under the apartheid regime has been very meagre compared with the extent of their suffering.

President. — I should like to remind the honourable Member that supplementary questions must be actual questions and not declarations or speeches.

Mr Barry. — I am not sure that the honourable Member is aware that the Ten met in political cooperation yesterday in Dublin and that one of the matters they discussed was South Africa. I think the best reply I can give to the Member's supplementary question is to read out the statement that was issued. The declaration by the Ten on South Africa was issued after that.

The Ten discussed the recent events in South Africa, in particular the elections to the coloured and Indian assemblies, the arrests and detentions of leading figures involved in the boycott and the violence and rioting in the black townships. In so far as South Africa's new constitution is concerned, the Ten recalled that the international community has expressed its view on this in discussions of the Security Council Resolution 554 on 17 August.

The Ten consider that the recent violence and rioting in black townships such as Sharpeville reflected *inter alia* the frustration of black South Africans at their deliberate exclusion from South Africa's political life and at the denial of adequate political means through which to express their grievances. The Ten have consistently called for an end to apartheid and for constitutional arrangements in South Africa which will include all South Africans fully and equally in the political process. The recent events underline once again the need for early progress in this direction if further conflicts and violence are to be averted.

The Ten are also concerned at the arrest and detention of those involved in the boycott, in particular the leaders of the United Democratic Front and the Azanian People's Organization. They agreed that they should express this concern to the South African auth-

Barry

crities and seek the immediate release of those detained without charge. These native developments are in contrast to more positive developments in relations between South Africa and its neighbours.

Mr Seligman (ED). — I am glad the Minister mentioned that last phrase. There are a lot of positive things going on in South Africa as well as the ones referred to.

Is it not true that the elections to the coloured and Indian assemblies were boycotted as a measure to prevent some sort of solution to apartheid? In fact, they could have accepted that as the first step towards eliminating apartheid. They fear that this government will succeed in eliminating apartheid in that way, and therefore they are trying to prevent it by the uprisings in Sharpeville and by generally stimulating social disharmony. So, I do not think we should take sides in this matter at all.

Mr Barry. — I do not think what the honourable Member said is true. The fact is the elections were still only going to be representative of 27% of the population: 73% of the population of South Africa were debarred from voting anyway.

Mr Balfe (S). — The final clause of Mrs Dury's question refers to action taken to exert continued pressure on South Africa. May I ask the President-in-Office whether that action will include representations on behalf of Malesela Benjamin Moloise, who is under sentence of death, about whom an emergency resolution is tabled, whether it will concern the fate of Mark Hunter and Patricia and Derek Hanekom, who are accused of high treason in South Africa, about whom an emergency resolution is tabled, and whether it will concern the matters in the resolution on the situation in South Africa and the deteriorating situation referred to in the resolution by Mr Wurtz. Unless we use specific examples to put on pressure, the general statement — which is admirable — will not have its full impact.

Mr Barry. — I think some of my colleagues in political cooperation would not want me to give a specific reply on individual cases like the ones mentioned, because there is a view that the more often the well goes to the bucket, the less attention is paid to it. We should be quite selective and quite careful about what cases on human rights we bring to the governments of individual countries. Having said that, I can at the next meeting in political cooperation — if the Member wishes — bring to the attention of my colleagues the three cases mentioned by him and ask them if they wish to make in those specific cases representations to the government in question.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) This statement by the Foreign Ministers constitutes a new element which we had not taken into account. However, the problem referred to by Mrs Dury in her question surely remains — namely that while these events are taking place in South Africa, there are governments who are receiving the visit of the South African Prime Minister. So I should like to extend the final point in Mrs Dury's question by asking what kind of measures, particularly in the economic field, the Foreign Ministers intend to take to keep up pressure on South Africa. There is no specific reference to this in the statement. I should like to know what practical measures are to be taken in the economic field to help the people of South Africa in their struggle for the restoration of democracy in that country.

Mr Barry. — I did not expect that the statement I read out from the Council of Ministers yesterday would add a great deal to people's knowledge in this Parliament. What it does is to show how seriously the Foreign Ministers of the Ten take the situation in South Africa and to show that they are determined to express this concern to the South African authorities and seek the immediate release of those detained without charge. That is one of the points.

It is also true that the Ten have drawn up a Code of Conduct for South African subsidiaries of companies from the European Community, which is aimed at improving the lot of black workers in these companies.

I can also say that the situation in South Africa is kept under constant review by the Ministers working in political cooperation. Every opportunity is taken to bring home to the South African Government their sense of concern over what is happening there. Subsequent press reports make it clear that all the countries that received Mr Botha, when he visited them in the summer, took the opportunity to point out to him their concern, both as members of the Community and as individual countries, over what is happening in South Africa and the distaste they feel for the system of apartheid, which, as I said earlier, deprives 73% of the population — even under the limited system of elections that has been taking place in the last month — from taking part in the normal democratic process.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) In view of the fact that certain European Governments have received Mr Botha it would be only right if you were to recommend, in your capacity as President of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, that they receive the representatives of the black population too.

Certain representatives of the African National Congress are in fact in Europe in order to state their views at this time.

Would it not be a good idea if those responsible for

Lizin

political cooperation were to consider meeting these representatives or, at the very least, if they were to recommend those countries which received Mr Botha to right the balance by receiving the ANC representatives too? This, at any rate, is what Mr Tindemans has been asked to do.

(Applause)

Mr Barry. — As I said, these visits were of a bilateral nature and the Council of Ministers did not receive Mr Botha in that sense. If a representative of the majority population in South Africa wished to be received by those same countries, I do not see any reason why he or she should not be so received.

President. — I call Question No 61, by Mr Paisley (H-100/84):

Subject: effective system of extradition

Can the President-in-Office state when last was an effective system of extradition, which would operate throughout the whole Community, discussed by the Foreign Ministers and what progress has been made?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — This matter has not been discussed by the Foreign Ministers meeting in the framework of European political cooperation.

Mr Paisley (NI). — When the Republic of Ireland last held the presidency of the EEC, it made promises about progress towards a solution of this problem. Indeed there was the Dublin Agreement on the suppression of terrorism, Doc. 1-603/79. I am sure that the President-in-Office is aware that this Parliament has taken action on this, and I refer to the resolution adopted on 9 July 1982 (*Official Journal*, C 238, p. 82).

Has the President-in-Office studied that particular document, and especially paragraph 8, which says:

Considers that in the case of terrorist crimes alone the concept of political motive or political offence in the context of laws governing extradition should have no place within the external frontiers of the Community?

Could he give an assurance to the House that this matter will be brought before the Ministers of the Ten, as it is a matter that needs to be urgently considered?

Mr Barry. — Yes, perhaps it does, but it is not a matter that can be discussed in the framework of European political cooperation. I should say that the agreement to which the honourable Member refers has not yet been ratified by any Member State and will only

enter into force when all Member States have ratified it.

Mr Taylor (ED). — The Minister has spent most of this afternoon wearing his Irish Republican hat as a Minister from Dublin and refusing to answer as President-in-Office of the Council. Will he, continuing to wear his Irish hat, tell us why it is possible for well-known IRA terrorists to walk openly around the Dundalk part of the Irish Republic near the border with Northern Ireland? Is he aware that a Member of Parliament from his own Dublin Parliament confirmed last week that dozens of these IRA terrorists are walking around Dundalk and that they are not being 'lifted' by the Irish police? Would he agree that extradition can follow only when terrorists have been caught by the security forces? When he goes back to Dublin, will he see to it that the Irish police and army are sent into Dundalk to clean up that area of IRA terrorists?

President. — Mr President-in-Office, before I ask you to answer, I have to say to Mr Taylor that I cannot, as chairman of this sitting, accept his allegation that the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers has not answered the questions put to him in his capacity as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. He has done so in every case. In some cases he has added some words in his other capacity as a national Minister. In no case has he omitted to answer on behalf of the Council of Ministers, as indeed is his duty.

It would have been *my* duty to remind him if he had not done so. The fact that I did not proves that he has in every case answered on behalf of the Council of Ministers.

I could not let that go.

Mr Taylor (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President, I did not say that the Minister had not answered questions. He certainly answered questions as President-in-Office. He then proceeded to give further answers wearing his Irish hat and gave more time to his Irish propaganda answers than he did as President-in-Office of the Council to answering EEC questions.

President. — I accept your second version, Mr Taylor. If I remember aright, in the first instance you did say that he had not always answered in his capacity as President-in-Office of the Council. That has now been corrected. Therefore, I now call on the Minister to answer your question.

Mr Barry. — For the record, in only two questions out of 12 did I wear my Irish Foreign Minister hat. For

Barry

the others, I was speaking in my capacity as President-in-Office of the Council.

I am very sorry that Mr Taylor has introduced this old chestnut, which should have been well and truly buried long, long ago. Mr Taylor knows very well that if there is a shred of evidence to back up what he has said here, the people about whom he is speaking *can* be prosecuted under the Criminal Law Jurisdiction Act of 1976. For the education of the House, that Act allows people who are wanted for a crime in either jurisdiction to be charged with the crime in the other. It has happened on only one occasion in eight years, to the best of my recollection. On only one occasion in eight years has that Act been used by the people whom Mr Taylor professes to represent. If there are any other well-known criminals walking the streets of Dublin as he alleges, then let the evidence be produced and let them be charged under the Criminal Law Jurisdiction Act of 1976. If they are found guilty, they will be dealt with.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — The President-in-Office has partly answered the question that I proposed to ask I proposed to ask him if he agreed with me that a corrupt political system in Northern Ireland has spawned an overflow of discontented people who have plagued and afflicted the part of Ireland that is peacefully and usefully governed. Would he agree with me that the authorities in Northern Ireland have been reluctant to use the legislation enacted and the agreement reached by the two governments because this might be seen as a measure of cooperation between the two countries? This would appear to civilized people to be a useful and sensible solution, but solutions involving cooperation are not wanted by the present Northern Ireland authorities. They would much prefer to make allegations.

Would the Minister agree with me that they would much prefer to make allegations of terrorists roaming freely in the South of Ireland than to use the legislation which has been put there for the purpose of resolving the problem? Would the Minister confirm that in one case where an extradition was effected by the authorities in the South of Ireland on evidence produced by the authorities in the North, the authorities in the North of Ireland have so far failed to come up with a trial for the so-called criminal who was extradited?

Mr Barry. — I can confirm everything that Mr McCartin says. Just for the record, let me say that this Act, which was introduced by both governments to cope with the problem outlined here by Mr Taylor, has been used on only nine occasions: once only by the authorities in the North of Ireland and eight times by the Dublin Government. That shows you the seriousness with which they are tackling these criminals roaming the streets of Dublin, according to Mr Taylor.

President. — At its author's request Question No 62 is postponed until the next part-session.

I call Question No 63, by Mrs Lizin (H-127/84):

Subject: the Pegard company: refusal of an export licence

As a result of an arbitrary decision by the Belgian authorities, the Pegard company, based in Andenne, was refused an export licence for the Soviet Union, in respect of machine tools which, as the Belgian Minister for External Relations has himself confirmed in various notes, are not covered by any form of military secrecy.

Did the Belgian Minister for External Relations, who used the attitude of Cocom as a pretext for his refusal, refer the Pegard case for discussion in political cooperation? Secondly, do the Ministers intend in future to hold consultations prior to meetings with Cocom, a body which manifestly sets out to protect American undertakings from European competition on certain specific markets?

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — The question does not fall within the scope of the European Communities meeting in political cooperation.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) In so far as this question concerns the Pegard company — which is a private company — it obviously does not fall within the scope of political cooperation. On the other hand, it is somewhat less obvious that the idea of the various Member States coordinating their positions in preparation for the Cocom meetings should not fall within the scope of political cooperation. I should be grateful if the President-in-Office could tell us, at the institutional level, on what grounds he claims that the idea of introducing cooperation and organizing a meeting between the various Member States to discuss the topics to be dealt with at the Cocom meetings and decide on the position it intends to adopt is not a matter for political cooperation, since it is high time Europe took a united stand *vis-à-vis* the United States on the question of export of a strategic nature, with a view to establishing a sufficiently strong position from which they can defend their rights to export what they want without having to knuckle under to the wishes of the United States. What, therefore, is the legal basis for your claim to the effect that prior cooperation in preparation for Cocom meetings does not concern the Ministers meeting in political cooperation?

Mr Barry. — Cocom, which is a NATO body, does not concern the Ministers meeting in political cooperation, because they are not all members of NATO. My own country is not a member of NATO and therefore does not discuss NATO and NATO-related subjects.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) With regard to the last point made by the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, I should like to ask him a question.

A few years ago Greece became a Member of the European Community, not of Cocom. I would therefore ask him to tell me what links there are between the institutions of the European Community and Cocom, since despite the fact that the President-in-Office has told us today that nine countries belong to NATO and one does not, many publications and decisions of the EEC institutions and the committee's lists prove, with regard to relations with the Socialist countries, that the European Community carries out the instructions of Cocom. Consequently, the President-in-Office should, since he actually mentioned the subject of the nine members, state categorically what the relations are between the European Community and Cocom, so that we know whether Greece, by joining the EEC, also became a member of Cocom.

Mr Barry. — If the honourable Member was speaking about a coordination committee in relation to NATO and the Community, there is no such body. The NATO organization is entirely separate from the Community, and it just happens that there are nine members of the Community who are members of NATO. NATO matters are not discussed at any level in the Community, nor is there any coordination committee between the two.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) This is not a question to the President-in-Office of the Council, but to the President of the Parliament.

This is supposed to be Question Time and we are trying to obtain answers. The President-in-Office of the Council tells us that NATO-related subjects do not fall within the scope of political cooperation, while it is quite clear from discussions within the context of political cooperation that security is indeed a matter for political cooperation.

Mr President, you must either do something to ensure that the Members of this Parliament receive serious answers to serious questions aimed at furthering the cause of political cooperation, or you are not doing your job properly. I should like you to ask whether security is a matter for political cooperation, yes or no. The answer is, I think, quite clear.

To return to my question. Why cannot the Member States hold preparatory consultations prior to meetings with Cocom, regardless of whether they are members of NATO or not?

President. — Mrs Lizin, I am terribly sorry but it is not for the President of this Parliament to pass judgment on the contents and relevance of answers given

by the President-in-Office of the Council or of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. Like yourself, all I can do is listen politely to the questions put by the honourable Members and the answers given by the Commissioners or Ministers. It is then for each of us to make up his own mind as to the value of the answers given.

Question Time is closed.¹

6. *Accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community — Negotiations on the accession*

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

- the statement by the Commission on progress in the negotiations on the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community;
- the oral question with debate (Doc. 2-438/84) by Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), Lord Douro, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, and Mrs Veil, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Council of the European Communities:

Subject: Negotiations for the accession of Spain and Portugal

In view of the European Council decision at Fontainebleau that the negotiations for the accession of Spain and Portugal should be completed by 30 September at the latest, will the President-in-Office of the Council report to Parliament on the current state of the negotiations?

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today's debate is further evidence of the interest that Parliament has always shown in this problem, which is so vital to the future of the Community. Now that we have embarked on the final phase of the negotiations on the accession it is appropriate to sum up the situation and come to some conclusion on how matters should proceed.

To start, let us look at the position as it stands. Progress has been made since the first agreements were concluded in March 1982. Problems in some areas affecting both countries have been solved, either entirely or in their most essential aspects, and these are transport, regional policy, capital movement, harmonization of legislation, environment and consumer protection, Euratom research, right of establishment, economic and financial affairs and aspects of taxation.

¹ See Annex.

Natali

In the case of Spain there is also the question of patents and with Portugal the customs union, the ECSC and foreign relations. Occasionally there are some isolated points still to be cleared up in these overall areas and these points could become important as events take their course.

The agreements so far reached will be considered final only within the context of the overall agreement to be established when the negotiations are brought to a close. The main areas still to be negotiated are social affairs, agriculture, fisheries, institutions, own resources and relations between the applicant countries during the transitional period. As far as Portugal is concerned the problem of patents remains unsolved whereas in the case of Spain there are still a number of important points in areas in which the negotiations have already reached an advanced stage such as the Customs Union, the ECSC, external relations and finally a particular area, the Canary Islands.

This brief review of progress to date differs from one country to the other depending on the size of each dossier and the various problems specific to each country. During the negotiations the Commission is responsible for the drawing-up of proposals and the Commission would not be performing its duties correctly if it did not take account of the whole economic, political and social fabric which forms the background of any negotiations on this scale, as well as its obligations under the terms of the Treaties.

Mr President, I do not feel that it is right at this point to become more immersed in the details of the negotiations in progress, which really are the business of the Member States. However, in view of the political commitment undertaken at highest level in order to bring to a conclusion a programme launched some seven years ago I feel I should state my views to the House on a number of matters. The negotiations, as I mentioned earlier, are centred at the moment primarily on agriculture, fisheries, social affairs, and, in the case of Spain, the dismantling of ECSC tariffs. Obviously, there are other minor problems under discussion or still to be broached. At this point, however, I should like to limit my remarks to the obstacles we encounter in those areas which from the outset we knew would be of particular interest both for the Member States and the applicant countries.

After the two last sessions of ministerial negotiations there is evidence of a lack of progress which is a clear indication of the real problems hampering efforts to find sensible solutions which neither jeopardize the fundamental principles of the Community *acquis*, the protection of which is the main aim throughout the negotiations, nor which preclude the possibility of smoothly absorbing the two countries into the Community. However, should the negotiations be increasingly hampered by a lack of progress, I see little time left in which to get them moving again. The Commission is fully aware of the problems currently affecting

the common agricultural policy, including those relating to agricultural aspects of the accession negotiations. I refer to example to the proposals made in this respect, the first of which date back to 1980. However, it is illogical on the part of the Member States to proclaim that they want to bring the negotiations on accession to a close in the near future while at the same time each Member State on its own account introduces requirements which are tantamount to genuine preconditions. Changes to the *status quo* of the Community which are implicit in steps to safeguard this or that price level or level of expenditure should not be the subject of impromptu decisions nor are they conducive to reconciling the various points of view and interests which underlie the Community process. In the context of the accession negotiations it is not possible to bring forward decisions on the solution of certain problems connected with the future of the CAP without running the risk of postponing indefinitely the conclusion of the negotiations. In contrast, there can be no guarantee that the progress still to be achieved in these areas can be achieved if, meeting for meeting, stands are taken up on issues of principle. To speak of the principle of balance, progress and reciprocity in general terms without putting forward firm proposals to serve as a basis for bringing the sides closer together with a view to achieving new and faster progress is another way of keeping the negotiations marking time.

Let me be clear, agriculture is not our sole concern. As far as fisheries are concerned the initial positions adopted can be described as anything but conciliatory. Over the next few days and following a large number of new contacts and new studies the Commission will submit new proposals for solutions which it hopes will take the negotiations into a more positive, and dynamic climate. As regards social affairs the solution achieved must be an equitable one which takes account of some fundamental rights.

Clearly, the weeks to come will be decisive and for all the parties involved the time has come to practice what they preach. The time has come to stop using the enlargement negotiations to solve problems which are in no way connected with the accession negotiations and the time has come to reconcile the interests of each Member with the overriding interest of the Community.

Yesterday's informal meeting in Dublin — an initiative of the Irish presidency to whom I should like to express my compliments not only for the meeting in Dublin yesterday but also for all that was done during the earlier sessions of the negotiations — can be considered as an appraisal of the Community's requirements. Let us hope that the same is true of all the parties involved.

In the wake of the decisions taken by the Member States to welcome Portugal and Spain into the Community and to achieve their accession by a certain date

Natali

it is the Commission's task, on the basis of the proposals it put forward, to prepare the optimum conditions for the functioning of the enlarged Community.

To this end it has played and will continue to play its part by making available all its inventiveness so that the remaining difficulties can be overcome and the grand plan which the Community has set itself can finally become reality.

The progress achieved along this road from the first agreements reached in 1982 gives us confidence for the future. We can state with satisfaction that after much work we are now reaching the end of what really has been an obstacle course. Commitments have been undertaken, dates have been fixed. Nobody more than the Commission hopes so fervently that these commitments will be honoured. Enlargement is not only a commercial and financial transaction. The Community cannot be a mere juxtaposing of material interests which in themselves are perfectly legitimate. For us all the Community is also and primarily something else — an on-going quest for the basis of a common future. Enlargement is an integral part of this never-ending challenge which requires the Community to seek continuous progress in order to survive.

Of course there have been breakdowns, mishaps and disappointments in the past and there will be more in the future. However, I think that the disappointments of the past few years have been so numerous because they have been swelled by the disappointment over a breakdown of the accession negotiations. The minutes of the ministerial conference at which the failure of the talks was admitted after seven years of waiting and effort would sound like an epitaph which, I am certain, nobody wishes to write or sign.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR FANTI

Vice-President

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* We put this question at the end of July. At that time, we did not know what the situation would be like at the beginning of September. Nevertheless, I believe we were right about what we thought would happen. I hope I will receive a firm answer from the President-in-Office of the Council, because I have here his press bulletin from the beginning of this month which actually shows very clearly what the situation is at the moment. It says that the President-in-Office spoke very strongly to his colleagues about the excessively slow pace of the accession negotiations with Spain and Portugal, and this was in September! There was therefore no speed-up in

the negotiations in July, August or at the beginning of September. This is what the President-in-Office of the Council has said. I hope he is not now going to declare that it was all wrong.

Furthermore, it was entirely the fault of the Member States, according to him. I hope he is not now going to tell us that Spain and Portugal have not yet stated their positions because according to the Council President's statement of 4 September, it was the fault not of the applicants but of the Member States.

In Fontainebleau, as had already happened several times at previous summit conferences, the heads of government of the European Community reiterated that they were in favour of accession. This House has repeatedly made it clear that apart from Spain and Portugal no other States have applied to join the European Community. It has also stated that Spain and Portugal, being democratic States with indivisible links with Europe's history and culture, have a right to become members of the European Community. They have the same right as the current Member States. Therefore, these declarations of the heads of government are in line with the position of this House and it is about time this was actually put into effect because otherwise it could be suspected that some heads of government are saying they are in favour of accession whilst in reality not wanting it at all.

In the words of the Irish President-in-Office of the Council, if the experts make no headway in the preparations by 17 or 18 September, that is, by the next meeting of the foreign ministers at the beginning of next week, other procedures will have to be set in motion. I would like to know what procedures he is thinking of, and I agree with him entirely that, if the Council of Ministers persists in its failure, it will in fact be time for the President-in-Office to do as he said and set his procedures in motion. I am pleased by his statement that he is tired of hearing and repeating the same old points both within the Council and at the meetings with the Spaniards. This House especially is tired of hearing the same old statements and reassurances! I only hope that the President-in-Office is not now going to say that we have increased the peace of negotiations since July or worked intensively towards accession since this or that date, or that our efforts have led to better understanding between the partners and that we can now expect definite positions to be adopted. Or that intensive consultations are being conducted to enable us to take a decision. I do not wish to hear any of this any longer because this is precisely the sort of waffle the Irish President-in-Office spoke out against in his press statement! It is no good to me either to hear that meetings are now taking place very much more often. In my view there is only very little time left. I therefore hope the President-in-Office will tell us quite frankly what is actually to be done. This House has taken a stance on these matters very often, in resolutions passed in 1979, 1981, 1983 and 1984, and we have also expressed our opinions on

Arndt

individual matters. Now no one can talk himself out of it anymore by saying that something has yet to be clarified. Without repeating it in detail here and now, I consider the Commission's position generally acceptable that a clear offer should be made to both applicant countries.

However, I would also like to express a wish to the Commission. I do not know whether it is correct or not, but I have been told by representatives of Spain and Portugal that at times when papers have to be drawn up, it is said to be not possible for the moment because, for example, some official or other, say in the Fisheries department, is still on holiday and will not be back before the middle or end of September. I hope there will be no more excuses like this, because no one in Europe would understand it if, one day, it was said that no agreement could be worked out because this or that Commission official was absent, and therefore the accession of Spain and Portugal had to be postponed for six months or a whole year. Action should therefore be taken now to ensure that such assertions propagated within the Spanish and Portuguese delegations are incorrect and that, in such cases, the officials are not on holiday but working because we are short of time. This House wishes to see these things brought to a conclusion. The groups which tabled the question will at the end of the debate table a motion which I hope will be adopted by a broad majority, even if the occasional difference of opinion remains on specific matters which perhaps ought to be discussed again.

However — and I would like to stress this particular point — it is no longer a question of simply the accession of Spain and Portugal but of the Community's very existence. The two things have namely become interlocked, and we must be aware of this. There is a whole group of national parliaments which will provide not a penny more for the European Community if additional resources are not linked with the accession of Spain and Portugal. The European Community's precarious budget situation which we all know about has now been irrevocably linked with the accession of Spain and Portugal. This passage was approved by over 90% of the votes in this House. Anyone who is in favour of the continued existence of the European Community must now ensure that the negotiations on accession are finalized because the question of the financing of the European Community and that of the accession of Spain and Portugal are irrevocably linked with each other.

There will definitely be no increase in the European Community's own resources without a clear and positive decision in favour of enlargement! This is the position of this House and I hope the Council realizes this. It has had seven years' time for the negotiations. It knew how urgent they were. Parliament originally set the deadline of 1 January 1984. We were not satisfied when this deadline was postponed, but we cannot allow the accession of Spain and Portugal to be carelessly neglected and obstructed, and the European

Community practically destroyed as a result, simply because the Council of Ministers is incapable of doing its job!

(Applause)

Mr Barry, President-in-Office of the Council. — With your permission, Mr President, I shall first reply formally to the special-notice question and I should then like to convey to the House my impressions of the possibilities of early progress in the light of discussions that took place yesterday in Dublin.

I shall start the formal reply by thanking Mr Arndt for the question, which gives me an opportunity at the point nearest the latest set of negotiations of explaining to Parliament precisely where we are. When he was introducing his question, Mr Arndt quoted from remarks I had made to the Council a week last Monday and said that I had expressed my dissatisfaction with my fellow Council members over the slow pace of the negotiations and lack of flexibility. That is quite true, but he underscored that point by saying that I had not included Spain and Portugal and that therefore the fault of the delay in negotiations lay with the Council members and not with the applicant countries. In fact, at the end of that statement I said that this message concerning the need for greater flexibility and determination in tackling the problems of enlargement, which were difficult for both member countries and the applicant countries, applied just as forcefully to the applicant countries as to the Member States and that I should also, therefore, be conveying it appropriately to them. So, while we have been tardy in our responses, there has also been some neglect on their part in responding as quickly as would be desirable to papers put to them by the Commission and Council up to now.

The European Council's confirmation at Fontainebleau of the Community's political will to bring the accession negotiations with Spain and Portugal to a rapid conclusion has meant that since July we have stepped up the already brisk pace at which these negotiations had been conducted in the first half of the year. At the moment, important chapters have still to be settled — agriculture, fisheries, social affairs, institutions and the Community's own resources. In the case of Spain, there is also the question of the duration of the transitional period for industrial tariffs and the ECSC chapter. Since July, the Community has been working steadily to ensure that these chapters can now enter the final phase of the negotiations.

Thanks to the efforts made during our meetings with the Spanish delegation in June and July and again quite recently, we have gained a better understanding of the points of general concern to the Spanish delegation as regards agriculture, the transitional period for industrial tariffs and the ECSC. We should now be able to obtain clear statements of position from our

Barry

Spanish partners in response to those put to them by the Community.

In the case of Portugal, many points concerning agriculture were clarified with the Portuguese delegation at the beginning of July. The Community was therefore able at the beginning of this month to state a position to the Portuguese delegation on most of the problems outstanding, both horizontal and sectoral. We can therefore consider that the negotiations with Portugal on this chapter are now in the final stage.

We are aware that we have still to inform Spain and Portugal of our position on two major agricultural sectors: vegetable oils and fats, and wine. Intensive efforts are currently being made so that the Community can state its position in these areas to our two partners.

On fisheries, another vital chapter in our negotiations with Spain and Portugal, there have already been important contributions from both parties. Discussion and time to assess the results thereof have proved both useful and necessary. The Commission will shortly be submitting the results of its reflections to the Council, and we shall then inform Spain and Portugal of our position to bring this chapter into its final phase of negotiation.

The chapter on social affairs is also of vital importance. It is a sensitive issue both for our two partners and for the Community itself. The Community has still to complete its position on various problems arising in this chapter, and this it intends to do in the very near future. We shall then have to make a determined start on the final phase of the negotiations in this important area.

With regard to institutional questions, the chapter traditionally discussed in the final phase of negotiations, the Community was able to put its position to Spain and Portugal in July and complete it at the beginning of this month. We now await our partners' reactions.

The chapter on the Community's own resources belongs to the final stage in negotiations and therefore will be discussed in due course. We are planning a very heavy schedule of meetings with our partners to tie up the negotiations in such a way that we achieve an overall balance in the solutions which have to be found to the problems arising in the main chapters.

Mr President, I said at the beginning that following my formal reply I would like to convey some additional impressions based in particular on the special informal meeting which the President convened in Dublin yesterday. I must say frankly to you, and I know I am addressing a parliament of politicians, that I have been disappointed at the slow progress in negotiations, in particular in the talks with Spain. I paid an official visit to both Lisbon and Madrid in July in

order to assess the mood there at first hand and to show the Presidency's deep commitment to completing the negotiations. There was understandable concern in both those capitals that the end was not yet clearly in sight for negotiations, which have now been continuing, as Mr Arndt said, for seven years.

I should like to pay tribute here to the Commission and to Vice-President Natali for the amount of work they have been putting in over the last few months and the sense of urgency which they have brought to the completion of these negotiations. My view, which I know is shared by both Commission and Parliament, is that continuing drifts of this kind are unacceptable. In all these circumstances, the presidency decided last week to make an appeal and, indeed to issue a warning about the state of the negotiations.

I said to my Council colleagues on 3 September that I now felt that we had little or no possibility of completing the negotiations by 30 September. This in itself would not disturb me greatly. It is not a matter of vital importance in my view whether the negotiations are completed on or shortly after 30 September. What is vital, however, is that there is no substantial slippage in our timetable. Spain and Portugal must join the Community on 1 January 1986, and there can be no departure from that date.

(Applause)

This is an immutable date, and working back from it the negotiations must be completed in the immediate future.

I want to state frankly, as I stated to my colleagues in the Council last week, that if we wish to secure this early agreement we need the maximum degree of political will and flexibility both by the Member States in arriving at a common Community position and by the applicant countries, Spain and Portugal. I must also say to you that I am extremely pleased by the response of my colleagues on that occasion. We followed up this commitment to higher political input in the negotiations that took place at a most wide-ranging, valuable and positive informal meeting in Dublin yesterday. We identified openings yesterday and, to put it briefly, we now have a much clearer picture of the way forward.

In restricted session at next Monday's Council, we shall continue our general consideration of the negotiations. I hope to submit a composite text to my colleagues to assist this overview. I intend that this text should cover all areas of the negotiations apart from fisheries, wine and the Canaries. The Commission's proposals on fisheries are expected on Friday. On wine — as I was particularly concerned about the difficulties in this field — I convened an informal meeting yesterday with the countries most directly concerned, i.e., France, Italy, Germany and Greece. We agreed at that meeting that the Agricultural Ministers should

Barry

submit draft proposals for a solution at the Foreign Affairs Council to be held on 1 October.

To sum up, Mr President, the way ahead is going to be unprecedentedly difficult. We have to complete in an extremely short time negotiations that have been going on for seven years. But despite the politically sensitive and difficult problems posed for all Member States and, indeed, for Spain and Portugal, we must and will complete them. The European Council has given us a clear mandate. This Parliament firmly supports that mandate. It would be disastrous for Europe, politically and psychologically, if we were to fail now. To paraphrase a most distinguished nineteenth-century Irish leader, statesman and parliamentarian, nobody has a right to set a boundary to the onward march of the enlargement of Europe. The Irish Presidency will not be found wanting in working for this central objective of European policy.

(Applause)

President. — I have received eight motions for resolutions, with a request for an early vote pursuant to Rule 42(5) of the Rules of Procedure, to wind up the debate on the oral question tabled by Mr Arndt and others.

These are as follows: motion tabled by Mr Ligios and others on behalf of the Group of the EPP; motion tabled by Mr Galluzzi and others (Doc. 2-529/84); motion tabled by Mrs Piermont and others (Doc. 2-530/84); motion tabled by Mrs Ewing and others on behalf of the EDA Group (Doc. 2-533/84); motion tabled by Mr de la Malène on behalf of the same group (Doc. 2-534/84); motion tabled by Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the Group of the European Right (Doc. 2-535/84); motion tabled by Mr Prag on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 2-539/84); motion tabled by Mr Arndt on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 2-540/84).

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

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, you said that there were 11 motions for resolutions — at least that is what the interpreter said. I made a quick note of the names you gave and I can only count eight on my list.

You gave only eight names after announcing that there were 11 motions. Why this discrepancy?

President. — Mr Sutra, that was undoubtedly a mistake in translation. There are only eight motions.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Some of the political groups worked out a compromise motion yesterday. Have you already received this compromise motion, which

would replace some of the other motions, including our own? You certainly did not mention it. It would be better if Parliament were informed that there was also a compromise motion tabled by several groups in the form of an amendment, so that this could be taken into account in the debate. This compromise amendment replaces, for instance, the motion tabled by the Socialist Group as well as those tabled by the Christian Democrats.

President. — Mr Arndt, this compromise amendment will of course be voted on tomorrow. This evening we are voting only on the requests for an early vote, so that in the meantime the text can be distributed to all the Members and the vote tomorrow can be taken in full knowledge of the facts.

Mr Prag (ED). — I think you have now explained your earlier statement, Mr President, in fact the vote now will be only on the request for an early vote, but the actual vote on the resolution to wind up the debate, including the compromise resolution, will be tomorrow as set out in the agenda.

Mr Didò (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, the question of Spain and Portugal's accession is becoming an increasingly important political issue while at the same time we must deplore the petty squabbling on problems which are clearly not major ones and which are supposed to explain why the negotiations cannot be successfully completed on schedule. What we have heard today from the Commission and the Council gives us serious grounds for concern. There are no really valid reasons why the negotiations cannot be concluded by September but still in time to abide by the date of 1 January 1986 as the date on which these two countries join the Community.

Leaving aside the reasons which prompted the Member States to agree in principle on the accession of these countries, I should like to remind the House that it is not only a question of what is best for the people of these two countries or of a question of a sort of guarantee to consolidate their newly won democracy. If there is an advantage in enlargement then it is for both sides. History has shown that when democracy and liberty are struck down or dealt a lethal blow in one of the countries in that part of Europe the danger is deadly for all our countries and, if it is our ambition to have Europe play a balancing role in the name of peace and progress for our own countries and for the world, in particular with regard to our relations with Africa and Latin America, there can be no doubt that the contribution which Spain and Portugal can make to the strengthening of this role is of fundamental importance.

It is for this reason that we want the political aspects, which must be considered as priority aspects, to be given priority in the negotiations. It cannot be denied

Didò

that there are particular problems in some areas of agricultural and social policy. However, we must admit that the complexity of certain problems is not a result of the enlargement of the Community but rather the result of the delays and difficulties which are hampering the process of integration among the Ten. Thus there are problems which we must all face together because they are problems which above all, are linked to interests which, in many instances, are primarily of a corporate nature and I refer in particular to the problems of vegetable oils, wine and, in certain aspects, social policy.

I should not like to dwell here on the merits of individual problems because the Commission has already submitted proposals which we think might prompt equitable solutions for the various controversial issues. The point I would like to emphasize and which has already been made by Mr Natali, is that it is unacceptable for the urgency of these negotiations to be used as an excuse to change the substance of the Community's *acquis* or even call into question agreements such as those recently concluded between the Agricultural Ministers on vegetable oils.

We should remember, therefore, that conditions exist which will allow equitable solutions to be found in all the negotiations so that Spain and Portugal can join on schedule. This is why we, as the Socialist Group — and I am convinced most members of this Parliament — call upon the governments urgently, and consequently the Council of Ministers, to abandon the instrumental attitude which has thwarted the conclusion of this stage of the negotiations and consequently the implementation of the political will which this Parliament has always expressed, which is to have Spain and Portugal in our Community on 1 January 1986.

A disastrous failure of these negotiations would be a sign that the European Community has failed. For all of us this would be an intolerable prospect. This is why we expect and require that all the deadlines set for the conclusion of the negotiations should be respected.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, in this House, people unfortunately talk all too often as if, by agreeing to Spain's accession, we were giving her a present in a one-sided act of generosity on our part. It is almost as if it is being assumed that we are doing all the giving, whereas it is a case of *do ut des* — in other words, us giving our Iberian friends something but receiving much more in return.

Of course Spain needs the European market. But the market existed long before the EEC. Most trade flows date back to the Middle Ages. The isolation of the Iberian Peninsula from the rest of Europe only began when King Louis XIV proudly declared that the Pyrenees no longer existed — which should be a warning to us to be careful with high-flown political phrases. But up to a relatively short time ago we were also the

natural market for Spanish agricultural products, whereas our industries found important markets in and via Spain. It was only as a result of the development of the EEC and, not least, British accession to our Community, that this situation changed. The traditional markets for Spanish agriculture and fisheries were restricted as a result. Many of those who benefited from this development were countries outside Europe which simply took advantage of a favourable situation or special treaties with the EEC.

Europe is still threatened by the imperialistic, hegemonic Soviet empire. We must therefore think of our security first and foremost. Today, this means above all a free Mediterranean. The Soviet Union has no chance of extending her territories unless she manages to weaken our strong position in northern Europe politically or strategically from the south. None of the Mediterranean countries has the strength to defend its region against a superpower. In actual fact, the only factors that count there are the two world fleets: those of the Americans and the Soviets. The future depends on which of the two is able to stay there. This applies not just to us, but perhaps even more to the oil-producing countries of the Middle East.

The difficulty facing the Americans is that they only have one natural line of communication with their home ports: the Straits of Gibraltar. As a result, everything depends on whether the coasts along the Straits continue to remain in pro-Western hands. However, this can only be achieved in the long term by strengthening Spain's young democracy and accepting this country into our Community under tolerable economic conditions.

The upholding of democracy is the task of all of us, not just the Spaniards. The older Members of the House will recall that the fall of the Weimar Republic in Germany was caused not just by Hitler and his troops. The policies of the Western governments in particular also played a major role in it. If the Western powers had made the sort of concession to a man like Brüning that the National Socialists made to him shortly after, the course of German history would have been different. We should bear this in mind when considering our policy towards Spain and Portugal.

It is therefore more than regrettable that there has been hardly any talk about politics and security in our negotiations, and that so far, discussions have been mainly about material issues. You cannot solve minor problems if you lose sight of the main, overall target, because this is the most important of all. It has rightly been said that the only serious problem we have to deal with is the question of political will. Unfortunately, all too often I have the impression that our governments and the negotiators have not got it. In the case of Spain and Portugal, as in many other really important issues, the problem arises as to what we really want to do with Europe: create a large-scale EFTA, i.e. a free trade zone, or a genuine Community.

Habsburg

I am afraid that this is not always seen clearly enough because, in our negotiations with the Iberian Peninsula, we are acting as if we only wanted a free-trade zone. We may succeed in achieving this, but it would not be for long, because this European free-trade zone would be both rich and weak. And we know only too well that in a world full of marauders, weakness and riches are a fatal combination.

We should not forget, either, that Europe has a cultural role and what would our culture be without Spain and Portugal? On the day on which the Escorial is 400 years old, this question should not need asking. I therefore ask you to adopt the motion for a resolution to ensure that the Commission's work is speeded up.

(Applause from the centre and right)

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, this debate gives us another opportunity to repeat our desire to see Portugal and Spain join the Community on 1 January 1986. I should like to support the remarks made forcefully by Mr Arndt on behalf of the authors of this oral question. It was agreed at Fontainebleau that the negotiations should be concluded by the end of September. The President-in-Office of the Council has told us that that no longer seems possible; but he rightly points out that a delay of only a few weeks would not jeopardize the entry date of January 1986. Nevertheless, these negotiations clearly must be concluded within the next few weeks.

Every Member State at some point in the last few years has committed itself to seeing Spain and Portugal join the Community. They have done so as individual Member States, they have done so while they held the presidency of the Council — which, of course, every country has done during the long period of seven years that these negotiations have been going on.

I thought Mr Arndt made an interesting point about the link with the budget. It is certainly true of some national parliaments that an increase in the Community's own resources without the accession of Spain and Portugal would not be acceptable. One of the major purposes of increasing these resources is to accommodate within our budgetary resources the needs of Portugal and Spain. Therefore, those in all the Community institutions who agree that there should be an increase in our own resources should show similar dedication to the conclusion of these accession negotiations.

I was very encouraged by Mr Barry's report on yesterday's informal meeting in Dublin, which appears to have made quite a lot of progress. But I hope one or two principles will be understood by everyone. It would be unjust in every possible way if disagreements between Member States on how to solve our own

internal problems should postpone the date of accession. That would be absolutely unacceptable, in my opinion. Equally unacceptable would be any pressure brought upon Member States by non-member States who fear the implications of Spain and Portugal joining the Community, and I hope no Member State will allow itself to be deflected from its resolve by any such pressure.

So, Mr President, my group hopes that these negotiations will be carried on with the utmost diligence. We were pleased to hear the dedication of the Irish Foreign Minister, the President-in-Office of the Council, to concluding these negotiations. I hope he can persuade his colleagues in the Council to display similar dedication, and we wish him well.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Galluzi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I have listened with much interest to the reply of the President of the Council and must quite frankly admit that I was not able to understand fully, possibly owing to interpreting problems, what the real position of the Council is. Does it support the remarks, the criticism, which is also justified, contained — I think — in Mr Natali's report or not, and, primarily, leaving aside the generous but too general reaffirmation of the need to ensure accession by January 1986, what are the reasons for the *impasse* and what does the Council intend to do to overcome the problems?

We have been discussing these matters for many years and we are still not able to reach agreement on any major issue. Mr Natali has stated this and the President of the Council echoed his words — there is no agreement on social questions, there is no agreement on agricultural questions, on fisheries, on industrial issues, on the dismantling of tariffs or on the budget. In some instances — and they are not issues of secondary importance — the Community position has not yet even been presented and discussions will have to start all over again.

We are thus faced with the serious situation which not only almost irrevocably jeopardizes the 30 September deadline envisaged for the completion of the negotiations but also makes it very difficult for the agreed date of accession to be respected. This date, ladies and gentlemen, is not just any date and the political commitment is not just any political commitment — the date is a final deadline, the last date before the next Parliamentary elections in Spain. It is thus a date which if not respected will, in view of the possible changes in the situation and in relations, may mean that everything has to start all over again.

I feel that the problems affecting the negotiations are not due — or at least not mainly due — to the lack of imagination or flexibility of the negotiators. No, I believe that underlying the deadlock in the negotia-

Galluzi

tions there is a real turn of direction, a change of mind in progress in Community policy and, in particular, in the policy of some Member States. The spirit of maintaining the *status quo* is gaining ground or what is worse, there is a growing trend to consider Community matters reflected in the distorting mirror of close national interest. For some enlargement is not the political opportunity for renewal, not a vehicle for forging ahead in the light of the changes and new requirements which arise, towards European integration by giving the Community a more solid basis. Instead, enlargement is becoming a vehicle for escaping from these needs, which are growing more urgent by the day, for citing enlargement as an alibi from behind a screen of excuses based on the costs involved, which still have to be assessed in practice, to keep intact those structures and degenerate devices which are responsible for the crisis as a whole, the serious crisis in which the European Community currently finds itself.

This is the real reason for the *impasse* of the negotiations and the change of outlook with regard to enlargement. On the very subject of enlargement which initially, you remember Mr Natali, was considered a challenge, and an historic occasion to build an independent Europe and, today, it is viewed more and more with annoyance, as a source of trouble, as a price which now has to be paid for a commitment which, however, is a rhetorical commitment which is best paid as cheaply as possible and as late as possible.

This is why we believe that the accession of Spain and Portugal on 1 January 1986 is the touchstone of the Community's will to press on, to reject occlusion, nationalist narrow-mindedness and, above all, reject the illusions of those who think they can defend national interests by controlling expenditure and those who think that Europe is a fine thing provided the others foot the bill.

This is why we believe that the European Parliament has an important part to play, a part which cannot simply consist in restating its position in principle, its wish to see progress made and the negotiations concluded by January 1986. It must urge the Council to face up to its responsibilities by revealing the true positions and exposing the contradictions, the conditions, the ambiguities and preconditions imposed by this or that Member State.

Mr Natali, we agree with the critical remarks contained in your report and the steps which, I think, you proposed to break the deadlock in the negotiations. This is why we Italian Communists and Allies will vote in favour of the joint amendment in view of the commitment it expresses to bring the negotiations to a conclusion by the date in January in 1986. However, while voting in favour, we nevertheless feel that this amendment is inadequate, in part ambiguous, and that in certain aspects its wording is redolent of the negative thinking of some Member States. We therefore

commit ourselves to raise the problem again in the House so that it can be given the consideration it deserves, a genuine debate held and the Council and Commission and the other institutions in the Community called upon to shoulder finally and unequivocally, their responsibilities.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, taking the floor in this House today, I cannot help feeling that we never stop repeating ourselves. And it is rather distressing to think that this problem of enlargement, bound up with the other problems of the Community, has got caught up in the same kafkaesque circle — and I think we really can say that — as many other problems.

Although we have now set a date for enlargement, and a very precise one at that, we have a definite feeling of moving backwards instead of forwards.

However, speaking on behalf of the Liberal Group, I must stress the importance our group has always attached to Spain and Portugal's accession to the Community.

As I said, we had numerous debates on this subject during the previous legislative period, but all the same I believe it would not be wasting time to spell out once more the positions we have always maintained on this issue.

First, there is our basic position in favour of enlargement. And I would like to say that our support is all the greater the more Europe is threatened by international tension. For years, the people of Spain and Portugal have hoped to benefit from the guarantees and progress which the Community embodies for the citizens of our 10 countries. The totalitarian regimes to which they were subjected did not allow their countries to belong to the Community which, as you said, Mr Natali, is something rather different from an economic community and a simple grouping of financial interests. You also said that the Community was constantly trying to establish the basis for a joint future. We can only give our full backing to this point of view.

We also know that the Community — and this House has stressed this point on numerous occasions — wanted to be not just a cultural Community but a Community of basic rights endeavouring to ensure respect for the personal rights of the citizens of all our countries. That is why, now that Spain and Portugal have had all their democratic rights reinstated, these two countries should be able to enter the Community, and should not have the feeling that their wishes are being ignored, and our Community is closed to them. It would be dangerous for them and for us, because the stability of their democracy represents a guarantee

Veil

for the Community. Even if these democracies have slowly become stabilized, discouraging any move to try to destabilize them, we cannot ignore the people who dream of reverting to the former situation or others who hope to embroil these countries in new adventures. Need I remind you that these countries have a right to enter the Community? Therefore, we are in favour for this reason alone.

However, if we are in favour of enlargement and really want the Community to function as well as possible, this Community must be capable of genuinely responding to the aspirations of all its citizens: it must be in a position to function effectively. It must also be possible for enlargement to take place, if not in perfect conditions, then at least in reasonable conditions, with each party assuming its own responsibilities. This is vital since we believe the Community is a precious asset, imposing obligations and responsibilities on all of us.

In this regard, and I am not afraid of saying it — my speech on this point will perhaps be rather different and less optimistic than those of previous speakers — the negotiations now appear to be in a bad state and enlargement is at risk as a result. I must say that what Commissioner Natali said today about the Commission's efforts in the negotiations hardly reassured me: there were many uncertainties in what he said. I do not intend, either, to forget what Mr Thorn, the President of the Commission, has had to say on several occasions over the past few months with regard to the Community budget.

I will be told of course that it is not just a question of money. We know this and I said just now that the Community is a community of fundamental rights, a cultural community. We also know that it is in grave financial difficulties. Members will recall the debates we have had for years on this issue — Dublin, Stuttgart, Athens and Brussels, to name just a few. Some may have nurtured a little hope after Fontainebleau, but others were more sceptical.

We also know how disillusioned the people of Europe are when day-to-day problems are not settled, and there is a feeling that the Community is about to break up. The fine speeches are of course all very well but we know, too, that they are not enough for our fellow citizens who have to face up to real difficulties. They hear about budgetary problems — in fact they never stop hearing about them! But it is the same governments who are coming to us today and saying we really must sign, who are prepared to make hardly any compromises on these budgetary problems.

Well, we cannot tell our people, 'We are going to carry on regardless. The money is unimportant, we must show that our hearts are in the right place; we must be generous and show a bit more idealism! The only way is forwards and there is no alternative to signing. We shall see what happens; let Spain and Por-

tugal join.' I would say that, at the point we have reached, we have no right to do so because we have been given no assurance as far as the budget is concerned. I am drawing attention to this point because Mr Thorn told us in this very Chamber where Commissioner Natali is sitting today that the planned increase in own resources — the 1.4% which is under discussion — has already been fully absorbed by the financial problems of the Ten. We know this perfectly well. Now when we ask, 'How are we going to pay for the extra cost of enlargement?', there is no reply. When we ask the Commission how much enlargement is going to cost, we are told, 'We cannot put a figure on it for the moment, because we do not know what the terms of the agricultural agreements will be or how long the negotiations will take'.

Now I would like to be very frank: I do not think this is a responsible approach. This applies both to the Council and to us if we rush into this matter without knowing where we are heading. And above all we would not be adopting a responsible approach towards our fellow citizens. We have no right to use this double talk.

Small wonder that the people of Europe are disappointed and disillusioned by the Community! How could they have confidence in their European politicians, whether in this House or at the Council, when they see them, as it were, signing a blank cheque for the future?

I ask you, 'Who is going to pay for the future of Europe?'. Is it those towards whom the Community has already undertaken commitments — commitments which cannot be kept — for example the farmers? Is it those who hope to receive aid from the Social Fund as compensation for the disasters created by essential restructuring, and who cannot benefit from the vocational training they hoped to receive? Could the Esprit project, which we are finding so difficult to finance, inspire any enthusiasm in them? But where is the money to finance it? Somebody should tell us because I think there is a contradiction between what we are told has been settled and what has actually been done. We can see it in the 1984 budget about which we were told, 'Everything will be settled after Fontainebleau'. We thought we were finally going to be able to deal with new topics and that the Community had slightly easier times ahead of it. Not at all! We already know that for 1984 and 1985 there is a gap which cannot be filled. We are then told 'For 1985 there is a solution: let us go ahead and increase our own resources, let us raise them immediately to 1.4% and then we will be able to absorb the increase in the budget for 1985'. But this is clear proof that we need the 1.4% for the Community of Ten before enlargement comes into it.

However, that does not mean we must abandon enlargement. It simply means that when we have ambitions, we need the means to fulfil them! Once more, we see here as we see at the Council that everybody is

Veil

ready to move forward, everybody has grand designs and great ambitions, but when it comes to paying, there is nobody there. This is completely irresponsible! Our budget represents 2.5% of the budgets of all the countries in the Community, a point which the people of Europe do not realize, and with this 2.5%, we want to perform miracles for 12 countries. It is not possible: it is irresponsible. If it is our wish, and it is indeed that of the Liberal Group, that enlargement should be possible and be done properly, we must treat the budget issue in a responsible manner and realize that the planned increase in own resources will not enable us to achieve this, and that these issues, whether we like it or not, are linked. This is the only way the Community can move forward and be a Community in which we can maintain our confidence. It is precisely because we have confidence in it and love it that we are calling for a responsible approach and for this problem to be solved first of all.

(Applause)

Mr Barrett (RDE). — Mr President, I also welcome the proposed accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community, and I was glad to hear the President-in-Office of the Council say here this evening that 30 September was no longer the deadline for negotiations.

I suggest that the Community also needs to tackle its existing internal problems and to agree to provide additional funding to meet new demands on existing policies because of the increase in the size of the Community. In particular, there is a need for a long-term solution to the problem of financing the Community's budgetary requirements from its own resources.

The Commission has calculated that Spain and Portugal's accession will result in an overall net increase in expenditure of between 5% and 7%, assuming that existing spending policies are continued. At present some Member States do not appear to have the political will to face future requirements of the budget of the Community of Ten. Can we be sure that increased net funding of the magnitude required for a Community of Twelve will be forthcoming?

At present, the CAP is under continuing attack from strong consumer interests in the Community because of its effects on food prices and because of huge surpluses in some food products. The expansion of the Community will result in increased surpluses in Mediterranean products, such as wine, olive oil, lemons, etc., while increased demands for northern products such as beef and milk will not be sufficient to eliminate existing surpluses in these items.

In global terms, the accession of Spain and Portugal will increase the Community's utilized agricultural area by 34%, the added value of agriculture by 24%, while the number of consumers will only increase by

18%. The proportion of workers engaged in agriculture in Spain and Portugal is far higher than the Community's average, while their income is considerably below the Community average.

The Community adopted a common fisheries policy in January 1983 which is at best a fragile and much criticized policy. Fish prices have fallen dramatically in recent times. In my own country, prices have fallen in real terms by 52% since 1979, while costs have increased by 30%. In addition, fish stocks are decreasing dramatically in much of the Community waters. The accession of Spain and Portugal will result in a substantial increase in the numbers of fishing vessels, in fishing capacity, in fish production for human consumption, and will result in increased pressure on existing fish stocks. Unless serious account is taken of these questions during the negotiations, the existing fishing industry in the Community may well suffer a permanent decline.

It is my contention that the existing Regional Fund is too small to tackle seriously the existing regional inequalities within the Community of Ten. According to the Commission's second periodic report on the regions of Europe, regional disparities in production levels did not diminish during the 1970s and are still very marked. Again, according to the Commission, the regions with the most serious problems are situated on the periphery of the Community and include Ireland, Corsica . . .

President. — Mr Barrett, I am sorry to interrupt you, but you have exceeded your speaking time.

Mrs Piermont (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, we have already heard a lot of talk about specific problems and difficulties and about the budgetary questions. On behalf of the Green Alternative European Link I would like to highlight three of the many problems in order to clarify some fundamental misgivings.

Firstly, Spain and Portugal are to be subjected to the common agricultural policy and all its aims, as laid down in the EEC Treaty. These include increased productivity, so-called technological progress, chemical and biological rationalization, reduced employment — here as well — in other words a realignment towards the structurally and financially strong large farms promoted by the EEC. Who cares that this puts the kibosh on the Portuguese land reform, which was a result of the return to democracy supposedly welcomed by all democratic powers? Certainly not the agricultural machinery concerns or the food and chemical industries who sense juicy new spoils in Spain and Portugal, after enthusiasm for their products has subsided in central Europe because of, among other reasons, the adverse effects on health and the environment. Only when small and medium-sized farms in Spain and Portugal go to the wall in droves, and the

Piermont

tide of unemployment, which has already reached 20%, reaches flood proportions, will yet another country be deeply convinced of the blessings of EEC membership. Secondly, the prospects also appear gloomy from an ecological point of view. For example, Spanish ecologists say the EEC is pressing for the clearing of a further approximately 1 million hectares of olive groves because of the already unsettled olive oil problems — a million hectares of woodland corresponds to about one seventh of the woodland of the Federal Republic of Germany. Thus we maliciously and systematically reduce the possibility of hibernation for our songbirds, who do after all feed on insect pests. Goethe was in a position to write: the little birds in the wood are silent. In the future these words will become meaningless. The woods are dying off, there will no longer be birds to sing or remain quiet, nor will there be silence because the humming of flies and mosquitoes day and night will drive us mad, unless we over-retaliate with chemicals. We are at the same time well on the way towards following in the footsteps of the ancient Romans. One of their most famous deeds was the systematic felling of trees in the regions which they conquered. The completely bare rocks and landscape around the Mediterranean are a tribute to them today. Do we wish to be immortalized in such a manner?

Thirdly, this is a Parliament and not a barracks. According to the Treaties the European Community is a civilian union. But theory and practice do not coincide. For example, Chancellor Kohl, on a visit to Spain in May, voiced the opinion that for him membership of the EEC and membership of NATO belong together. Europe's businessmen cannot march separately from Europe's soldiers. Is it not a scandal that the promise of accession to the EEC should be used as a means to press for agreement to unpopular NATO membership? This pressure is exerted by EEC governments on the government of Spain which, true to the pecking order, exerts pressure to win over its whole population. Mice are caught with bacon, even if the bacon is not of first-class quality. The promised referendum on NATO membership becomes more and more diluted or fades silently from memory. It is the Spanish people who are left caught in the trap. Thus, little by little, the borders of the EEC and NATO countries coincide more and more. Turkey, which is a NATO member with a military regime and harbours a desire to join the EEC, can also be included in this context. The converse is also true; Austria, which according to Mr Zahorka has expressed an interest in EEC membership, has met with little response, because it wishes to remain neutral.

We in the Green Alternative European Link would like to see a Europe in which the blocs do not grow stronger and more closely allied, but rather disband, while the EEC, apart from other considerations, finds its way back to its civilian role and contents itself with this. We have thus tabled a motion for a resolution to the effect that the Spanish and Portuguese peoples

should decide themselves, by means of a referendum, free from political, military and economic pressure, on the issue of membership of NATO and their possible accession to the EEC, and in full awareness of the dangers and problems involved. We wish to use all our capabilities and imagination in order to ensure that, despite the secrecy of the Brussels bureaucracy, nothing is kept hidden from them.

(Scattered applause)

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — *(FR)* Any attempt at enlarging the Community under the erroneous pretext that a transitional period of 10 years would allow obstacles to be removed and differences to be settled would cause serious harm to France, Italy and Greece and destroy the basis for the common agricultural policy and hence the Community itself.

It is in the interests of the 10 Member States, and first and foremost Spain and Portugal, that we should reorganize the Community's financing, draw up rules to protect the Member States' Mediterranean production and finally plan budget resources in line with new needs. The success of enlargement depends on a solution being found to these problems.

If the contributions of the Member States are not based on new and lasting provisions, Spain's entry will create a new problem, in which case there is no knowing whether she will stop trading with South America to take advantage of Community preference.

I am in favour of the contributions of the Member States being re-established to provide a better balance of national efforts, taking account of both agricultural and industrial resources.

The accession of Spain and Portugal poses the problem of applying a policy of guaranteed prices and a withdrawal policy for olive oil, fruit, vegetable and wine surpluses, and its financing will be rendered more difficult by the treaties we have signed with eight of the Mediterranean countries.

Finally, I would like to point out that the extension of the common fishing zones will create a new problem and that we cannot arrive at a satisfactory solution with Spain only covering the Mediterranean region.

The Commission estimates the extra cost of enlargement at 15 to 20% of the Community's annual budget. It would be more accurate to take the figure of 20% in view of the trend of the common agricultural market. However, rules will also have to be drawn up to maintain the legitimate rights of French, Italian and Greek producers to carry on their professions after enlargement.

On this point, I would like to express once more my own indignation and that of my group following the

d'Ormesson

Commission's proposal to reduce our vineyards by some 25% in France and 20% in Italy. I would remind you that wine production could be sharply reduced by introducing a viticultural land register in the producing countries, by defining rosé wine and its designation, since coupage of rosé wine is not allowed, and by creating a Community anti-fraud service.

Although these proposals have been adopted by this House, they have never seen the light of day. We shall not maintain or enlarge the Community by destroying part of its agricultural heritage. This idea is intrinsically repugnant.

Must we abandon enlargement, therefore? Certainly not. We must first of all lay down the conditions and set the common agricultural policy back on its course of expansion and conquest of markets. In Africa, for example, there is a potential market for vast agro-foodstuff surpluses because the population of Africa will double by the end of the century whilst agricultural production declines. However, in order to supply such a market, there must be a solvent demand at each end. Aid presupposes market profits, and this is where the problem lies. And here a new definition of the Lomé agreements could provide new possibilities and a new boost to enlargement — an enlargement which would increase the Community's influence, the influence of Europe as a whole and the conditions for her security. As a result, Europe will be in a better position to help the Eastern nations to throw off their shackles and rejoin their European brothers.

(Applause from the right)

IN THE CHAIR: POUL MØLLER

Vice-President

Mr Happart (NI). — *(FR)* Mr President, this is my maiden speech in this Assembly and I shall try to respect the ways and customs of the House; I would also ask you to make allowances.

I am of course in favour of Spain and Portugal joining the Community because I am a convinced European and because all the countries which apply for membership must be offered the possibility of joining our Community. However, I am a farmer and as such — and enough has been said here already on this point — in my profession I shall be subjected to the competition of fruit and vegetables from Spain and Portugal. But I am in favour of the accession of these countries, whilst being aware that this will mean having two more Italies, in other words, two more southern European countries on our hands. Now as everyone knows, the southern regions are poorer than those of the north. Is it not therefore time to take advantage of

Spain and Portugal's accession in order to stop for a moment to reflect on the type of Europe we want to have?

Do we want a Europe of men and women or a Europe of capital, a Europe where capital hides behind national selfishness and egocentricity?

The two-tier Europe that has often been discussed is in my view a bad thing. As a man of the Left, how can I justify the north being treated the same as the south whilst being aware of the disparities in income between the north and south for the same social and economic categories? If we are to be honest, the rich countries, in other words the countries of the north, must pay for the poor countries of the south. There must be European solidarity otherwise there will be no Europe. We must take a European taxpayer's view of the efforts to be made, but in politics as elsewhere we must be courageous and accept responsibility for the decisions we take. We would not dare to vote for the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community and at the same time refuse to release the funds it involved.

I believe I have used up my speaking time, but to conclude I shall say that since we are at what is a turning point for the future of Europe, the Community will either develop into a supranational entity or it will not. In my view we cannot remain constantly at the mercy of the sudden changes in mood of one government, that of the United Kingdom, for example.

President. — Mr Happart, you are a new Member, so I will not intervene. You too more or less kept to your speaking time, but speaking time is one of the things we insist should be respected most in this House, if we are to get through our work. You will come to realize that later.

Mrs Pery (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I would like to make a positive contribution to this debate, and I will begin by describing the unambiguous stance adopted by the French Presidency, which would like the negotiations with the applicant countries to be conducted so as to allow the accession date of 1 January 1986 to be adhered to. The European Council in Fontainebleau made this clear and the decision to increase the Community's own resources should allow this commitment to be met.

The negotiations with Portugal are practically concluded and we are pleased about this. The talks being conducted with Spain still involve a few points of disagreement which we all have a duty to resolve, especially since there was a meeting of the Ten in Dublin yesterday to revive negotiations with Spain across the board. Unfortunately, I believe no substantial progress was made. I shall not deal with each of the items causing problems, especially those to do with social aspects

Pery

and free circulation of workers or the agricultural issues. I shall confine myself to two highly sensitive subjects: wine and fisheries, since there has not been sufficient discussion of this latter point in the negotiations.

Not all the Commission's proposals dealing with the wine-growing issue can be accepted in their present form. The recommended destruction of vineyards affects the very structure of wine-growing activities and dependent economic activities.

Although Parliament has already made its views known on this subject, in that we are in favour of preserving a social and economic balance for agricultural holdings, these destructuring measures could end up by being simply a winding-up programme. And the effects of these measures would be too late in view of the difficulties already facing the Community and of Spain's accession.

We must try to achieve the best possible control of production and rationalization of the market. The setting of a hectare guarantee threshold and low-priced distilling seem to me to be more suitable for achieving the two specified objectives. A further advantage of these proposals is that they can be supported by the two applicant countries. For some years now, Spain has tried to keep its hectare production under control with a much lower yield than that of the Community. Nevertheless, Spanish wine-growers produce a surplus of 5 million hectolitres per year. Distilling in the Community is carried out at 60 or 65% of the guide price whereas the production cost in Spain is less than 50% of our guide price.

It is therefore urgent that we should adapt the existing system and spell out the Community's position in order to be able to negotiate with Spain as quickly as possible. We shall follow these negotiations very closely.

The other subject is fisheries. I shall draw attention to a few major items without entering into technical details. I myself have acted as rapporteur to Parliament on this issue. Spain has a fleet which is two-thirds the size of the Community fleet and therefore the social, economic and political importance of the fishing industry to that country is undeniable. Nevertheless, the 10 Community countries signed the agreement of January 1983 defining our Community policy and thus establishing a significant *acquis* allowing fishing resources to be kept in balance in Community waters. The Commission's proposals to Spain spelled out the basic Community position, including the *acquis communautaire*, and was supported by us, but they have so far met with Spain's total refusal.

I would like to express my anxiety at this point in view of the complexity of the decisions to be taken, which do not appear to be ready to be taken yet. It is true that behind the technical measures of fishing quotas or

access to fishing zones, the issue in question is the future of 100 000 Spanish fishermen, including many Basques, which does not simplify the problem for Spain because this adds a political dimension to it.

It is understandable that the Spanish Government should sometimes appear to be less eager than some Community countries to bring the negotiations to a conclusion and that it should prefer to wait a few more months to try to alleviate the sacrifices it will have to agree to.

I think we must take into account the applicant countries' legitimate rights. I also believe we must defend what we have achieved so far within the Community. It is also a question of the existence of the small-scale, semi-industrial and industrial-scale fishing industries of our Community, the balance of resources and hence the very future of the European fishing industry.

Finally, whatever technical and political decisions are taken, I would like to stress once more before this Assembly the need to develop monitoring activities at sea and on land to ensure that the law remains the same for everyone.

On several occasions over the past three years, Mr Sutra and I have spoken in this House to draw the attention of the authorities to the need to prepare these negotiations as carefully as possible. I would now like to say that, in the rush of the final stage, it should not be the interests of the fishermen or farmers that should be sacrificed. The difficulties I have now outlined do not cast any doubt on our commitment towards the applicant countries. The defence of democracy and the political importance of enlargement have been recognized as the major element which must govern our decisions. To conclude, I would like to say once more how important it is to keep to the planned date for accession even if this means the Community must conclude the negotiations with the two applicant countries separately. We shall succeed with plenty of political will, a sense of solidarity and mutual acceptance of the efforts to be shared, together with the necessary financial means.

Mr Penders (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, the enlargement issue covers three factors: the increase in the number of Member States, additional own resources and new policies in new sectors.

Recent meetings of the European Council have made it clear that the question of additional own resources goes hand in hand with the accession of Spain and Portugal. That does not necessarily mean to say, though, that extra money will guarantee a smooth, efficient, ordered and 'transparent' accession process. In view of the paralysis affecting the negotiations at the present time, and the reasons for that state of affairs, serious doubts are bound to arise as to whether anything will come in the Community of new policies

Penders

in such fields as the Regional Fund, the Social Fund and the Esprit programme. There is a danger of the economic recovery being placed in jeopardy by enlargement and the accession of new Member States. In view of the existing and looming surpluses, mainly in agriculture, but in other sectors too — and I am thinking here particularly of the steel industry — it is logical and, indeed, essential for us to seek to slow down the accession procedure for Spain and Portugal. But if we do so, is it then reasonable for the present 10 Member States not to apply restraint themselves? No, Mr President, what is sauce for the goose is surely sauce for the gander. There is no getting away from it — in a number of fields we shall have to take a close look at what the enlarged Community of Twelve is likely to produce, bearing in mind of course imports and exports and the fact that there is still such a thing as a world market. It would, after all, be cruelly ironic if we were on the one hand to celebrate the accession of Spain and Portugal as forming a bridge to Latin America and, on the other hand, cut off imports of Argentinian meat. The depressing thing of course is that nationalistic thinking will then once again become rampant, at precisely the moment when the Community is coming to realize that our decision-making mechanisms must be improved and the Council take more majority decisions.

There is of course one logical — albeit disastrous — alternative. If we can agree on nothing more at all, who knows — perhaps something good will come out of the ensuing chaos in Europe *après le déluge*. That kind of approach, though, is something my group categorically rejects.

There is one other 'solution', which is to block the accession issue and not let Spain and Portugal in. That, though, is impossible for three reasons. Firstly, the restoration of democracy in Spain and Portugal was made possible partly by the prospect of Community membership. Secondly, negotiations have been going on for too long now — five-and-a-half years — for us to break them off at this stage. And thirdly, Mr President, let us not forget that Spain is now a member of NATO, and that, if we were to block Community membership for Spain, Madrid would pull out again. In the current tense and unstable atmosphere in which Europe is feebly and hesitantly trying to develop a security profile of its own, that would be a highly negative development. In other words, it is just not on.

Fortunately the negotiations have served to clear the air. In the course of the talks, it has become clear to the present Member States that many of the obstacles to accession lie with us rather than with the applicant countries.

As Flora Lewis said in the Herald Tribune, the Communities still have a magnetic field, but they obey the laws of physics. And as a magnetic field grows it becomes less powerful. That is what we must resist.

We ought to be welcoming Madrid and Lisbon into a dynamic Community, and not into the Augean stables.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, let me say at the outset that I am committed to, and fully endorse, the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community. Mr Arndt said that they have a right to be members. I believe that they also have a requirement to accept the disciplines that we accept as members of this Community.

Let me deal this afternoon with two specific problems — agriculture and fisheries. Both Spain and Portugal are much more dependent on their agricultural sector than the rest of the Community as a whole. The Ten's agriculture contributes 3.9% to the gross domestic product, whilst Spain's contributes 9% and Portugal's 14.5%. This shows the level of the problem that we have to face in the Community, especially as self-sufficiency in Mediterranean products will grow rapidly. On the other hand, in the shorter term accession will help achieve a better balance in the sectors which are causing a certain amount of difficulty in the Community at the present time. With some sectors now accepting enforced disciplines and the economic and budgetary consequences that these entail, it will be necessary to ensure fairness throughout the Community and an extension of those disciplines to other sectors that will become sensitive after enlargement. Both wine and olive oil present particularly difficult problems within the budgetary possibilities even after the expected 'own-resources' increase to 1.4%.

Another key question will be the increase in the area of agricultural land as a result of irrigation programmes. Estimates suggest that by 1990, 1.2 million hectares of new land will be available for production, one-third of this being in Spain. If, as is expected, this land is used for fruit and vegetables, it may be extremely disruptive. At present, fruit and vegetables account for 25% of agricultural output in Spain. In addition to internal European Community difficulties, this will provoke problems with the rest of the Mediterranean basin and with the United States of America.

Whilst the agricultural sector presents certain financial difficulties, the fisheries sector cannot be bought off. The severe scarcity of our own fish resources and the recently-negotiated common fisheries policy, which is still in a very delicate and fragile state of development, make this impossible. Some warning shots were fired earlier this year — as I am sure everyone recalls — in the Bay of Biscay. There is no way that political goals can be realized to the advantage of all if this is done by sacrificing one of the Community's key sectors, fisheries, which has caused so much internal tension in the recent past.

Our fishermen need to be reassured that after 1992 the rights that they have gained within the 12-mile-limit

Provan

zones will remain in force. The Spanish fleet will also not benefit from funds allocated to existing Community fleets for restructuring. We in the UK have had to face the scrapping of our deep-water fleets, and I believe that the Spanish should be thinking of the future now.

The Community, on the other hand, must maintain and, indeed, strengthen the Spanish opportunities around the world, based on the common fisheries policy.

To sum up, Mr President, my commitment and endorsement cannot be made at any cost. I am convinced that if we do not succeed now in settling the terms of entry correctly, then not only shall we be storing up problems for the future but we shall also recreate the paralysis that has afflicted this Community for the last 10 years.

Mrs De March (COM). — (FR) Mr President, this House has already debated the issue of enlargement in great detail, back in November 1982. We are tackling the matter afresh today.

Well, for me, to speak truthfully means recalling that the negotiations have been conducted in the dark, without the national parliamentarians, nor the European parliamentarians, nor the populations affected really having the necessary information. Cuts are planned on both sides of the Pyrenees in productive capacity, in agriculture, in industry, with repercussions on jobs and the economy in many regions. But the negotiators hide this from those who will have to pay the price.

Through our comments and our actions at all levels we have achieved greater transparency, and, in spite of everything, clarity has been obtained about the risks of enlargement which has helped make the populations affected aware of these dangers. Today we are told that this is an obstacle race — Mr Natali used these words a few minutes ago. In actual fact, many grains of sand have got into the negotiation mechanism and are making it squeak, as the Commission and the Council have just admitted in their statement.

The artificial euphoria of Fontainebleau, which was nothing more than a psychological and political play to accelerate the process, has misfired. The negotiators can no longer content themselves with declarations of intent, and the Commissioner now tells us we must make our words and deeds match. Well, let us put our cards on the table. The only thing is that each upturned card gives rise to new contradictions within the Community, between the Community countries and between the applicant countries. The analyses, the forecasts made by the French Communist Members of this House are often proving to be correct. Moreover, in our regions — and I consult them — the farmers and wine-growers, who are clear in their actions and thinking, support our approach of truth and courage.

In addition, the applicant countries, deluded by diversionary talk about consolidating democracy, are starting to become disenchanted, because they see that the most ardent champions of enlargement now appear to be refusing to pay the price. And another thing: we are still waiting — as a Member of this House said just a few minutes ago — for a realistic estimate of the price, especially since the Community is bogged down in a serious budgetary crisis.

Many arguments justifying enlargement have collapsed one after the other. It has just been stated that it is not the right time to go into the details of the proposals, which — it is claimed — are a matter for the Member States alone. Of course the governments, the nations, have a right of inspection. But let us speak here about restoring the balance of the Community towards the South. As regards wine-growing, hasn't the executive Commission just proposed to the Council that it recommend large-scale grubbing-up of Community vineyards, the permanent abandonment — which would be supported and subsidized — of over 200 000 hectares in order to make way for Spanish wine? What will become of the agricultural regions in the south-east? Is this respecting the Community patrimony and the Treaties?

These plans are unacceptable. Guaranteed thresholds are envisaged for olive oil, fruit and vegetables. Instead of restoring the balance, we are going to accentuate the imbalances between products and between regions. The opening of new markets in the applicant countries remains hypothetical, and the applicant countries have still not given any commitment to abandon their current traditional trade flows dominated by the United States. Is this solidarity? As for preconditions and guarantees, one can judge their efficacy by the proposals of the Commission, which recommends lifting quantitative import restrictions to help Spanish exports to the Community.

I have almost finished. Under these conditions we do not think that the issue of enlargement has been finally settled or that it is an inevitable process. We believe that instead of enlargement, which will lead to a leveling-down — something contrary to the Treaty — there should be a genuine policy of mutually advantageous cooperation with the applicant countries. I believe that cooperation is our future and would avoid our having to watch the Community break up.

Mr Musso (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is not principles which are being questioned today. Neither is it Europe's political unity which is being questioned, and it is not we who are calling it into question — on the contrary. However, it is for the very sake of this political unity that we say one cannot adhere to the deadlines chosen. They were chosen without due consideration and in an arbitrary manner. If we keep to them we will achieve the opposite of what we are aiming for. Indeed, given the pres-

Musso

ent state of things, have you given serious thought to the consequences of membership on the date now fixed? There are two main ones. Firstly, in the industrial field, it is not known at the present time — and no one can tell us, not even the Commission — whether the impact as regards creating jobs will be positive or negative. It is not known whether such effects will be regionally concentrated. Thus we run an enormous risk in this field, and we are making Spain and Portugal run one too.

Another sector is that of agriculture, which brings me to the second consequence, of which there is no doubt. Is it realized that there will be very heavy competitive pressure due to large-scale imports of products specific to the Mediterranean region? I am thinking of wine, I am thinking of olive oil, I am thinking of fruit and vegetables. Thus the Mediterranean regions will be adversely affected, and this will only increase the existing disparities within the EEC. Furthermore, how can one ignore the fact that in these two countries the economic situation is different from that of the EEC? Unemployment is higher, as is population growth. The proportion of jobs in agriculture is very high in these countries. And lastly, the internal development level varies greatly.

Given this situation, where will we end up? In a Europe of Twelve the people in less-favoured regions will be doubled, and the problem of the regions will be even more chronic than in the past.

By trying, under the pretext of lofty principles, to take the bull by the horns, as some people have called it, we will achieve the opposite of what we are striving for. We will create serious problems.

We want certain preconditions to be laid down prior to accession. These concern social measures, measures in the industrial field, measures in agriculture and fishing, as well as measures for regional policy. And these measures must be financed by suitable methods.

Despite all this, we are not calling political union into question. We sincerely want this political union with Spain and Portugal, because we do not forget that those who created the EEC wanted an ever closer union between the peoples of Europe.

Mr Christensen (ARC). — *(DA)* Mr President, I speak on behalf of the Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community. We are opposed to the inclusion of new territories in the European Community. Just as we do not wish to interfere in the affairs of Spain and Portugal, we do not accept interference by them in our affairs. What we want is free, open cooperation between all countries, such as that practised in EFTA and Portugal's free trade agreement with the Community, which is a form of cooperation in profound contrast with the European Community's union model.

We are not opposed to these two countries joining the Community because they are poor. We simply note that their accession will decisively reduce the agricultural, so-called 'Community' benefits for Denmark. We note moreover that enlargement will mean that the Community will be oriented further to the south and that Denmark's geographical, political and national isolation on the periphery of the Community will be accentuated.

Enlargement will alter the character of the Community to such an extent compared with the Community Denmark joined in 1972 as to call for a referendum on the issue, analogous to the one held some years ago in France on the enlargement of the Community to include the United Kingdom, Ireland and Denmark.

Finally, we would advise Spain and Portugal to study the treaty proposal with care. They are welcome to Denmark's place in this House.

President. — I do not suppose that Mr Christensen made his concluding remark on behalf of the Danish Government.

Mr Almirante (DR). — *(IT)* Mr President, after the splendid speech of my friend Mr d'Ormesson, I could even forgo my speech, brief though it is, but I feel I must assume the positive responsibility of the Italian Right which feels that without Spain and to a lesser degree without Portugal there can be no Mediterranean Europe capable of offsetting in the Mediterranean the destructive thrusts which are the stamp of communism and which all too often are ignored or fostered by the so-called real socialism which is in power in Italy, in France and in Spain itself. We are here as Italians and as members of the European Right to achieve European unity in real terms and thus achieve the Mediterranean Europe, not as against the Europe of the North Sea, but certainly with a view to establishing political, economic and social balance.

What is needed, essentially, is (a) to press on with the negotiations so that by 1985 all the agreements will have been reached and the national parliaments can ratify them on schedule and (b) to tackle now the fundamental problems which in economic terms are wine and olive oil while in social terms it is uncontrolled immigration, and (c) to launch clear while at the same time flexible negotiations which are not aimed at achieving immediately full agreement but are designed to prevent genuine disagreement arising since the alternative, disagreement, i.e. the failure of the negotiations and their indefinite postponement will benefit nobody other than those defenders of essentially anti-European interests which are also anti-national. If it is true, and it is true, that to build the Europe of the Mediterranean is a prime concern of all Europeans and in particular of those of us who believe in Europe

Almirante

as we believe in the nations which make it up civilly and historically, of those who believe in the European fatherland, of those who believe in their own Italian fatherland, French fatherland, their own Greek fatherland and, with respect, of those who do not share our views and believe in the German fatherland and the British fatherland, the Danish fatherland and Dutch fatherland, in other words all the fatherlands of all the Europeans worthy of such a name.

(Applause from the Group of the European Right)

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, I welcome the accession to the European Community of Spain and Portugal, two countries which belong to Europe and which have a remarkable stage of development behind them. They are countries with an imperialistic past, like most of the European countries, but which have recently developed into social-oriented democracies. There are two points I would like to make on this count.

Firstly, accession brings with it the need for a serious energy debate. As a result of the priority which is being given in Europe to nuclear energy, Spanish mines are under threat of closure, with all the social repercussions now being felt by the British and Belgian miners, who are currently on strike to safeguard their jobs and ensure secure energy supplies.

The second point I wish to make is that the accession of Spain and Portugal might stimulate moves towards democracy in other potential Member States still characterized by violations of human rights, as used to be the case in Spain and Portugal. I am thinking in particular of Turkey.

Of course, the accession of Spain and Portugal will bring with it economic problems in the short term. We are all aware of that. But problems are there to be solved; after all, Europe — like man — does not live from bread alone. In the long term, there can be no doubt that the accession of these two countries will stimulate the cultural and social development of Europe as a potential keystone for the harmonious and fair economic development of our old continent.

A dynamic and unified Europe will undoubtedly be in a position to make a major contribution towards fair relations with the poor countries of the South with whom we used to have historical links, not to mention fostering peaceful relations with our powerful neighbours.

Mr von der Vring (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, since so many Members of this House are newly elected, we have to repeat a few things which up till now have been the commonly shared view of the House on enlargement, and have been supported by a large majority. As far back as the period of Iberian fascism,

the Community — and this House — promised to allow the applicant countries to join when they had a democratic constitution. Spain and Portugal, we want to stress this, have a right to join, and it is for them alone to decide whether they want to join or not. They have applied, and the overwhelming majority of the peoples of Spain and Portugal want to join.

The issue here is not whether joining the EC is desirable from the point of view of the Spanish and Portuguese. I would like to stress the remark made by the Rainbow Group to the effect that we must not interfere with the development of opinion in Spain and Portugal on this matter. But for this very reason I have to reject the resolution put forward by this group, which demands that these countries hold referendums. I see a direct contradiction in the resolution wording when it says that we must demand pledges from the Spanish Government, whereas we do not have such a right. On the contrary, they have claims on us.

The Community must not lay down any preconditions, such as that the Community must first solve its internal problems, a thing it is clearly unable to do. Some confusion has been caused by a recent radio interview given by the President of this House on this matter. Six years of negotiations are enough. In Stuttgart the Heads of State or Government committed themselves to concluding the negotiations in September 1986. For us there is no reason whatsoever to go back on this.

We have not conducted the negotiations. We were only onlookers. We have repeatedly discussed this with the Commission in the Joint Committee. The result of these negotiations will be a product of give-and-take by both sides, and not a one-sided affair, that is certain. The national governments will find this compromise hard enough to swallow as it is. This House should guard against formulating conditions or standing in judgment on them. We are getting tired of new conditions being brought up at each and every debate. It is our task to press for rapid agreement between the governments, for the completion of enlargement. I do not know what the compromise amendment says, I have not received a copy of it. However, I am against this House laying down any conditions regarding the negotiating positions.

We should reject the de la Malène resolution, but I am also worried for the same reason by paragraphs 4 and 5 of the European Democratic Group's otherwise welcome resolution, because they remove individual negotiating points from the context of give-and-take, and this should not be so.

We in this House must stick to the accession date of 1 January 1986, and I am grateful that the President-in-Office of the Council has also stressed this. We shall have to make fitting preparations for the long-awaited arrival of our future Iberian colleagues.

von der Vring

We in this House did not take the Stuttgart decision, but this decision now forms the Community's basis for accession, and it also contains a link between enlargement and raising the 1% limit. Regardless of whether we in this House approve this link or not, it has been decided. Furthermore, it is an actual fact, since some national parliaments are firmly resolved to effect both ratification procedures simultaneously, so that there will be no separation of the two at Community level.

Thus, our House should affirm afresh its resolve to accomplish Spain and Portugal's accession on 1 January 1986. This enlargement is a political task for us, as Mr Arndt emphasized once again, in the same way that we regard accomplishment of a democratic European Community as a political task. We must never subordinate this political goal to short-term consideration about wine or fish, or suchlike technical problems or compromises.

This House was the most consistent champion of the Iberian peoples and their rightful claim to join the Community. This should remain so, and I hope no one will try to thwart tomorrow's vote by some kind of manoeuvre.

Mr F. Pisoni (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, first and foremost I should like to express my whole-hearted support for Mr Natali's statement. It is in my view stamped with a sense of realism and responsibility and it showed Parliament the difficulties which are still hampering these negotiations. The report by the President-in-Office of the Council appeared less clear. Even if it did confirm the principal ideas it did not dispel some remaining doubts and problems regarding the attitude of individual States.

This evening we have stayed on here to make political declarations rather than to discuss the merits of the negotiations themselves and it was right to do so. What is striking is that these political declarations are not followed up by coherent action to transform them into firm measures. Let me say here, as others have already done, that we want these dates to be respected, the 30th of this month as far as possible and at all cost 1st January 1986.

Having said that we must take steps to ensure practical follow-up measures, as I said before, so that these dates can be respected and we can prevent accession, which should be an enrichment for all those concerned, i.e. both for the Community and for Spain and Portugal, slowing down the process of cohesion between the Member States and, what is worse, becoming an even greater manifestation of the very problems we are discussing. There are still too many unsolved problems so that if we reassert the will to respect the deadlines set we must also ask ourselves if everything is being done — and I call upon all involved to do everything they can — to honour the commitments undertaken.

There are problems with regard to own resources and problems with regard to agriculture. I should like to comment briefly on the latter. Although we have had many problems with this CAP over the years and are now debating in order to find an internal solution, we cannot shackle the negotiations by making their outcome dependent on the solution of all the agricultural problems because I fear that that will be tantamount to denying the whole of the Communities *acquis* or to passing on the cost of the accession to the Mediterranean countries, in other words the very countries who bear the brunt. This is not in our view Community thinking nor in the long term would it be advantageous for Spain or Portugal. By inviting the Commission to exercise its imagination, which moreover has so far not been lacking, and primarily by inviting the Council of Ministers of the various Member States to refrain from repeated statements of principle which are then not borne out by fact I should like to stress that we must conduct the negotiations without aspiring to solve all the problems at the outset and allow, in particular as regards agricultural and social policy, Community discipline to be extended gradually to Spain and Portugal as and when it is modified by us. On a different level it would be unfair to make on-the-spot changes to the CAP and to all our other policies as I feel this would leave us the poorer but, what is more important, leave the others dissatisfied.

Mr Kilby (ED). — Mr President, as a new Member of Parliament I speak as one who welcomes Spain and Portugal to the Community, but I also seek reassurances from the Commission that the highly protective trade barriers which have given Spanish industry in particular a grossly unfair advantage over its British and European competitors will be strictly phased out over a transitional period of not more than five years.

When the Commission granted such highly favourable concessions to Spain in 1970-71 in response to that country's stated intention to join the European Community, it was recognized by everyone that Spanish industry was indeed inefficient by European standards and that some degree of protection of its domestic market was therefore necessary. But that was 14 years ago. At that time it was also assumed that accession would be achieved within five to seven years. Spain has indeed been very fortunate in being able to use this extended period of protection to build up its local industries until many sectors are now as big as, sometimes bigger than, those of other industrial countries in Europe. By the time a further five years of phase-out from accession have passed, Spain will have enjoyed no less than 20 years of industrial protection of its domestic market — at the expense, I might add, of the European countries, including 50 000 jobs lost in Britain through the manufacturing chain.

But it is not just the Spanish domestic market which has enjoyed the protection. Spanish manufactured products are virtually free to enter the British and

Kilby

European markets, whilst their own are protected. The reassurances I therefore seek from the Commission are not, I believe, unreasonable. I do not ask for favours or special treatment, only fair and equal competition within the Treaty of Rome rules.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Mr President, it is for mainly political reasons that Spain and Portugal are to join the EEC, and this is why the serious negative economic consequences which their accession to the Community will have for all the workers in the two countries are being disregarded. The political reasons for accession — as Mr Piermont's motion, which we also support, rightly points out — are also confirmed by the actions of the Federal German Chancellor, Mr Kohl, who visited Madrid last May and laid down as a condition of accession Spain's continued membership of Nato. This is exactly what happened with Greece. In order to join the EEC, it had to return to the military side of Nato, from which it had withdrawn in August 1984 after the Nato's shameful role in the invasion and occupation of the northern part of Cyprus by Turkish forces. These are examples of brutal interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states. So it is totally hypocritical to claim that the EEC is a guarantee of democracy and independence for its Member States.

Greece provides an eloquent example of the economic consequences that will befall the peoples of Spain and Portugal as a result of accession. Greek farmers have so far buried over a million tonnes of fruit and vegetables, inflation and unemployment have increased, the standard of living of working people has fallen drastically, and their economic situation is going from bad to worse. Working people in the EEC Member States, especially the economically less developed states, cannot expect anything good from this organization of monopolies in which the rich get richer and the poor get poorer and where there are more than 15 million unemployed and officially over 70 million poor. This is why we are surprised at the Greek Government's position in favour of enlargement, all the more so since the accession of Spain will make the position of Greek farmers even more difficult, since Spain produces large quantities of agricultural produce of the same kind as that produced by Greece.

Mr President, for all these reasons and on the basis of Greek experience of joining the Community, we members of the Greek Communist Party are against the accession of Spain and Portugal, also bearing in mind that the progressive political forces of these countries have adopted a position against entry. In addition to this statement of our position, we express our class solidarity with the working people of Spain and Portugal.

Mr Guerneur (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as has been said, the solidarity

between Europe's democratic peoples should be promoted. No nation belonging to our common western civilization should be excluded from the political union which we have set as the final goal of our endeavours. The countries of southern Europe have a right, as do those of the north which we represent here, to cooperation in the interest of their peoples' social progress. In our view, the membership application now under discussion is fully in line with this legitimate right.

But this having been said, it is not right for the Community to run the risk of ruin by unwisely taking on new problems with the arrival of new members, especially at a time when it is finding it difficult to solve the problems it already has. And yet it is precisely this dangerous prospect which the European Council has accepted in a lighthearted manner, arbitrarily fixing a final date for concluding the negotiations on Spanish and Portuguese accession to our Community. In arrogantly deciding that the discussion phase would come to a close at the end of September, and that the new members would join the EEC on 1 January 1986, the Council Presidency and the governments forgot — or perhaps even brushed aside — a principle we must regard as fundamental: no-one joins a club until he has complied with its rules.

Our House must point out in no uncertain terms this essential requirement, explaining this demand with sound and specific reasons. Agriculture offers incontestable reasons, especially in the field of wine, oil, fruit, vegetables, and pig production. My colleague Mr Musso referred to them only a few moments ago, and we know them well.

In the few minutes allowed my group I can only stress two unacceptable consequences stemming from an enlargement undertaken in haste, without prior guarantee of the legitimate rights acquired by the Ten. The first consequence: the European fishing sector is seriously threatened by the entry of the Spanish fishing fleet into Community waters as long as no assurance has been formally given, or received, that fish stocks will not be subjected to additional depletion incompatible with natural replacement of the species. The Community fish pond is still in a delicate state. We must, at this time, maintain the balance happily created by the common fisheries policy. The survival of coastal occupations in Europe will depend, basically, on Community firmness against unreasonable exploitation of our natural resources.

The second consequence: even now the Social Fund and the Regional Fund are totally inadequate to keep pace with and compensate for the technological changes linked to industrial advances. It is known that the EEC has 13 million jobless. This intolerable situation calls for social solidarity, and involves the Community in expenditure which, of necessity, is rapidly rising. And now the arrival of new Member States — whose courage in the struggle for progress we most

Guermeur

certainly know about, as we do about the large funds needed to ensure their regional development — this arrival means an extra financial burden for the Community, and one which far exceeds the money currently allocated to the ERDF and the Social Fund.

It has to be said that enlargement as currently envisaged seriously threatens the support given by the Community to the poorest of its inhabitants and to the least developed of its regions.

In conclusion, I would like to say very briefly, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that I hope this House uses its powers, drawn only a few weeks ago from the newly expressed trust of the peoples of Europe, to commit the Council to a policy of courage, wisdom and sense. It is not too late, but it is high time.

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after much debate I have gained the impression today that many people are trying to hide the specific reasons for the delay in Spanish and Portuguese accession behind general statements in favour of accession. Should we stand in the way? Just because we have not put our own house in order on time does not mean that we can ask Spain and Portugal to remain locked outside this Community any longer, i.e. after the 1 January 1986 deadline. For decades we were telling them that if they shook off their dictatorship they would be accepted into the Community, and now — because we cannot get to grips with certain agricultural problems, fishery problems and the like — we are telling them: you'll have to stay outside even longer now! No matter what reasons we give, the people in Spain and Portugal will not understand because they have in the meantime reached the limit of what can be reasonably expected.

Such delaying tactics might be to the liking of colleagues from the Rainbow Group, the Communists and others who oppose the political unity of Europe, who oppose joint endeavours for freedom and to defend freedom inwardly and outwardly. These people are simply against defending such things and, of course, want to keep Spain and Portugal out as well, because they do not believe in solidarity among the western democracies. On the contrary, their long-term aim is to bring about a lack of solidarity among the western democracies.

For this reason we must overcome the individual political problems, which undoubtedly exist, through political will and political leadership, because after overcoming dictatorship Spain and Portugal belong to our Community politically and culturally. They have a lot to offer it, politically and economically they form Europe's bridge to Latin America.

Following our experiences with the first stage of enlargement, we can — in my opinion — proceed from the premise that Spain and Portugal probably

believe in the ultimate political goal of our Community more than other countries which joined the European Community in the Seventies. For these reasons, we must try to involve both countries from the outset in the future shaping of the Community, in an advisory capacity, for example in connection with the Spaak Committee.

Above all, we should solve our internal problems. From the point of view of my country, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Community's own resources can only be increased if the Community is enlarged at the same time. Anyone who thinks that the increase can be carried off — in order to gobble it down for breakfast, so to speak, in the agricultural policy sector — must realize that he will not obtain these own resources. We are in a financial situation which we can only solve by reforming agriculture, and delaying enlargement will not keep this decision at bay any longer!

When Spain and Portugal become members there must not be any discrimination, and I say this as a member of the Social Committee. Transitional arrangements are no doubt necessary as regards free movement of workers, but afterwards they must have complete access to the Community, like all others. This also applies to social benefits, such as child allowance and the like. Even though this will not come cheap for the Federal Republic of Germany there must not be two classes in the Community. Everyone in the Community must have the same rights, in social matters too, so that this Community is a Community of solidarity!

If we want to strengthen democracy in our 10 countries and in the applicant countries, and if we want to defend freedom — within the framework of the Western Alliance — we have to realize, whether the ladies and gentlemen of the Rainbow Group like it or not, that Spain's populace sees a link here. Thus, we should not just ask the Spanish people for support in defence matters, we should also allow them to join our Community, because the two go together. This can only help further develop the Community!

(Applause from the centre)

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, the enlargement of the Community to include Portugal and Spain is the most important decision and probably the most difficult one before the European Communities at this time. The difficulties are, first, that the individual Member States represented in the Council have not been able to agree amongst themselves on a solution to many of the problems and so have already caused the proposed deadline for accession to be extended by two years; secondly, that they have not been able to find timely solutions for financing the Community's present and future budget; and thirdly, that they have no satisfactory agreed medium or long-term plan for the Community.

Beazley

The Community is therefore faced with a daunting prospect, but the Council must be capable of accepting this dazzling challenge. This is a time for statesmanship, not for political infighting. It must be recognized that the difficulties between the 10 Member States would be just the same whether there was a proposal for enlargement or not.

What is called for now is solidarity among members of the Council to solve genuine problems realistically in line with the needs and resources, present and future, of the Community. Where compromises must be found, they must be acceptable within the bounds of reason and feasibility. Portugal and Spain must be equally reasonable and understanding in their resolution of these problems if they want to join by January 1986.

Timing is inevitably the crucial factor, and this, too, must be considered realistically. The Council and both of the aspiring new Member States must make a heroic and statesmanlike effort to resolve their outstanding difficulties at their next meeting next week; otherwise, the realization of this inviting opportunity will be forever delayed or lost.

Finally, whilst a simultaneous enlargement is desirable, it is not essential. If, for good reasons, the much greater difficulties which have arisen in Spain's case cannot be quickly resolved, then Portugal's accession should not be further delayed and we should welcome Portugal's timely accession on its own.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the problem posed by enlargement concerns not only Spain and Portugal but the very future of the Community. The question is: can the EEC carry on as it is without enlargement? I think that the answer we all give is a categorical 'no'.

From Stuttgart to Fontainebleau optimistic statements were made which subsequently came to nothing. And the whole European perspective is being sacrificed because the ruling circles are possessed of a literally disastrous notion according to which it is necessary to tackle the crisis, unemployment and lack of investment by continually increasing unproductive military expenditure while calling, on the other hand, for financial discipline and one-sided austerity. Just the day before yesterday President Reagan, who is considered by capitalist circles as a prophet and by the peoples as a prophet of doom, demanded fresh expenditure by Nato countries. So there is no room for people's dreams or plans for the future.

The accession of Spain and Portugal, if that is what the peoples of those countries want, is an obligatory step for all of us. Who can deny these two countries, which have a great heritage and have been liberated from facism after so many struggles the right to join us in our common destiny? Nobody. However, there is

no-one among those who will benefit economically and commercially from enlargement — and I am referring to the industrially developed countries which will acquire new markets, not only in our own continent — has the right to make either the peoples of the two countries concerned or the other Mediterranean countries of the Community foot the bill for enlargement. Not to mince words, Mr Brok, the powerful capitalist circles must pay the price for increasing own resources to the level required for a large-scale programme of European integration, as proposed by the Commission. All of us must work for a balanced development, to press on with the existing common policies and to implement new ones, by steering a course which can make the Community a factor of international balance and a bond a cooperation between the three worlds.

Ladies and gentlemen, we of the Greek Communist Party of the Interior are in favour of the accession of Spain and Portugal, because we hope that the peoples of these two countries with a rich heritage will also throw their weight into helping the Community develop a new dynamism. We would point out, however, that one of the basic conditions which have already been proclaimed and must be immediately met is that the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes be implemented and the commitment to comply with the Greek Memorandum be honoured.

Mr Marck (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, we have listened to a number of speakers, but I believe that the most important question with regard to the accession negotiations with Spain and Portugal is not whether we should accept Spain and Portugal by the agreed deadlines, but under what conditions accession should take place.

I believe in accession and in achieving it by the stated deadline if at all feasible. But I also believe that we must be clear in our own minds when we take the decision, bearing in mind the problems now facing the Community. My view is that the accession of both Spain and Portugal would be a dubious matter in the absence of a clear decision on the Community's own resources and the criteria to be applied for the distribution formula. The main reason why it seems to me to be a dubious affair is if we close our eyes to the problems we already have in the Community, and which are bound to be exacerbated by accession. The most obvious example is that of olive oil, as has already been mentioned. As we know, the problem will become all the more acute if Spain joins the Community. We should be doing whatever is necessary now to ensure that, in a few years time, we are not accused of having raised expectations unduly and plunged the country concerned into difficulties. We must bear in mind what is likely to be the future situation right now if we want to institute Community preference in real terms. This must take the form of a general legislative policy, without which this problem

Marck

cannot be solved. The same goes for other problem areas like fisheries.

In other words, the search for Community solutions, bearing in mind the accession situation, must be speeded up, and the requisite political determination must be there to bring it to a satisfactory conclusion. The Council's deliberations on this point are most disappointing, and give the impression that restraining factors and arguments are all too often being misused to put off the moment of accession. The fact is that, the longer we put off the decision, the greater the problems will become and the more determined the attempts on the part of particular sectors and lobbies to intensify the existing distortions.

At any rate it seems to me essential that we should respect what has been achieved so far in the Community, but always bearing in mind the new situation which will arise on accession. It also seems to be essential for the accession issue to respect the Community preference system on the part of both the new and the present Member States. If these conditions are fulfilled, I am in favour of sticking to the proposed dates for accession, and for accession to take place as soon as possible, without however exacerbating the Community's current difficulties.

Mr Toksvig (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, at this late juncture I do not intend to extend the debate for too long. I have much sympathy for those speakers who have stressed the problems but have remained steady in their resolve to carry through the enlargement of the Community. Many problems have been raised, some minor, some major, but throughout, as in this debate, there has been the attitude that this is something we intend to see through. I have a feeling that none of the problems will disappear even if Spain and Portugal join. We will constantly have to find new solutions, but where there is a will there is a way. It is important at this late hour not to underestimate the psychological and political damage we will suffer if we give up now or merely postpone. I think I should emphasize to the Commission that the matter is urgent — the Community's political reputation is at stake.

Ever since I first began to take an interest in these problems — that was when we last had an Irish presidency, with a celebrated summit in Dublin — our public image has been plagued by the so-called British budget problem and its various ramifications. We have reached deadlock. The deadlock has been total, and has done such enormous damage to our reputation that we simply seem to have lost our entire dynamism. During our period of toil and trouble, one of the refreshing aspects and one of bright spots has been our readiness, inspired for by our ideals, to accept Spain and Portugal into the fold in accordance with Article 237 of the Treaty. I wish to emphasize that we are not a rich man's club, and that our only condition for admission is democratic pluralism — the corner-

stone of democracy. In my view — and this was one of the reasons why I took part in the election and now find myself here — this was a noble standpoint. It was a principled standpoint, an idealist standpoint. It showed that we were prepared to do what we could, and everything in our power, to assist new-born democracies. Democracies are in short supply in today's world, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr President, we have a self-evident duty to assist, and we knew when we embarked on this course all these years ago that it would cost money. So it is with increasing amazement and horror that one hears Members of this House calling into question the willingness of Member States to pay the price. However — if I may say this as a new Member to the old Members — you have already been through this debate a long time ago. You decided in this chamber that we should start the process. That was long before we new Members arrived. Nobody promised you anything other than that Spain and Portugal would create problems, including economic problems. The decision has been taken. What remains, as far as one can judge, are problems of detail that can and should be resolved.

Although we have now been promised by the Commission that it will stand by the target date of 1 January 1986, the process will by then have been under way for just under 10 years. I recall again the British budget problem, which we have been struggling with for just as long. It is not entirely easy for newcomers to accept this tempo. None of us — and I believe the election results demonstrate this very clearly — can create respect for Parliament if, when we decide to write European history, we do so line by line and with ten-year intervals between these lines.

Mr van Aerssen (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for seven years now the applicant countries' applications have been on the table, and today we have all noted that a breakthrough was at long last achieved in Fontainebleau, and that the Council placed itself under pressure and set its eyes on 1 January 1986 as the accession date. It is now important that the Community keep its word, does not lose face, and offers arrangements in line with the sense and purpose of this accession, arrangements which are fair and understood by the others, and that no-one fears from the outset — as some colleagues have emphasized — that a state of disequilibrium will develop in time.

The facts make it imperative to conclude the accession negotiations, and this House should keep the Council under permanent pressure. The Council has itself said that own resources cannot be increased until the accession negotiations have been concluded, i.e. not until 1 January 1986. The Council has, therefore, forced this move upon itself.

The European Community, this House, and the Council in particular are working more and more with

van Aerssen

the Commission to find a common policy to contain the agricultural surpluses.

It has also been decided to go for a policy of change in dealing with major Mediterranean products — olive oil, fruit, vegetables and wine — in order to obtain a better balance between north and south in the European Community. However, it would be a mistake to believe that these changes favouring southern products would only apply to countries which are already members of the European Community. If there is to be a fair accession they should be also benefit those — Spain and Portugal — joining the European Community as new members.

This House has acknowledged the fact that the Commission conducts the negotiations. But it would be wrong to assume that this House has sufficient knowledge about the details of these negotiations. The information provided by the Commission is much too flimsy for this. The Commission's behaviour can only be interpreted as a defensive posture rather than as a courageous approach to solve the problem and to cut the Gordian knot.

At the end of the negotiations on Greek membership this House made it clear that while it does not want to be involved in the minute details of such negotiations, it does want to be kept informed at regular intervals, and that in the end it ratifies the treaty in keeping with international law. This presupposes that the Commission treats this House differently as regards the negotiations with Spain and Portugal.

It is very important to make sure — and this significant demand is directed at the Commission — that trade flows are not changed around when Spain and Portugal become members. It would be a fatal error to think that Spain and Portugal could become members without opening up the markets to other countries. We would then lose the markets and friends with which we already have close trade links in the Mediterranean: Israel, Malta, Cyprus, Morocco, Algeria — I don't have to list them all. Our Mediterranean policy would collapse, and the European-Arab dialogue would be finished.

The problem with Spain and Portugal is one of give-and-take. If we do not give the Spanish and Portuguese an immediate signal through a courageous decision by this House, then they will lose faith in the European Community. We would lose friends who could be of help and support to us in the European Community on many occasions.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Enlargement towards the south is, in actual fact, a political decision. The Community institutions took it years ago, and speedy completion of the negotiations is desired, as many of my colleagues before me have stressed. There are several serious problems, mainly of an agricultural and

social nature, which delay completion of the accession negotiations time and time again. Since matters of the Community's financial survival are at stake here, I have to sound a clear warning against all the grand speeches and against the many deadlines set.

They can only lead to disappointment for the applicant countries, Spain and Portugal. The issues still unresolved, and we know they are very difficult, should, of course, be settled before these countries join, so that the Council of Ministers does not have to patch things up later. If the negotiating partners' policy is to go for the latter option, then this is unacceptable if one considers our experiences over the past ten years. It would lead the Community to political and financial ruin.

This debate was not meant to go into unresolved specific issues or technical solutions. But let me highlight one point. The European Community has — in my view, much too late — contributed decisively to bringing about the long-overdue change-over to a cost-conscious agricultural policy which takes account of actual consumption. The same thing is necessary in the case of Spain's accession for olive oil, wine, citrus fruits and vegetables, to name but a few, Spain has a huge production potential for such things.

Olive oil production alone far exceeds what the country can consume. The holdings have increased drastically and are to be incorporated into the Community upon accession. If the present high-level guarantee prices and aid to producers are applied, then production would probably be doubled. Spanish consumption of olive oil will drop after accession, when the country has to open its borders to imports of more attractively priced oils and fats from the other countries. This will lead to a further increase in the Community's olive oil surpluses. Since there is hardly any demand inside and outside the Community for this expensive olive oil, this will inevitably lead to enormous financial strains on Community funds. At the same time — and I say this as someone who is not a farmer — the change in agricultural policy introduced with such difficulty will be put at risk. One cannot expect, for example, that milk farmers in the northern Member States will accept the recently introduced curbs when, on the other hand, their new Spanish colleagues are rewarded almost without limit for raising production of olive oil and other items. We have to have curbs on quantity and on guarantee prices: the solution to the problem of surpluses following accession does not lie in protectionist foreign trade or fiscal measures.

My colleague Mr van Aerssen has mentioned the difficulties which the Mediterranean countries such as Israel and the Maghreb states will have to cope with when Spain joins, while the Community will have to keep its large market open for trade flows which have now become traditional and are based on agreements. Despite our large and excellent agricultural production, the Community remains essentially a community which exports technological and industrial goods. This

Blumenfeld

necessitates give-and-take with our trade partners in the Third World and also with the great economic powers, first and foremost the USA.

As Mr van Aerssen noted, the facts compel us to finalize the accession negotiations, but let us be honest and let us say who is going to pay for it all!

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — The debate is closed.¹

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

¹ Requests for early votes — Membership of Parliament — Verification of credentials — Agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.

Annex

I. Questions to the Commission

Question No 13, by Mr De Gucht (H-108/84)

Subject: Zero-rated sales of newspapers and magazines

In a number of Community Member States (United Kingdom, Denmark, Belgium) sales of newspapers and magazines are zero-rated for VAT purposes. As part of its policy of ensuring that all Community countries apply the same VAT rates for the same products, the Commission would like to see this zero-rating abolished, because some countries apply the rate to products other than newspapers and magazines.

In its proposals in this area, has the Commission taken into account the need to retain the zero-rate for sales of newspapers and magazines and is the Commission aware that abolition of zero VAT rates for newspapers and magazines would in fact place the written press at a disadvantage by comparison with radio and television?

Answer

1. The gradual phasing-out of the zero rate is not just a simple desire on the part of the Commission — it is a rule laid down by the Council in its Directive 77/388/EEC abolishing zero rates as a permanent element of the VAT system. The zero rating of the written press applied in varying degrees in only four Member States comes within the scope of this rule just, like any other zero rating.
2. It should be pointed out that, although the Commission's report to the Council in January 1983 on the transitional provisions applying to the common system of VAT contained its views on how this gradual abolition of existing zero rates might be achieved, the Commission nevertheless feels that it would be premature at this stage to present formal proposals on the matter.
3. The Commission does not share the view that abolition of the zero rate for newspapers and magazines would put these at a disadvantage compared with radio and television, which are exempt under Article (13)(A)¹ (q) of the Directive referred to. This exemption, which does not include radio and television activities of a commercial nature, is intended to take account of the fees normally charged by a public body.

*
* *

Question No 14, by Mrs Cinciari Rodano (H-133/84)

Subject: Participation of the Community institutions in the UN Conference in Nairobi in 1985 for the end of the Women's Decade

In view of the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on the Community's participation in the United Nations Conference in Nairobi in 1985, how will the Community institutions be represented at the Conference and will a Community document be prepared on the problems under discussion, as specifically requested by the European Parliament?

Answer

The Council has decided² that the Community as such will participate in the World Conference which is due to take place in Nairobi from 15 to 26 July next year.

¹ Doc. COM(82) 885 final.

² On 21 February 1983.

As for the Community delegation, it is too early at this stage to decide on its composition, since the Community has yet to receive the invitation for the Conference, and since the agenda remains to be finalized.

A number of Community documents will be prepared for Nairobi. These will include statements to be made on behalf of the Community in the plenary session and the working parties, and any further written and/or oral contributions as required by the agenda of the Conference.

*
* *

Question No 16, by Mr Tomlinson (H-117/84)

Subject: Youth unemployment

Has the Commission considered the recent pamphlet produced by the British Youth Council entitled 'Youth demand a new deal', and will the Commission comment on the pamphlet's specific proposals concerning 'Europe and youth unemployment'?

Answer

The competent departments of the Commission have taken note of the document referred to by the Honourable Member; the Commission does not plan to give detailed opinions on proposals put forward by every national youth organization but, in this instance, considers it useful to comment on:

1. The considerable degree of convergence between the proposals of the British Youth Council and the positions adopted by the Commission (see in particular the communications on training in the 1980s and on the promotion of youth employment).
2. The measures already applied or in progress which fulfil the expectations of the authors of the document concerning in particular:
 - the reform of the Social Fund and ongoing efforts to simplify procedures and inform the general public about ESF operating rules;
 - all the efforts made to foster job creation, both at the macroeconomic level (public and private investment) and at the level of local initiatives, including, more specifically, initiatives involving the young;
 - the systematic taking into account of the unfavourable situation of the young in all proposals put forward in the field of social policies.

*
* *

Question No 18, by Mr Chanterie (H-121/84)

Subject: New developments concerning the reorganization of working time

What initiatives is the Commission contemplating concerning the reorganization and reduction of working time at European level, bearing in mind that the recommendation was not adopted at the Council meeting of 7 June last and that the directive on part-time work is still being locked?

Answer

The Commission can only express its great disappointment that, despite the efforts of both the Commission and the Presidency of the Council and the support of nine governments,

it was not possible to reach an agreement on the proposal for a Council recommendation on the reduction and reorganization of working time in the Council on 7 June.

It is for the Irish Presidency to decide how to proceed. For its part, the Commission continues to regard this subject as one of the highest importance on which the Council should adopt a clear position. At present, the Commission sees no other basis than the text to which nine governments have already agreed.

With regard to the draft Council directive on voluntary part-time work, the Commission continues to believe, as we have already stated in reply to written question No 435/84, that a directive is the best way to secure the objectives embodied in our amended proposal. The Commission will actively support any efforts to achieve a positive outcome on this basis in the Council.

*
* *

Question No 19, by Mr Deprez (H-123/84)

Subject: Creation of national committees of European volunteer development workers and initiatives concerning the legal and social statute for such voluntary workers

Having regard to the wish expressed by the Fontainebleau meeting of the European Council to support the participation of young Europeans in Community activities in the Third World and to encourage, to this end, the creation of national committees of European volunteer development workers, can the Commission give details of the initiatives which it intends to take, bearing in mind the need to have a pool of volunteers with the right qualifications and in a position to live in a country other than their own with a suitable legal and social statute?

Answer

The Commission has been concerned for some time about the social security rights of those returning to the Community following a period of work as volunteers in development projects in third countries, particularly on those projects carried out by non-governmental organizations. The Commission is currently preparing proposals on this subject for submission to the Council and considering what other initiatives might be taken at Community level as a follow-up to the Fontainebleau European Council.

*
* *

Question No 20, by Mrs Salisch (H-128/84)

Subject: Initiatives to promote employment

What steps does the Commission propose to take to ensure that the development consultants for local employment initiatives, who have been assigned special priority for assistance under both criterion E4 of the guidelines for the European Social Fund and the Council Decision of 7 June 1984, can benefit from the resources of the Social Fund, preferably under the next series of measures financed by the Fund?

Answer

The Commission's management guidelines for the Social Fund determine the *priority* to be attached to eligible applications. *Eligibility* is defined in the Council decision and implementing regulation adopted by Council last October.¹

¹ OJ L 289 of 22. 10. 1983.

Development agents are listed among the eligible categories of beneficiaries of Social Fund aid in Article 4(3) of the Council decision. However, the list of eligible expenditure, given in Article 1 of the implementing regulation, limits Social Fund aid as regards development agents to the financing of vocational training schemes and certain recruitment operations. It does not include expenditure incurred in the running of advisory services which would involve the continuing employment of development agents. In this respect, the Council did not follow the advice of the Commission and Parliament but simply requested the Commission to examine the issue further.

In its Communication¹ last November on the contribution of local employment initiatives to Community action to combat unemployment the Commission confirmed its view that the Social Fund should be able to support the activity of development agents in a more comprehensive way.

Preparations within the Commission have now begun on a proposal to the Council to amend the Social Fund Regulation in such a way as to achieve this objective.

*
* *

Question No 21, by Mr J. McCartin (H-130/84)

Subject: Subsidies for lime and artificial insemination (AI)

Bearing in mind the serious situation faced by farmers in Ireland at the present time will the Commission propose the reintroduction of the lime and AI subsidy scheme?

Answer

The support measures to promote the production of beef cattle in Ireland and Northern Ireland were temporary; they were introduced as a result of the unfavourable situation with regard to agricultural incomes, particularly between 1979 and 1981. Given the current trend indicating an improvement in the position for Irish farmers, and in the light of the budgetary situation, the Commission will propose that only some of the measures laid down in Regulation (EEC) No 1054/81 be extended.

*
* *

Question No 22, by Mrs Caroline Jackson (H-135/84)

Subject: Delays in notification to successful Social Fund applicants

In view of the fact that applications for Social Fund grants in 1984 had to be submitted by mid March, that the Social Fund Advisory Committee made its recommendations on 22 June, and that the Commission gave its final decision on the applications on 23 July, can the Commission explain why there was a further delay in notifying applicants, particularly those whose applications had been successful and on which no debate had been held and no possible adjustment remained to be made?

Answer

The decision of 23 July 1984 was notified to the Member States on 13 August 1984. An interval of this length between decision and notification is normal, and is devoted to completing the full formal content of the decision.

¹ COM(83) 662 final.

After 13 August 84, it was the responsibility of the Member State to inform individual beneficiaries of the outcome of the decision.

*
* *

Question No 23, by Mrs Castle (H-136/84)

Subject: Fraud investigations

To ask the Commission what progress has been made by its fraud investigators into allegations that subsidized butter destined for Cuba last year was diverted to Russia and whether they approve of the action of the British Intervention Board in releasing £ 4 347 291 to the Dutch firm responsible for the export before it had been established whether a fraud had been committed or not?

Answer

It is too early, at this stage, to discuss the findings of the Commission's investigations into this matter. Commission officials, assisted by criminal investigation authorities in the Member States, are still conducting a number of enquiries.

Once the investigations have been completed, the Commission will analyse the evidence and decide what further action can be taken. As stated at a meeting earlier this year of Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control, chaired by Mr Aigner, a report on this will be submitted to the committee.

During the investigations, the Commission has asked all the intervention bodies involved to suspend payment of export refunds and, if possible, not to surrender the security deposited in connection with the supplying of the butter in question. The sum of approximately £ 4.3 million from the British intervention agency was not a payment as such; rather, it represented the security which the Dutch firm had deposited in order to obtain export refunds in respect of this butter.

The firm was legally entitled to recover its security as soon as it had submitted proof from the Cuban authorities that the butter had been placed on the open market in Cuba.

Moreover, I would point out that this butter was not taken from intervention stocks; rather, it was bought on the open market.

The United Kingdom authorities took the decision to surrender the security, on the basis of the evidence in their possession, after seeking legal advice. This in no way precludes the possibility that the Commission will take steps to recover the sum. Indeed, the United Kingdom authorities have also announced that they will continue to cooperate with the Commission in these investigations and that they will attempt to recover the export refunds if it can be established to their satisfaction, that these refunds were paid out by mistake. The Commission is empowered to review the case, once all the evidence is available, and to attempt to recover any sums that prove to have been paid out by mistake; naturally, it reserves the right to do so.

*
* *

Question No 24, by Mr Pearce (H-137/84)

Subject: Transfers between lines

In view of the decision by the President of the European Parliament on 27 July 1984 not merely to take note of certain decisions of the Budget Committee concerning transfers

between lines (as has been the practice for several years) but to permit votes (and amendments) in plenary on such matters, does the Commission in future intend to act upon Budget Committee decisions on transfers or will it await ratification by the plenary sitting?

Answer

The Commission will act when it is informed by the Parliament that the latter has taken a decision on a transfer or when the delay of six weeks stipulated in the Financial Regulation has expired. How Parliament takes its decisions on transfers, as on other matters, is Parliament's internal responsibility, though the Commission naturally welcomes procedures which allow its proposal to be dealt with rapidly.

*
* *

Question No 25, by Mr Clinton (H-138/84)

Subject: State of negotiations with Spain and Portugal on fisheries

How soon does the Commission consider that it will be possible to conclude the negotiations on fisheries with Spain and Portugal, and can the Commission please present a summary of present negotiating positions to the Fisheries Working Party of the Committee on Agriculture?

Answer

The Commission is making great efforts to ensure that the planned deadlines are observed.

The Commission would point out that, under the Treaties, the Member States are responsible for the negotiations. Nevertheless, the Commission is prepared to inform the Working Party on Fisheries about the progress of the negotiations.

*
* *

Question No 27, by Lord Bethell (H-145/84)

Subject: Free entry into France for British citizens

Is it correct that the French authorities are refusing to cooperate in the enquiry instituted by the Commission into the incident that took place on 31 May 1983, when a number of young black people from Brent in London, British citizens with British passports, were refused entry into France? If so, what action does the Commission propose to take, bearing in mind the fact the incident took place more than a year ago and that its enquiry was launched very soon afterwards?

Answer

The Commission is not aware that the French authorities have refused on principle to conduct an investigation into this matter. However, they have not yet replied to the Commission's requests for information, sent in March and June 1984, as the Commission notified the Honourable Member by letter of August 1984.

In the light of this oral question by the Member, the Commission has reminded the French authorities in writing about these requests.

Should these requests remain unanswered, the Commission would be obliged to examine the possibility of proceedings against France for infringement of the Treaties.

*
* *

Question No 28, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-146/84)

Subject: Campaign against drug abuse

Can the Commission of the European Communities state what follow up there has been so far on the European Parliament's resolution of 1982 on the combating of drug abuse?

Answer

As a follow-up to the request made by the European Parliament in its resolution of 14 May 1982 (OJ C 149/120 of 14. 6. 1982), the Commission has undertaken studies and other work. Three studies were carried out by the Commission on the following subjects:

1. Comparative analysis of policies aimed at combating drug addiction in the member countries from the point of view of the links between the various methods employed and their legislative basis (study completed).
2. Critical analysis of the drug problem and description of the situation in the ten Member States of the Community (study completed; at present submitted to Member States for checking).
3. Preparation of an educational manual on illegal drugs and psychotropic substances intended for teachers in secondary education in the Member States of the European Community (study begun in 1984).

A fourth study, on 'factors related to the introduction of primary school leavers to drugs, alcohol and tobacco', is being prepared.

In addition, the Commission and the WHO jointly organized a Seminar in Brussels in 1983 on the problem of preventing drug addiction among young people. Emphasis was placed on the need for a rigid epidemiological methodology and on the value of holding exchanges of information on epidemiological matters, treatment and other statistics.

The Commission is now finalizing a 'Communication on the problems of Community cooperation in matters of health' which will in particular consider joint action against various types of addiction. This will be on the agenda of the forthcoming Health Council which the Irish Presidency plans to hold before the end of 1984.

*
* *

Question No 32, by Mr Alavanos (H-155/84)

Subject: Intervention by the Commission in Greek trade policy

In a recent letter the Commission of the EEC expressed its alarm at a series of measures taken by the Greek Government regarding imports and in particular the creation of a trade intervention organization and also because, according to the Commission, Greece is pursuing a policy of protectionism by failing to implement 136 of the 193 Community arrangements in this sphere.

Can the Commission inform us whether by its intervention it is questioning the sovereign right of a country to impose controls on its foreign trade especially when, as in the case of

Greece, its economy is undermined by speculators, high prices and enormous increases in imports?

Answer

1. As regards the honourable Member's reference to the proceedings initiated against Greece for infringement of the Treaties, in which the Commission maintains that various Greek measures regarding imports are incompatible with Community law, the Commission would like to state the following:

(a) By reason of its accession to the Community Greece undertook to adhere to and implement the common rules of law enshrined in the Treaties and the secondary Community law. It is the Commission's duty to monitor and ensure adherence to these rules by the Member States and any other authorized bodies. This is essential for the proper functioning of the Community.

(b) Insofar as Community law lays down rules for intra-Community trade and the Community's external trade, there is no room for national measures or for 'controls on foreign trade'.

In view of this legal situation, there can be no question of the Commission's having intervened in the sovereign rights of Greece.

2. Various Greek rules on imports from other Member States are incompatible with the provisions of Community law on the free movement of goods, in particular with Articles 12 and 30 of the EEC Treaty.

This is especially true of the following rules:

- (i) The import of goods is subject to a licence system or a system of negative certificates, although no restrictions or inspection measures are allowed under Community law;
- (ii) payments for imported goods are subject to a preliminary control by banks, with the documents normally used in international trade being disregarded unless they have been declared valid or accepted by the competent authorities;
- (iii) imported goods are subject to a levy to which domestic goods are not liable;
- (iv) imports of certain goods are subject to the production of certificate stating that the products in question cannot be manufactured by domestic industry;
- (v) certificates of origin are regularly demanded for goods originating or in free circulation in another Member State.

The Commission is sure that the institution of proceedings for infringement of the Treaty was essential and justified with a view to abolishing these serious barriers to trade.

*
* *

Question No 33, by Mr Adamou (H-156/84)

Subject: Measures to protect Greek olive oil

It was recently reported in the press that the Commission intended to reduce aid for olive oil consumption by 50%. A measure of this kind will create new problems for Greek olive oil production and will promote consumption of imported seed oil — to the detriment of olive oil — once the protective restrictions on imports of seed oil are lifted on 1 January 1984 pursuant to the Treaty of Accession.

What plans does the Commission have at present with regard to this measure which is against the interests of olive oil producers in Greece and Italy and only favours multinational companies in the foodstuffs sector in the USA and in other countries which export seed oil to the EEC?

Answer

As regards the measures to protect Greek olive oil, the current market situation does not call for any change in the consumer support for olive oil. The Commission therefore does not intend to make any change before 31 October 1984, which is the end of the 1983/84 production year. It will shortly be submitting to the Council a proposal for a Council directive laying down the representative market price for olive oil for the production year 1984/85, and this price determines the level of consumer support in the production year in question.

*
* *

Question No 34, by Mr Ephremidis (H-159/84)

Subject: Mediterranean programmes

The final statement of the meeting of the European Council in June contains no reference to Integrated Mediterranean Programmes. Moreover, according to Commission estimates the increase in own resources to 1.4% will not solve the problem but will merely postpone bankruptcy for 2 years.

Does the Commission therefore believe that despite the fact that no reference is made to them in the final statement of the last Summit meeting, it will be possible to implement Integrated Mediterranean Programmes from 1 January 1985 as scheduled, and furthermore does it consider that it is possible to finance these programmes since they are 5 year programmes and the main financial burden falls during the last 2 years, while according to the Commission the increase in own resources does not solve but merely postpones the problem?

Answer

1. The final communiqué of the European Council last June traced the framework for the future financing of the Community and stated 'An attempt will be made to coordinate the activities of the various Funds, for example in the form of integrated programmes to help the Mediterranean regions of the present Community which will become operational in 1985.'

The final communiqué also states that 'the financial resources allocated to aid from the Funds, having regard to the integrated Mediterranean programmes, will be significantly increased in real terms'.

The Commission considers this a positive achievement which will facilitate the Council's examination of the draft regulation, so that implementation of the integrated Mediterranean programmes can be started in 1985.

2. In view of the fact that most of the appropriations will be paid out between 1988 and 1991, the Commission does not think that the financial implications of the proposal concerning these programmes are incompatible with the proposed timetable for the increase in own resources, particularly when account is taken of the financial consequences of the proposals put forward for the reform and development of other Community policies.

*
* *

Question No 35, by Mr Roelants du Vivier (H-164/84)

Subject: Implementation by Belgium of Council Directive 79/409/EEC¹ on the conservation of wild birds

In September 1982, the Commission of the European Communities delivered to Italy a reasoned opinion (under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty) calling on it to implement forth-

¹ OJ L 103 of 25. 4. 1979, p. 1.

with the EEC directive on the protection of wild birds (79/409/EEC), the provisions of which should have been incorporated into domestic law by all the Member States before 6 April 1981.

Could the Commission state the reasons why no such reasoned opinion has been delivered so far to Belgium, which has not yet brought its national legislation into line with the European directive?

Answer

On 10 August 1982 the Commission delivered to both Italy and Belgium a reasoned opinion under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty.

These two Member States had not fulfilled their obligation to inform the Commission of their legislative measures to implement Directive 79/409/EEC, but in the meantime this has now been done.

Now, however, the Commission has instituted proceedings against all the Member States under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, since it has established that the national legislation did not agree with the above-mentioned directive in all points.

A reasoned opinion will be delivered within the next few weeks.

*
* *

Question No 36, by Mr Hughes (H-165/84)

Subject: Visits by Commissioners to the North of England

What plans has the Commission for visits by Commissioners or senior Commission staff to the North of England during the next twelve months?

Answer

As stated in its answer to Written Question No 1477/79 by Mr Boyes, the Commission does not publish the programmes of visits by Members or senior officials of the Commission in advance.

The Commission is, of course, prepared to examine carefully any question the Member may wish to submit on a particular official visit to the North of England by a representative of the Commission, however.

I would add that the term of office of the present Commission ends in four months' time and that, therefore, decisions on many of the visits planned for the next 12 months will be the responsibility of the new Commission, which takes up its duties on 1 January 1985.

*
* *

Question No 37, by Mr Crouw (H-166/84)

Subject: Sinking of the French cargo vessel, the *Mont Louis*, off the Belgian coast near Ostend on 24 August 1984 — transport of uranium hexafluoride

According to press reports, the Commission has asked the French Government for information concerning the sinking referred to above.

What reply has it received to its inquiry and

What measures can it take to prevent accidents from occurring when radioactive material and dangerous substances are being transported by sea off the coasts of countries of the European Community?

With particular regard to transport outside territorial waters, can the Commission take measures to establish international rules governing this matter?

Answer

In answer to the Honourable Member's first question the Commission has not officially received any information from the French authorities.

In answer to the other questions. I can say that the Commission, in collaboration with research bodies in 14 European States, is engaged in a 3-year research programme on a potential shore-based vessel traffic management scheme which will be particularly appropriate for the avoidance of collisions by ships using the crowded shipping lanes along the coastlines of Member States. This programme, known as COST 301, received the full support of the European Parliament on 9 July 1982 and was adopted by the Council on 13 December 1983. When the work is successfully completed in 1986 and if such a scheme is adopted and implemented by the European States concerned, it is confidently expected that not only will there be prior knowledge of ships carrying dangerous cargoes but the risk of collisions or other accidents involving danger to life or the environment will be considerably reduced.

In principle, COST 301 will not be confined to territorial waters, and the Commission is at present engaged in seeing how the procedures currently being developed may be introduced on an international scale through the IMO.

*
* *

Question No 38, by Mrs Scrivener (H-167/84)

Subject: Formaldehyde

In the resolution it adopted on 24 May 1984, the European Parliament adopted a position on indoor pollution and requested the Commission to take action in a number of areas.

In view of the renewed public discussion and widespread public disquiet, can the Commission indicate how far its research into the effect of formaldehyde on indoor air quality has progressed, whether its priority research activities already point to formaldehyde having carcinogenic effects, whether it has made its provisional research findings available to the health authorities of the Member States and whether efforts are already being made to achieve a Community-wide ban on the use of urea formaldehyde foam for house insulation?

Answer

For several years now the Commission has been closely following the questions and problems involved in the use of formaldehyde and urea formaldehyde foam in buildings and their effects on humans.

Several investigations are currently underway in this field in the Member States, and the Commission will take account of these in its future policies and activities in this area.

Hitherto, the Commission has largely followed the opinion of the Advisory Scientific Committee for the Investigation of the Toxicity and Ecotoxicity of Chemical Compounds. This opinion can be summarized as follows:

The diagnosis of nasal tumours in mice and rats — although not in hamsters — after prolonged exposure to highly irritant formaldehyde concentrations under special experimen-

tal conditions must be compared with the findings of several epidemiological studies recently carried out on humans, which produced no evidence that formaldehyde was carcinogenic in humans.

The opinion of the Scientific Committee was communicated unabridged to the Member States.

Moreover, in November 1983 the Commission held a meeting with the Member States to investigate whether it was necessary and appropriate for Community regulations to be proposed in this field. The majority of the Member States did not consider such regulations necessary in view of the existing national legislation and because no barriers to trade in the products in question had been established.

Shortly after the European Parliament had drawn attention to indoor pollution in its Resolution of 24 May 1984 the Commission held meetings combining various directorates to review the question and decided that the following questions should be investigated in an international study:

- (i) main sources of formaldehyde and exposure concentrations recorded;
- (ii) quantitative assessment of the possible effects of exposure;
- (iii) assessment of the health risk for the population of the Community;
- (iv) summary of existing national legislation on formaldehyde;
- (v) preparation of practical proposals aimed at lowering the concentrations of formaldehyde at workplaces, in housing and outside.

Finally, in the United States an extensive epidemiological study involving a population of 17 000 subjects known to have been exposed to considerable concentrations of formaldehyde is already far advanced. This study will provide valuable and more precise data for an assessment of the risk to humans. The Toxicology department in the appropriate Directorate-General is following this study closely and will examine the findings as soon as they are available.

As soon as the Commission has a more complete view of the effects of formaldehyde it will review the question of the possible need for measures in Europe.

*
* *

II. *Questions to the Council*

Question No 48, by Mr Deprez (H-124/84)

Subject: Implementation of the conclusions of the European Council meeting at Fontainebleau as regards the creation of national committees of European volunteer development workers

With reference to the activities to strengthen the identity of Europe in the eyes of its peoples and of the world at large agreed to by the meeting of the European Council at Fontainebleau,

considering in particular the measures designed to encourage young Europeans to take part in activities conducted by the Community in the Third World,

can the Council state what the present position is as regards the creation of the national committees of European volunteer development workers?

Answer

In the light of the conclusions of the European Council in Fontainebleau it is the Council's intent to continue the action taken by the Community to make public opinion, and

young people in particular, more aware of the development problems of the third world countries and to help solve these problems through all available means.

The Council would point out the significant increase in recent years of co-financing by the Community of projects set up by non-governmental organizations; these projects take various forms including the sending of volunteers to third world countries and are integrated in the daily life of the countries, with a view to the full implementation of the concept of North-South independence.

As regards the European Council's desire that the Member States should take steps to encourage young people to take part in activities conducted by the Community inside its borders, and in particular that they should contribute to setting up national Committees of European volunteer development workers, the Council notes that such initiatives are included in the activities which an *ad hoc* Committee made up of representatives of the Heads of State or of Government of the Member States has been instructed to prepare and coordinate.

*
* *

Question No 51, by Mr O'Donnell (H-131/84)

Subject: Easing checks on persons at frontiers

On 7 June 1984, the Council adopted a resolution on the free movement of persons within the Community. The effect of this resolution was to maintain the *status quo* and put off any further consideration of the problem for up to four years.

How does the Council now propose to implement the conclusions of the Fontainebleau Summit, which called for the elimination of all police and customs formalities before June 1985?

Answer

In accordance with the resolution of 7 June 1984, it is for the Member States to take the appropriate measures to reduce waiting time and the duration of checks to the minimum necessary, insofar as they have not put them into effect already.

The question of abolishing all police and customs formalities relating to the movement of persons at the Community's internal frontiers is one of the subjects to be dealt with by the *ad hoc* committee referred to in the conclusions of the Presidency of the Fontainebleau European Council meeting.

*
* *

Question No 52, by Mr Ryan (H-132/84)

Subject: Technical barriers to trade

At the close of the Foreign Affairs Council on 23 and 24 July 1984 it was stated that all Member States with one exception could agree to the adoption of the 15 directives before the Council on the removal of technical barriers to trade. Will the Council indicate which Member State is holding up progress and state why there has been no vote in the Council on these important directives?

Answer

The 15 directives on the removal of technical barriers to trade to which the honourable Member refers are based on Article 100 of the EEC Treaty, which requires unanimity for

adoption by the Council. However, at the Council meeting on 23 and 24 July 1984 one delegation was able to give its provisional agreement to 12 of the 15 directives but maintained a reservation on the other three directives.

In the meantime, clarification of these three draft Directives has been given to that delegation. I have every hope that it will shortly be able to agree to all 15 directives so that another step can be taken towards free movement of goods in the Community

*
* *

Question No 54, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-147/84)

Subject: Campaign against drug abuse

Does the Council of Ministers intend to place the problem of combating drug abuse on the agenda of forthcoming meetings?

The Council would repeat that, as it had occasion to state in reply to one of the Honourable Member's previous questions, it is perfectly aware of the importance of the problem of drug abuse and its consequences.

The European Council in Fontainebleau confirmed and emphasized the importance of the problem. In its conclusions it expressly instructed the *ad hoc* Committee for a People's Europe to examine measures to combat drug abuse.

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.

*
* *

Question No 55, by Mr Alavanos (H-154/84)

Subject: Mediterranean programmes

According to statements by Members of the European Council, the subject of Integrated Mediterranean Programmes was raised at the Summit meeting in June.

Can the Council inform us why no reference is made to the IMPs in the final statement of the Summit meeting especially since, according to President Mitterrand, a decision has been taken on this matter and, secondly, why no separate solution outside the 'package' was found as occurred in the case of dairy products MCAs and the Esprit programme, especially in view of the fact that the Commission proposal guarantees the implementation of IMPs from 1 January 1985?

Answer

As the honourable Member has already said, the conclusions of the European Council in Fontainebleau confirm the agreements reached at the European Council in Brussels. These agreements provide, *inter alia*, for the launching of integrated programmes in favour of the Mediterranean regions of the Community.

*
* *

Question No 56, by Mr Adamou (H-157/84)

Subject: Euro MPs from West Berlin

In the recent European elections 3 Members were elected to represent West Berlin.

Since the press in some countries carried a number of articles on this matter can the Council explain the legal basis for this election from the point of view of international and Community law and explain to what extent these proceedings are in accordance with the post-war agreements and in particular the Treaty of Potsdam which constitute an integral part of international law?

Answer

The Council would draw the honourable Member's attention to the declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the occasion of the adoption of the Act concerning the election of members by direct universal suffrage.

The text of this declaration is as follows:

'The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that the Act concerning the election of the members of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage shall equally apply to Land Berlin.

In consideration of the rights and responsibilities of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, the Berlin House of Deputies will elect representatives to those seats within the quota of the Federal Republic of Germany that fall to Land Berlin.'

*
* *

Question No 57, by Mr Ephremidis (H-160/84)

Subject: The Committee on the Association between the EEC and Turkey

According to recent information the Committee of Permanent Representatives of the EEC pressed for the convocation of the meeting of the Committee on the Association between the EEC and Turkey in July in response to a request by the Turkish Government regarding the reduction in quotas on Turkish exports to the EEC and on the trade of industrial goods, etc.

Can the Council inform us whether the decision regarding the convocation of the Committee of Association was taken unanimously and how it can be justified seeing that Turkey is still ruled by the junta of General Evren, martial law is still in force and that thousands of patriots and democrats are still being brutally tortured, and given the fact that the European Parliament and other organs of the EEC have previously adopted contrary resolutions on this matter?

Answer

The EEC-Turkey Association Committee did in fact meet on 20 July 1984 to tackle a series of technical problems which had arisen for both parties in the operation of the Ankara Agreement.

I would like to make clear that agreement to such a meeting — which, like previous meetings since 10 September 1980 was devoted exclusively to questions concerning the management of the Association Agreement — does not represent any new development in the Community's general position regarding Turkey.

*
* *

Question No 58, by Mr Kyrkos (H-162/84)

Subject: Integrated Mediterranean programmes

In view of the fact that the Council of Finance Ministers of the Community failed to find a formula to agree on the expenditure proposed by the Commission in the budget for the implementation of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, and that the recent Summit meeting of the Heads of State of the Member States in Paris failed to issue any statement regarding IMPs, can the President of the Council of Finance Ministers inform the House of the state of implementation of integrated Mediterranean programmes?

Answer

The Council would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that the conclusions of the European Council in Fontainebleau contain a confirmation of the agreements reached at the European Council in Brussels, including one for launching the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes.

The fact that the Council has not yet been able to reach agreement on the draft budget for 1985 can in no way affect the undertakings given by the European Council.

Moreover, the Commission has just submitted a new proposal on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes taking into account the Opinion of the European Parliament. The Council is currently examining the proposals.

*
* *

Question No 59, by Mr Pearce (H-163/84)

Subject: Taxation systems for commercial road vehicles

Why does the Council not manage to make progress towards adopting the 1978 draft directive on national taxation systems for commercial road vehicles, which it discussed on 24 March 1984?

Answer

As the honourable Member has said, the Council did indeed discuss the draft directive on national taxation systems for commercial road vehicles at its meeting on 24 March 1984. At the end of its discussions the Council instructed the Permanent Representatives Committee to submit proposals which would enable the difficulties arising in connection with this proposal to be overcome, taking into account the textual amendments which had become necessary and the various suggestions made during the discussions.

*
* *

*III. Questions to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs**Question No 64, by Mr Pearce (H-129/84)*

Subject: Production of heroin and opium

Will the Foreign Ministers reinforce their representations to the governments of countries in which heroin and opium are produced that the production of these substances be ceased, and be prepared, if necessary, to exert appropriate sanctions on those countries if persuasion fails to bring about the required result?

Answer

This matter has not been discussed in the framework of European political cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 66, by Mr Alavanos (H-153/84)

Subject: Visit by Mr Duarte to the Federal Republic of Germany

The 'President' of El Salvador, Napoleon Duarte, recently visited Bonn and other Western European capitals.

Do not the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation agree that a visit of this kind amounts to support for a government which is guilty of serious infringements of human rights and is a blow directed against the people of El Salvador in their struggle for democracy and social liberation?

Answer

Visits of the type mentioned by the Honourable Parliamentarian fall within the bilateral framework and not that of EPC.

The Ten are fully aware of the unsatisfactory human rights situation in El Salvador, which has existed for a number of years. They have underlined the need for strict observance of human rights in all the countries of Central America. The Ten welcome the assurances of Mr Duarte that human rights cases will be properly pursued, and they express the hope that these assurances will be implemented.

*
* *

Question No 67, by Mr Adamou (H-158/84)

Subject: Imports from the illegal 'State of Denktash'

According to reports by the international news agencies at the beginning of July the government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria refused to allow through its airspace a Turkish commercial aircraft carrying sultanas from the Northern part of the Republic of Cyprus which is illegally occupied by Turkish forces.

Can the Foreign Ministers inform us why EEC countries such as the United Kingdom — the destination of the aircraft referred to above — refuse to respect international law and accept products from the internationally outlawed 'State of Denktash and the Turkish tanks' which naturally do not bear the official stamp of the Republic of Cyprus, in defiance of previous positions adopted by the European Parliament and the Commission?

Answer

The issue raised by the Honourable Parliamentarian does not lie within the scope of European political cooperation.

With regard to the question of Cyprus, the Ten have repeatedly made known their support for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Cyprus, their rejection of the declaration of 15 November 1983 purporting to establish a

'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'; and their support for Resolutions 541 and 550 of the Security Council.

*
* *

Question No 68, by Mr Ephremidis (H-161/84)

Subject: Representations for the release of Mr Dikerdem

Mr Mohammed Dikerdem, a diplomat and a former Turkish Ambassador to Paris, the President of the Peace Committee of Turkey and vice-president of the World Council of Peace is in very grave danger. The health of Mr Dikerdem who is suffering from cancer has deteriorated owing to the medieval conditions of imprisonment in which he is being held.

Do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend on humanitarian grounds to press the Government of Turkey for the immediate release of Mr Mohammed Dikerdem who enjoys an international reputation so as to enable him to spend his last days in peace insofar as his ruined health allows?

Answer

The specific case of Mr Dikerdem has not been the subject of discussion by Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

The Ten remain concerned at the human rights situation within Turkey and particularly at the circumstances of those imprisoned on account of their beliefs. They expect the Turkish Government to respect fully basic human rights and freedoms.

The Ten will continue to follow closely the evolution of the situation in regard to human rights within Turkey.

*
* *

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 1984

Contents

- | | | |
|--|-----|--|
| 1. Approval of the minutes | | |
| Mr Rogalla | 126 | |
| 2. Topical and urgent debate | | |
| • Sinking of the 'Mont-Louis' — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-478/84) by Mr Ducarme and others; (Doc. 2-504/84) by Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz and others; (Doc. 2-507/84) by Mr de la Malène and others; (Doc. 2-524/84) by Mrs Van Hemeldonck and Mr Arndt; (Doc. 2-527/84) by Mrs Weber and others and (Doc. 2-484/84) by Mrs Schleicher and others | | |
| Mr Ducarme; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mrs Dupuy; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mrs Weber; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Bombard; Mr Chanterie; Mr De Gucht; Mr Staes; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Schwalba-Hoth | 126 | |
| • Unemployment — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-509/84) by Mr de la Malène and (Doc. 2-526/84) by Mr Didò and others | | |
| Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Didò; Mrs Salisch; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Tuckman; Mr Bonaccini; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mrs Chouraqui; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Brok; Mrs J. Hoffmann; Mr Richard (Commission) | 131 | |
| • Rules on the deferred payment of VAT — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-485/84) by Mrs Boot and others, Mrs Veil and others, and Mr Rogalla | | |
| Mrs Boot; Mr Patterson; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Rogalla | 136 | |
| • Appointment of a new Commission — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-488/84/rev.) by Mr Christopher Jackson and others and Mr Klepsch and others | | |
| Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Hänsch; Mr Croux; Mr Spinelli; Mr Narjes (Commission) | 137 | |
| • Dairy sector — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-487/84) by Mr Provan; (Doc. 2-500/84) by Mr Tolman and others, Mr Eyraud and others, Mrs S. Martin, Mr Mouchel and others and Mr Ducarme and (Doc. 2-479/84) by Mr Bocklet | | |
| Mr Provan; Mr Tolman; Mr Bocklet; Mr Eyraud; Mr Gatti; Mr Wolff; Mr Mouchel; Mr Happart; Mr Wolter; Mr Ducarme; Mr MacSharry; Mr Richard (Commission) | 139 | |
| • Human rights — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-477/84) by Mr Donnez and Mrs Veil; (Doc. 2-496/84) by Mr de Camaret and others; (Doc. 2-512/84) by Mr Segre and others; (Doc. 2-514/84) by Mr Arndt and others; (Doc. 2-480/84) by Mrs Lenz and others; (Doc. 2-495/84) by Mr de Camaret and others; (Doc. 2-494/84) by Mr de Camaret and others; (Doc. 2-497/84) by the Group of the European Democratic Alliance; (Doc. 1-501/84) by Mr Molinari and others; (Doc. 2-513/84) by Mr Wurtz and others; (Doc. 2-523/84) by Mr Van Miert and Mr Arndt; (Doc. 2-516/84) by Mr Glinne and Mr Arndt; (Doc. 2-518/84) by Mr Schmid and Mr Arndt; (Doc. 2-521/84) by Mr Glinne and Mr Arndt; (Doc. 2-525/84) by Mr Van Miert and Mr Arndt; (Doc. 2-502/84) by Mr Vandemeulebroucke and others; (Doc. 2-503/84) by Mr Lalor and others and (Doc. 2-517/84) by Mrs Castle and others | | |
| Mr Donnez; Mr Andrews; Mr Donnez; Mr Antony; Mr Trivelli; Mr Verbeek; Mrs Lenz; Mr Tripodi; Mr de Camaret; Mrs Chouraqui; Mr Molinari; Mr Wurtz | 144 | |
| 3. Deadline for tabling amendments | | |
| Mr Pannella; Mr Hume; Mr Taylor; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Andrews; Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr Pannella; Mr Elliott | 148 | |
| 4. Votes | | |
| Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Cot; Mr Ducarme; Mr von der Vring; Mme Scrivener; | | |

Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr von der Vring; Mr Dankert; Mr Cot; Mr Cryer; Mr Pitt; Mrs Castle; Mr Langes; Mrs Castle; Mr Cryer; Mr Klepsch; Mr Prag; Mr Piermont; Mr Coste-Floret; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Sutra;

Mr Marshall; Mr Pranchère; Sir Peter Vaneck; Mr Taylor; Mr Richard (Commission); Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Sherlock 151

5. *Adjournment of the session* 158

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

Mr Rogalla (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I would like to draw your attention to Item 10 of yesterday's Minutes, which simply refers to verification of credentials. I was present yesterday, but cannot recall the President initiating any such action. The Minutes for Tuesday, 11 September need correcting: in Item 4 no mention is made of the list of Members whose credentials have been verified. I would be grateful if you would arrange for Item 10 of yesterday's Minutes to be altered, either to include mention of presidential action, so that we have some reference, or to refer to action by the chairman of the committee responsible. Secondly, the title of Appendix II, which refers to this matter, should be altered to read: Members whose credentials have been confirmed, not verified. Thirdly, I request that the legibility of the list be improved: in its present form it is unreadable. I would be grateful if a legible list could be appended to today's Minutes.

President. — Mr Rogalla, we shall have those changes made. The list of names will be printed in the final version of the minutes.

(Parliament approved the minutes)¹

¹ *Withdrawal of motions for resolutions — Documents received: see Minutes.*

2. *Topical and urgent debate¹*

Sinking of the 'Mont-Louis'

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

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-478/84) by Mr Ducarme and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the sinking of the 'Mont-Louis' cargo ship and the transport of radioactive materials;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-504/84) by Mrs Bloch von Blotnitz and others, on behalf of the Rainbow Group, on the transport of nuclear materials in connection with the sinking of the 'Mont-Louis';
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-507/84) by Mr de la Malène and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the sinking of the 'Mont-Louis' containing uranium hexafluoride;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-524/84) by Mrs Van Hemeldonck and Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the sinking of the 'Mont-Louis';
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-527/84) by Mrs Weber and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the accident involving the 'Mont-Louis' and agreements on the protection of the sea;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-484/84) by Mrs Schleicher and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on environmental issues of current relevance
 - the transport of radioactive substances
 - dioxin residues in waste incineration plants
 - formaldehyde.

Mr Ducarme (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I shall be extremely brief, particularly since Members have tabled a large number of motions for resolutions.

¹ Further information on the voting in the topical and urgent debates can be found in the Minutes.

Ducarme

I should like to go one step further than the justification given in the motion I tabled on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and insist on our Parliament voting a motion today, even a joint one. This would enable us to invite the Commission and the national authorities to take up a position on this matter.

We know the situation. We know that one government, the French government, has proved to be very un-European in this matter, as there has been no communication with the other governments or with the Commission. And we also know that, as things stand, a transporter of such substances has real immunity because there are no regulations. And here we insist that, at the end of this debate, the European Parliament take a unanimous vote on a Community regulation on the transport of radioactive substances over land, by sea and by air.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — (DE) It is tragic that an accident has to happen before a problem is discussed and solutions sought. Surely it should be the task of this Parliament to act as a pioneer rather than shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted. What else has to happen, what other dreadful accidents must there be, before we finally grasp that we must take immediate, urgent action? Parliament must have been aware of the potential dangers: Mrs van Hemeldonck of the Belgian Socialist Party spoke on this very problem here in the House a year ago.

I would also particularly like to point out that these substances are transported by road and rail as well as by sea. I come from an area where, during the next few weeks, nuclear waste is to be transported daily through unprotected villages on its way to Gorleben. When will it finally be accepted that this is a dead-end technology, which is not only extremely expensive but also harbours untold hazards for humanity? We by no means control these hazards: they control us. I call upon you to take action to ensure that such accidents cannot happen again. In short: is this planet to be sacrificed to nuclear madness or do we wish to prevent this?

Mrs Dupuy (RDE). — (FR) The Group of the European Democratic Alliance agrees with what has just been said.

Although I am a new Member, I know this House has insisted on many occasions on the need for measures to prevent and fight pollution of the sea.

After the sinking of the *Amoco Cadiz*, which showed how ill-prepared we were to handle disasters of this magnitude, a plan to form a Community unit equipped with powerful means of prevention was devised. What has happened to it?

In May this year, on the basis of a Commission proposal, the European Parliament came out in favour of making emergency plans to combat the accidental tipping of hydrocarbons into the ocean. It laid particular emphasis on the proposal for a directive being extended to include other toxic substances and voted an amendment along these lines.

All the Member States know what position our Parliament took up. So why the silence and embarrassment in this sort of affair? I am shocked and baffled at the deceitful attitude and wonder what disastrous consequences there could have been if the nature of the *Mont-Louis*' cargo had not been made public by a private body, which come to know of it through a leak of information.

Mr President, we call on the Commission to tell the European Parliament, by the end of October, what progress has been made at Community level with the transport and disposal of dangerous waste and, in particular, how far the project devised after the sinking of the *Amoco Cadiz* has got.

I appeal to the honourable Members to give their full support to our resolution.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — (NL) Mr President, it was ten years ago that this Parliament first drew the Council's and Commission's attention to the need to protect the public and the environment against the side-effects of new industrial processes and the use of nuclear fuel. As rapporteur on the transfrontier transport of dangerous substances, I referred in July 1983 to the many loopholes in the relevant international legislation. Despite the clear mandate given by this Parliament, for some unknown reason the Council allowed a year to pass before reaching some kind of political agreement in June 1984. Circumstances now force us to reiterate and reassert the need for legislation in three areas:

Firstly, the transport of dangerous substances by water, land and air should be governed by stringent and binding legislation. Secondly, the Seefeld proposal on the protection of personnel in ports and at sea, the training of the workers concerned, who are exposed to incredible risks, and the information with which they are provided should be reconsidered. Thirdly, there is a need for legislation on shipping in the North Sea, where the traffic in some places is almost as dense as it is on the Place de la Concorde, and this should include the introduction of specific pilot services and the compulsory recruitment of specialized pilots for this kind of dangerous transport operation.

Mrs Weber (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, how many more Sevesos must there be before the Community takes the proper action at the proper time? Up to now, Parliament has always had to

Weber

take the initiative. After the accident in Seveso, Parliament took up the matter. When the Seveso waste disappeared, we set up a committee of enquiry. Perhaps the *Mont-Louis* accident will finally lead to action.

The Seefeld report drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Transport was presented in 1981. Appropriate action has still not been taken. In 1982 we adopted a motion for a resolution. During 1983 and 1984 Parliament persistently pressed for a solution to be found to this problem.

What risks is our industrial society still prepared to accept and when will we face the consequences? All industrial activities, and this includes the transport of hazardous substances, must be subjected to environmental impact assessment. The risks must be weighed before any decisions are taken. Incidents like this, where precisely these dangers were left out of the initial considerations, only serve to provide the opponents of nuclear energy with grist for their mill.

What is the point of international agreements if they are full of loopholes, if certain countries refuse to ratify these agreements despite being urged to do so? It is high time that the Community ratified these international agreements so that we have an opportunity of controlling what goes on. We must sanction countries that refuse to ratify these agreements by boycotting their ports. We cannot allow them to penalize those countries which accept the rules by permitting these ships to use their ports. We should support those trade unions who cannot accept that their members should handle these transports, and we must say openly that we are unwilling to tolerate them any longer.

We call upon the North Sea Conference, which is to meet at the end of October, to reconsider all these important matters.

Mrs Schleicher (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, an accident or a catastrophe is not foreseeable. When something does occur, it soon becomes obvious whether the minimum preventive measures necessary have been taken or not.

There have been three incidents reported in the Press over the last few weeks which have shaken the confidence of the people of Europe in the European Community's ability to deal with environmental problems, in particular hazardous substances and wastes: the collision in the Channel, the closure of nursery schools because of danger to health from formaldehyde and the dioxin scandals in various places.

The Group of the European People's Party is appalled that parliamentary proposals dating from 1981, for example in the Gatto and Seefeld reports, have still not been implemented, that the standard of measures for dealing with hazardous substances in the Member

States of the European Community varies widely and that these are in no way sufficient to reduce dangerous transfrontier problems to a minimum.

There are still a large number of open questions regarding the accident in the Channel. What was the ship in fact transporting? Was this vessel at all suitable for this type of transport? Are international agreements adequate? Which Member States are refusing to introduce the measures agreed by the Community?

We accuse the Commission of only taking half-hearted action and the European Council of being incapable of drawing up and implementing the measures urgently required to protect our population.

The motions for resolutions submitted by various groups in this Parliament show that there is no simple solution to this problem and that the inertia of the Commission and the Council are ultimately detrimental to the people of Europe.

Mr Bombard (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to return to the *Mont-Louis*. I approve of everything Mrs Dupuy, Mr Ducarme, Mrs Schleicher and Mrs Weber have just said and you, Mr President, who headed the Committee of Enquiry into the transfrontier shipment of waste, can hardly do anything but support me when I say that these rules absolutely have to be applied in maritime transport, as we want them to be applied in transport on land and by rail.

What we must avoid on this occasion is mixing things up, as Mrs Bloch von Blotnitz is doing, and evading an issue which has got to come up in this House one day and which all previous governments, French and otherwise, have evaded. That issue is the danger attached to the transport of radioactive substances. So far, we have talked about chemical waste and dangerous waste, but we have not mentioned radioactive waste. There will have to be a debate on the transport of radioactive products and waste in this House. But I should not like to do more than one thing at a time as far as the sinking of the *Mont-Louis* is concerned. For the moment, the *Mont-Louis* problem is not, fortunately, terribly serious in that the wreck is accessible and we know how to get the contents out.

Uranium? It is a frightening word, but we live with uranium in our natural surroundings and the amount of uranium in the products in the *Mont-Louis* is very close to the amounts around us naturally. I should just like to say that we need a special debate on the problems of radioactive products — otherwise there will be really disastrous accident one day, far worse than the *Mont-Louis*.

Mr Chanteric (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the accident involving the 'Mont-

Chanterie

Louis' has focused attention on the problem of transporting radioactive substances. Do enough people realize that, after the 'Olau Britannia' had collided with the 'Mont Louis' on 25 August, 900 passengers spent some five hours drifting over a cargo of 450 tonnes of radioactive uranium hexafluoride? Do they realize that it took the French authorities some twelve hours to inform the Belgian authorities of the cargo the French vessel was carrying? In the last two and a half weeks the public have constantly been left with the impression that the information provided, particularly by the French authorities, has been incomplete or incorrect and that this has resulted in a serious lack of coordination between the French and Belgian authorities.

Mr President, the North Sea is one of the busiest shipping areas in the world. I would compare it to the Champs Elysées in Paris. Would the French authorities allow so dangerous a substance to be transported along the Champs Elysées in Paris? They would, I think, make other arrangements. And this is what must be done when such substances are transported in the North Sea. It is estimated that every year some 420 000 ships pass through the Straits of Dover. That is more than a thousand ships a day. The largest concentration is, of course, to be found near ports, but shipping accidents regularly occur in the North Sea. In 1980, for example, there were 201 cases of ships colliding, going aground or sinking. If we look at the present situation, we find there is a great deal of national, Community and international legislation, but we cannot help feeling that this multiplicity of legislation is a sign of weakness and a hindrance. There is consequently an urgent need for the Community to take the initiative and call for a central North Sea conference to coordinate all this legislation.

Mr De Gucht (L). — (NL) Mr President, I shall not go into this matter, since I believe the previous speakers have already referred to all the facts of the case. I agree with everything they have said.

I should merely like to say on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group that concern for our natural environment will, and indeed must, be uppermost in our minds in our debates during the life of this Parliament. It is unacceptable that, as this drama involving the 'Mont-Louis' has once again shown, we should have to wait for an accident to happen, or almost happen, before we are prepared to tackle a specific problem. We must demonstrate more general concern for our environment, and the Liberal and Democratic Group is convinced that the European Parliament is best suited to drawing attention to this issue at all times.

Mr Staes (ARC). — (NL) We propose that the European Parliament should form a delegation composed of members of the committees which consider matters relating to the environment, transport and energy.

Before the end of November this delegation should make contact with everyone on the Belgian crisis management team. All the pertinent questions regarding the 'Mont-Louis' should be raised at these meetings, so that the European Parliament is fully informed and is able to discuss the matter with a knowledge of all the facts.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — (NL) As I live in Ostende, I am perhaps more concerned than anyone here by the 'Mont-Louis' accident, which once again raises the whole question of the transport of radioactive substances. It is absolutely inconceivable, as Mr Chanterie has just said, that the Straits of Dover can be used for this purpose.

Another aspect to be considered is the horrifying unwillingness of the French authorities to disclose what cargo the ship was actually carrying and their hypocritical attitude regarding the progress of the salvage operations. It was left to Greenpeace to announce that the cargo included hexafluoride, and it was fifteen days after the accident before it was reluctantly admitted that high-tech equipment and chips were also on board the 'Mont-Louis'. The whole incident reveals the inconceivable lack of international legislation on the transport of dangerous substances. Perhaps this accident will at last give the Commission and Council an opportunity of drafting binding and uniform legislation, which should include provisions requiring notification of cargoes being carried and routes followed and setting out the penalties that will be imposed.

Mr President, it is absolutely essential for the transport of radioactive substances to be prohibited immediately and for this ban to remain in force until appropriate legislation has been introduced.

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — (FR) Mr President, I am shocked to hear Mr Bombard, who, I hope, was only speaking for himself, say that there are not great problems attached to the *Mont-Louis*. Not a day — nay, not an hour — goes by without us realizing that the threat represented by the products in the hull of the *Mont-Louis* is mounting, and I believe, Mr President, that the only wise thing this House can do, pending a regulation, is to ban the transport of these radioactive wastes by sea, by air and on land. We need a restrictive regulation, but first we must have a ban. . .

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, first of all I would like to thank the House on behalf of the Commission for placing the *Mont-Louis* incident first on its list of topics for urgent debate, thereby clearly demonstrating the political significance of this matter. However, the questions include requests for such a wide range of information on the technical, scientific, ecological, legal and political aspects of this incident that even brief replies to

Narjes

each point would cause this debate to overrun seriously. We shall be left with extensive material for the committees to deal with, and for further debates in the House.

Following this accident, the Commission has checked the effectiveness of all the regulations on the transport of hazardous substances, in particular radioactive substances, has considered what improvements are possible and has also submitted appropriate proposals for those areas where existing international regulations have been invoked to challenge the Community's authority.

This applies particularly to the transport of hazardous substances by sea, and here I agree with Mr Bombard. The IMO claims the right to regulate this on an international basis. The majority of Member States completely refuse to accept any Community or Commission authority in these spheres. However, the question arises as to whether it is not high time for special legislation to be created for the Community's coastal waters and for the busy stretches of the European offshore waters of the North Sea, the Baltic Sea and the Mediterranean — where possible with the cooperation of those coastal states in these areas which are not members of the Community.

The Commission will attempt to influence the work of the North Sea Conference along these lines and will raise these matters at the Conference, whose work is already far advanced and includes other major environmental problems in the North Sea. We also hope that the improvement in the weather this morning means that the cargo can in fact be salvaged within 4 or 5 days.

I would now like to reply to the individual questions under two headings: firstly, matters relating to the *Mont-Louis* accident and secondly, the EPP's questions on dioxin and formaldehyde.

The Commission was first informed of the *Mont-Louis* accident by a letter from the French government of 30 August. Our overall information on the cargo is similar to what Members will have read in the Press. I do not wish to repeat all that here. It would appear that to date all the containers are intact. The main dangers involved possible chemical reactions, not nuclear and radioactive hazards emanating from the cargo.

One enquiry concerned the hypothetical question of how this incident would have been handled if no private organization had taken the initiative and informed the public. We assume that salvage attempts would have been made even without public concern. We have no opinion as to what information would or would not have been made available in such a situation. As far as the legal aspects of this incident are concerned, Community legislation only applies under the rules of Euratom, namely, the basic standards for

protection against radioactivity which also apply to the transport of radioactive substances.

Beyond this there are special regulations formulated and discussed by the IAEA, of which all Member States and the Community are members. These are described in detail in a report which is obviously not familiar to all Members.

It was presented to the House on 26 April this year, relates to the transport of radioactive substances in the European Community and reflects the conclusions of the committee of experts demanded in the 1982 Seefeld report. This committee dealt with all the aspects in its technical and scientific section. I refer you to it.

With regard to the question on to what extent the measures taken in connection with the *Amoco Cadiz* incident were ineffective here, or to what extent they were not complied with, I would first of all like to point out that the oil spilt is approximately one half percent of the quantity that led to the major damage caused by the *Amoco Cadiz*.

Following that incident, it was decided to set up a system to exchange information and provide mutual aid to combat pollution from oil spills. A programme to develop new methods and techniques to combat pollution in a manner less damaging to the environment was also initiated. The European Parliament's suggestion for a register of oil tankers has not yet been accepted; the Council of Ministers has failed to reach a decision.

I have already mentioned the IAEA report which makes it clear that the Commission is considering initiatives in three areas, to some extent, however, not until the groundwork has been carried out. Firstly, a proposed directive must be drawn up to counter Member States dragging their feet over implementing IAEA measures. Secondly, organizational problems in the transport industry need to be dealt with more efficiently, particularly with a view to reducing the quantity of consignments. Thirdly, we intend to submit a report on improved training for transport personnel.

As far as the nautical aspect is concerned, the so-called 301 programme is currently operating within the framework of the COST programme. This programme, details of which are well known to the Committee on Research, aims to set up an integrated network of coastal surveillance centres using radar and information technology systems. Initial research on this should be completed by the end of 1986.

With regard to port controls, the application of existing international regulations is sufficient. My investigations show that some 10 000 vessels were checked in recent years, of which 340 were detained in port for defects to be remedied.

We must also consider whether roll-on/roll-off vessels such as the *Mont-Louis* can be used in future for such

Narjes

dangerous consignments. This type of vessel has no bulkheads and tends to capsize even when only slightly damaged. I cannot give an opinion on this matter, since it does not come under Community jurisdiction. Investigation by the marine authorities responsible must establish the extent to which mistakes by the crews of the two ships involved contributed to the accident.

A further question related to the availability of data. I would again refer you to the Commission's April report. According to one figure we have, there were something like 1.4 million consignments in 1980, of which well over 90 per cent were from the field of medical and scientific research.

In the second part of my reply, I would briefly like to mention the other two environmental problems referred to by the EPP group. Firstly, waste incinerators: their emission comes under Article 9 of Council directive 319 which dates from 1978. Waste incinerators require a permit to operate. There is, however, no Community legislation on waste incinerators as such, which are entirely the responsibility of the Member States.

As far as formaldehyde is concerned, I would like to point out that Mrs Scrivener asked a question during the last Question Time which was answered in writing. This matter cannot now be discussed orally. To save time, I would therefore refer you to the detailed written reply to Mrs Scrivener's question.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote

Amendment by Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, and Mr Carossino, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, replacing the first five motions for resolutions

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — (DE) We request that the vote first be taken on the separate motions for resolutions. I would also request that our motion for a resolution be voted on paragraph by paragraph, as it is highly controversial. I feel that we should try to achieve some real progress and not simply vote on generalities.

President. — Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz, since there is a joint amendment, that will be voted on first. Should this be rejected, then we shall vote on the separate motions for resolutions. It is up to Members themselves therefore in the vote to determine what procedure will be followed.

Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC). — (DE) On a point of order, I would submit that amendments are permissible to the amendments by Mr Arndt and others.

This amendment was not tabled until today and only appears to offer a compromise. As far as our demands to reject the nuclear industry and nuclear and plutonium transports are concerned, it takes a defensive view.

President. — It is not customary to have amendments to amendments.

(Parliament adopted the amendment and the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-484/84) by Mrs Schleicher and others)

Unemployment

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-509/84) by Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the need to tackle as a matter of priority and in a new way the problem of unemployment;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-526/84) by Mr Didò and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the reorganization of working time.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let there be no doubt in anyone's mind that the single greatest challenge facing the Community is the scourge of unemployment. The European Community is reeling from one intolerable set of unemployment figures to another. Remedial action is long overdue.

We are deeply concerned at the way in which unemployment has hit young people under the age of 25. At the same time, there is every need to improve the situation of other workers, women and those over the age of 50. On behalf of my group, the European Democratic Alliance, I urge the Members of this Parliament not to lose sight of the problem that unemployment constitutes. We must not allow ourselves to become indifferent with the passage of time to the desperate situation facing the 12 million people who are without work in 1984 — a figure 4 times greater than a decade ago. They are without hope, without champions to plead their cause.

We are at the beginning of a new term of office. It is our sincere hope that the European Parliament will show its appreciation of the situation by supporting our request that all the institutions of the Community once and for all tackle unemployment in a positive way. We appreciate that there are other issues which the Community must resolve, in particular the budgetary crisis. Yet we believe that by finding a solution to the budgetary impasse we help to find a means of tackling the time bomb that is unemployment. Unless

Fitzgerald

this Parliament can persuade the Member States, the Council and Commission, together with the employers and trade unions, to cooperate in this matter, our relevance to the swelling ranks of the unemployed, particularly our young people, will cease to exist. The number of unemployed young people in my own country increased by almost 11% in the past year and the situation shows no sign of improving. For the sake of all those who are unemployed, let this Parliament send out a message loud and clear: we are concerned and from the outset we intend to make the creation of new jobs our priority task.

In conclusion, may I, as a former Minister for Social Affairs, add a brief poignant personal note. Just consider the job losses and factory closures over the last 18 months! On behalf of my group, I make an urgent plea to Parliament to support the resolution.

Mr Didò (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, despite the beginning of economic recovery, unemployment is unfortunately getting worse and it is particularly affecting women and young people. This Parliament, like the Commission and the Council, has recognized that the reorganization of working time is one of the measures necessary to deal with unemployment, particularly where this is due to industrial reorganization and the introduction of new technologies which replace men with machines.

The reformed Social Fund is now offering financing to undertakings which reduce working hours while at the same time increasing the number of jobs. In addition, in all the Community countries general or specific agreements have now been concluded to this effect. The most recent has been in the German Federal Republic.

We therefore feel that conditions now exist for a European framework agreement to be drawn up. And we call, first, on the Council of Ministers that will meet on 21 September to adopt Parliament's resolutions in this matter. Should, as happened in June, one country oppose its veto, we ask that the Governments which agree put these resolutions into effect. Secondly, we ask that the Commission adopt all the measures necessary to induce the social partners at the European level, that is UNICE and the European Trade Union Confederation, to start negotiations on the formulation of a European framework agreement that can serve as a guide for the social partners in the individual Community member countries.

Mrs Salisch (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have frequently dealt with the subject of unemployment and I sometimes feel like a parrot constantly repeating itself. On behalf of my group I have frequently criticized the fact that all the Councils and the Commission repeatedly declare that the problem of unemployment has top priority, then never do anything.

When we look at all the proposals for next year's budget, it is obvious that the resources available will not be enough to combat steadily rising unemployment. It is more important than ever that Parliament, as in the past, take the initiative and press for our proposals to be implemented. Above all, both sides of industry must get together at European level to arrive at some sensible solution on reducing working hours as a way of combating unemployment. This is a matter to which I attach great importance.

I would like to mention one other point that comes up in the Didò amendment. The point is frequently made that employment structures vary throughout Europe and that it is not possible to know precisely which methods are most efficient in the fight against unemployment, particularly youth unemployment and the long-term jobless. If this is so, then we do need a European institution to observe labour markets in the Member States, collect material, carry out comparative studies and publish information. I therefore strongly urge that the House adopt Mr Didò's amendment so that we can set up a European observation service.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, my group is pleased that Mr de la Malène and Mr Didò have taken these initiatives, because we believe that unemployment cannot be discussed often enough here. At the same time, I share Mrs Salisch's opinion that there is a tendency simply to repeat what has already been said in the past. I feel we must be careful in this respect and that this resolution should concentrate chiefly on the appeal to the Council of Ministers to define the framework agreement on the redistribution of work. This resolution should overcome the *impasse* that has occurred in this area. If that is made the essence of this resolution, we can support it.

As this resolution principally concerns the redistribution of work, I should like to summarize my group's views on this subject. We fully endorse the concept of the redistribution of work, but only if stringent requirements are satisfied. We believe that work must be redistributed flexibly, not on the basis of a single model. We also believe that the redistribution of work is a matter for the two sides of industry rather than legislation. We further believe that work must be redistributed in such a way that the pressure on industry is not increased and that its competitiveness is not restricted more than it already is. We also believe that work must be redistributed in the way that creates the maximum number of new jobs, and we feel that these jobs must be reserved primarily for those who have been hardest hit by unemployment: young people and women. Those are our premises, and I must say that few of them are to be found in Mr Didò's resolution. We have therefore tabled a number of amendments to emphasize these points.

To conclude, I will just explain one of these amendments. We do not agree with the Socialist Group that

Maij-Weggen

the European Community should set up an institute to provide information on the redistribution of work. We believe that this should be left to the two sides of industry and that this kind of information can also be included in the social and economic reports.

Mr Tuckman (ED). — Mr President, my group also is interested and very keen that this subject be debated seriously and often. Our worry is that we see it very much like one of those medical problems where we know what we want to achieve but do not know how to get there or whether one can get there at all. Our great concern is that in comparison with our competitors, particularly in the Far East and in the United States, we lag behind and that merely to say that we will reduce working hours per week is not going to help us at all. We would like to believe that by a rearrangement of working time we could create extra jobs, but we are worried about what the net effect might well be if this is wrongly handled — that, in fact, we may become less competitive and therefore further outdistanced by our competitors.

What we really think is that a lot of the problem on the input side is due to Europe having reduced its pace of work. There are experiments going right back to the 1932 era when Western Electric in the United States found that the pace of work was a group thing, and our European set-up is reducing its pace. We are also concerned that we are taking out more than we are putting in, that we are not investing enough and therefore a lot of these solutions are going to be harmful rather than helpful.

Nevertheless, in general we have sat down together and looked at the amendments. If those of Mr Brok go through, then, in general, my group would be very happy to support this resolution. But we have to continue to say that we would like the search for better solutions to continue. It will not do just to utter fine words here, because, in the end, whether Europe lives or dies economically, whether it prospers or diminishes, depends on what happens on the shopfloor and not on what happens in this Chamber.

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, my group has always sought to persuade this Parliament that in fact the best economic system is the one that can ensure full utilization of all the available resources — and surely the most important of these are human and manpower resources.

We cannot therefore but feel bitter and express our disapproval — both of society and those that govern it — when we see so many men and women deprived of the opportunity to work and so many hundreds of thousands of more mature individuals, those aged 40-45, made 'obsolete' by the workings of our present economies.

We shall therefore be voting for the resolutions, not least as a reference to the work we have already done and intend to do shortly, starting from next week, when we shall be calling in the Committee on Economic and Monetary affairs for a fresh initiative in the area of the economic recovery programme and of problems more specifically related to employment.

Our position on the resolutions will be consonant with all this, as we are particularly anxious to prevent any postponement.

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, my group regrets that the very serious problem of unemployment should be discussed in five minutes in the form of an urgent debate. We think this is ridiculous and simply pulls the wool over the eyes of all our fellow-citizens who are out of work. If we are going to adopt resolutions, let us at least be sincere. The *Didò* resolution now before us hardly differs from all the sops with which some Members of this Parliament appear to have been trying to pacify the European electorate for years.

Mr President, although it may be a difficult pill to swallow, innovative production methods and, of course, automation are necessary if employment is to rise again in the longer term, unless we want to become a museum of past glories. If our amendments are adopted, the resolution will be clearer and above all more sincere in this respect.

Mrs Chouraqui (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to contribute one detail on my Group's attitude to the *Didò* resolution in this very short debate on unemployment.

Employment is an absolute priority as far as we are concerned, but we do not believe in the reduction of working time as a factor in job creation. Let me explain. It is high time we debunked the idea of work-sharing as an answer to unemployment. The real debate should not be about working more or working less. It should be about working more and offering as many jobs as possible to the maximum number of workers. A rigid reduction in working hours does not create employment. Looking on the quantity of work as a piece of mathematical data and concluding that you have to take jobs away from some people to give them to others is a static and conservative way of looking at things. Making working hours more flexible, on the other hand, and reorganizing working time is more in line with the economic and social imperatives of Europe today.

We shall make proposals in this field in good time, for we believe that a range of very different measures to provide a response to the workers' social aspirations are involved.

Chouraqui

Look at the economic history of Europe in ancient and modern times and you will see that waves of reorganization and reduction of working time always accompany waves of investment. It is productivity increases plus reorganization of the productive apparatus that lead to reductions in working time.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, there is one very important sector where employment is concerned, and that is coal-mining. This sector is all the more important because of the serious doubts society has about nuclear energy and its effect on the environment. Our thoughts also turn in this context to the British miners' strike and the closure of pits in Belgian Limburg, the area from which I come. I therefore propose that we should have an energy debate to discuss, firstly, the implications of this trend for employment, secondly, what the workers can do in this respect and, thirdly, the reduction of working hours.

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it has become a ritual for us to discuss the subjects of unemployment and a reduction in working time again and again without ever achieving any progress. I do not think that the European Community should be trying to achieve a framework agreement at European level with a Community plan.

The West German Social Democrat proposers in particular must be aware that, in free collective bargaining, the unions in West Germany have reached different agreements during this year's negotiations on restructuring and reducing working time.

The desire to draw up unified concepts for the whole of Europe is both unnecessary and wrong. We should be trying to influence the level of unemployment in ways that take account of different conditions in different regions, of different sizes of undertakings. Our international competitiveness and cost factors must also be borne in mind.

I also strongly oppose a negative approach to the new technologies. The third industrial revolution naturally presents us with problems of adjustment, and we must come to terms with their impact on society. We must accept, however, as shown for example in a study by the Social Democrat candidate for the office of West German Economics Minister at the last election, Professor Krupp, that those sections of industry that have welcomed new developments and technologies are providing more jobs, whereas those sections that reject the new technologies have lost jobs. We Europeans must beware of a negative attitude to the new technologies, we must welcome their positive aspects. In my view this is the only way to achieve progress. The creation of institutions to rehash what we already know is not the way. We need a concept that offers real hope for the future.

Mrs J. Hoffmann (COM). — *(FR)* I too should like to say a few words on this question of unemployment, a crucial one for our national economies and for the life of our peoples, which has been the subject of a number of resolutions.

In July our Group again asserted the need for this House to be active and constructive on this essential issue and, whenever it comes up, we shall support anything that works along these lines.

Having said this, I should like to say that we have no illusions when we read the texts that have been tabled. Experience has shown that there are several ways of fighting unemployment. But it means action. Combating the crisis, as far as we are concerned, means modernizing — and not necessarily reducing employment. It means investing, training the workers, increasing the quantity and quality of what we produce, cutting working hours without cutting wages, giving a mass dimension to vocational training and maintaining and improving the purchasing power of our wage-earners. We must, as indeed the proposals suggest, encourage the idea of negotiations, but, to our mind, they must not be exclusive negotiations. All the representative trade union organizations of our countries must be there.

I should just like to end by saying that we cannot expect to alter the situation without bold social innovations. But there will be an opportunity to talk about this later.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, may I say right at the outset that, as far as the Commission is concerned, today's debate is both timely and useful. I think it is important that the European Parliament at its first session after a fresh election should make a firm statement of its views on unemployment and its determination to try and do something about it. Therefore, as I say, we cannot but welcome this motion which reaffirms that the highest priority should be attached to the problem of unemployment.

May I say a word about the effect of policies in the last few years. As an institution, Mr President, the Commission has frequently reiterated its view that the fight against unemployment should be the Community's No 1 priority. I, therefore, wholeheartedly agree with Parliament's emphasis in this respect. Registered unemployment now stands at well over 12 million. Over 4 million people in the Community have now been out of work for more than one year. Over 2 million people in the Community have now been out of work for more than two years. Nearly one in three young people under 25 are now unemployed. I am disturbed, Mr President, to find myself having to repeat such figures over and over again — and each time I have to repeat the figures, they themselves seem to be getting worse.

Richard

The Commission has produced its proposals for action. Since 1982 we have been working within the framework set down by the Council resolution on action to combat unemployment, following the mandate given by the 1982 Jumbo Council of Finance, Economic and Employment Ministers. In 1982 I could say to the Parliament that I thought there were some prospects for real progress. Since then we have produced action programmes and policy guidelines on vocational training, youth employment, women's employment, local employment initiatives and the new technologies. We have launched a whole strategy on the reduction and the reorganization of working time and labour. I will say a word about that in a moment. We have engaged in far-reaching reviews of the Social Fund and the Regional-Fund; we have produced new policies and instruments for sectoral readjustment and for promoting investment; we have urged the Council and the Member States to make greater efforts to reconcile economic and social objectives, to strengthen rather than weaken the social dialogue in periods of difficulty and to take proper political responsibility for maintaining solidarity in society. Despite this, unemployment in the Community has actually doubled since 1980.

Mr President, governments — it must be said and it should be said — have failed to react positively and in concert to the ideas and policies that the Commission has put in front of them. I say this with no enjoyment. I say it, indeed, more in sorrow although tinged with a fair amount of anger. As a result of that, the employment and economic problems of Member States have worsened rather than lessened in the last four years. Corrective action now has to be envisaged in a more radical and far-reaching way than was thought necessary a few years ago. This only reinforces the need for cooperation at Community level.

Mr President, I am not asking for the moon. What I am asking for is simply a more realistic approach by the individual Member States and by the Council of Ministers acting in concert to this problem. The more we go on fiddling about with the problem as we have been, frankly — or some of the Member States have been — over the last few years, the more difficult it will be to get a grip on the problem and to take major policy initiatives which will bring it under control.

I turn now to the second resolution before the House this morning, that by Mr Didò on the reorganization of working-time. I think there is a direct connection between the reduction of working-time and flexibility of working-hours. If one looks at what the Commission has said on this subject, the documents and proposals we have produced or, indeed, the draft recommendation that was negotiated with nine of the ten Member States before the last Council of Ministers, one will see that the link between the reduction of working-time and flexibility of working-hours and working methods is one which we clearly accept.

The Commission can only agree with the wish of Parliament that the nine governments which have supported the draft Council recommendation on the reduction and reorganization of working-time should now proceed to carry it out by implementing the appropriate measures. Important breakthroughs in collective bargaining in some countries with regard to employment-orientated reorganizations of working-time may give additional impetus to similar action in the other Member States.

Mr Brok asked for a flexible framework to be negotiated either with the Council or with both sides of industry at European level. I entirely agree with the need for flexibility. We need a flexible framework at European level within which individual Member States and the social partners within those Member States can themselves negotiate flexibly. I have to say to him, however, that despite some recent successful negotiations on working-time in some important branches of industry, UNICE remains hostile to a framework agreement at Community level, since it doubts that an overall reduction in working-hours would have positive employment effects and because it does not have a mandate to negotiate a Community-wide agreement on this matter. The Community shares the opinion in the resolution that such an agreement would be wholly desirable, since it is becoming increasingly clear that the slight upturn in the economic situation has not led to a more promising employment outlook. However, as past efforts of the Commission to this effect have failed, it is hard to see how at present the divergent views of the ETUC and UNICE on this issue can be reconciled.

I shall now deal with the question of data and monitoring and publications. Data on working-time, productivity, production and employment are already regularly published by the Commission. The major sources are the production, employment, labour-cost and working-time statistics, as well as *European Economy* itself. Also the annual economic report and the survey of DG II, *Social Europe*, and the annual report on social developments issued by DG V. There is therefore a lot of documentation already being published which is, of course, all available to Parliament and to individual Members. In addition to these regular publications, relevant studies are being and have been carried out in DG V's research programme on labour-market developments as well as within the framework of the FAST programme of DG XII.

In addition, I can tell the House that the Commission proposes to make available at about the end of this year a factual survey of recent developments in the field of working-time with a special focus on agreements which have helped to create jobs. This would bring up to date the annex to the Commission's memorandum of December 1982, which is now some two years out of date.

Finally, on this subject of the reduction and reorganization of working-time, there is no doubt at all in my

Richard

mind that, if used properly, it can be a successful element in the preservation or the creation of jobs. What it will not do is create jobs for 12 million people. What it will do, taken in concert with a set of other measures which we have also urged member governments to implement, is to make a useful contribution in the general fight against unemployment in the Community.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution (Doc. 2-509/84) by Mr de la Malène and the resolution (Doc. 2-526/84) by Mr Didò and others)

Rules on the deferred payment of VAT

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-485/84) by Mrs Boot and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, Mrs Veil and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and Mr Rogalla, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the Council's failure to reach a decision to introduce the 'Single document' and the 'Rules on the deferred payment of VAT'.

Mrs Boot (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, shipping agents and international carriers in the Community are very worried about action that has been taken in the United Kingdom, which will change the procedure governing imports of goods into Britain: from 1 November the VAT due on imports will again have to be paid at the frontier. It will not be possible to import goods unless the VAT is paid or a bank guarantee is presented. This is a step backwards in the development of the free European internal market.

The main reason for this move is that the United Kingdom wants the £1 200 m this will enable it to pay into its exchequer. But it would not have taken this action if the Council had adopted the 14th VAT Directive on 9 July. One of the major advantages of the 14th VAT Directive is that it would move frontier formalities inland, a system that has long been the norm in the Benelux countries.

The Commission proposes that this system should be introduced throughout the Community. We therefore feel the Council has failed dismally by not taking a decision.

We appeal to the Council to make amends and adopt the directive without delay, because the citizens, shipping agents, exporters and carriers of Europe simply no longer understand why the attitudes of two or perhaps three Member States should be holding up a proposal which will be of considerable benefit to intra-Community trade. If our exporters are to remain efficient and competitive and continue to provide a high-quality service, the 14th VAT Directive must be

adopted in the very near future. I also believe, Mr President, that the Commission should have a casting vote in the Community's decision-making procedure.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr President, I want to use my two minutes to make three points.

The first is to agree, and to agree passionately, on behalf of my group with the text of this resolution. It is quite incredible, is it not, that in a common market theoretically established for a quarter of a century we still have 70 different documents in use for internal trade.

The second point I want to make is to express regret that the Government of the United Kingdom — like that of Ireland two years ago — is finding it necessary as from November of this year to change the system of collecting VAT on imports. That is, to move away from the postponed accounting system which avoids completely VAT collection at borders and which the whole Community would adopt under the 14th VAT Directive.

However, in view of what the proposer has just said, perhaps I should clarify why this has happened. It is not because of the 1 1/2 billion in revenue. Up till now the United Kingdom has been one of the good boys of Europe on this matter, but until the 14th Directive is adopted, United Kingdom industry will have been at an unfair competitive disadvantage compared to industries in other Member States. In effect, importers have been given a three-month cash flow advantage without any corresponding advantage for UK exporters. Now, all this would have been corrected had the 14th Directive been adopted. I make it absolutely clear that my group and the British Government is in favour of the adoption of the 14th Directive as soon as possible; meanwhile it is regrettable that, as I understand it, 100 extra customs and excise staff are having to be taken on — a step backwards, you may think.

Finally, therefore, I want to ask the Commission and Council a number of questions. First, Commissioner Narjes, is it still possible to hope that the 14th VAT Directive will be adopted? Have you got a solution to this immediate loss to exchequers and the danger of fraud? Secondly, Commissioner or Council, can you say precisely which governments are holding up the single document and the 14th VAT Directive?

The time has come, in my opinion, when perhaps we can shame our national governments into implementing the treaties which they have all signed.

(Applause)

Mr Wijzenbeek (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, as I rise to speak my first words in this Parliament, having

Wijsenbeek

served it in a different capacity for twelve years, I must say that this is unfortunately a sad occasion. Rather than pressing ahead with the European ideal, the Council seems intent on going back on what three-quarters of our people still believe in. I call on the Council to state its views on this directive. In the countries which apply the system of payment at the destination rather than at the frontier, 95% of VAT payments are made in this way. If a decision is not taken on this by 1 November, Mr President, the Community will take another step backwards, and the question will then be whether we are still trying to make progress towards a unified Europe, in which I still believe.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, the Commission fully shares the concern expressed both in the motion for a resolution and the debate that two major aspects of a policy aimed at strengthening and consolidating the internal market have still not been adopted.

The 'Single Document' referred to in the motion for a resolution relates to a technically complex project which involves computerizing customs clearance procedures. Lengthy negotiations have, without doubt, achieved some progress. We can now be certain that the Member States are, in principle, prepared to support this project. This is something which was by no means certain. The European Council recently gave its approval in Fontainebleau to a clear priority for adopting this bundle of measures by the end of the year. We will do all we can to ensure that this deadline is met, but the initiative and the responsibility lie firmly in the hands of the Council of Ministers and the Member States.

The situation concerning the proposed 14th VAT directive is far less satisfactory. At a Council of Ministers meeting on 9 July the Member States refused to take a decision. However, to reply to Mr Patterson, this is no reason for us (a) to give up hope, or (b) to reduce our efforts to set aside the real and imagined problems which led to this refusal. I have no hesitation in saying that the main resistance came from Rome, Paris and Bonn, though not necessarily in that order. These three major European customs authorities obviously find it extremely difficult to adopt such far-reaching changes. We are all aware, however, that unless this 14th directive is adopted — and *all* heads of state and government have agreed to it — customs barriers cannot be removed.

We must not allow ourselves to be discouraged and, with the continued aid of Parliament, will carry on working for progress in this field. I would particularly like to draw the attention of Members to our consolidation programme which forms the political framework for our current overall action.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) Mr President, I would like to ask why, as one of the proposers of this motion, I have not been given an opportunity of speaking.

President. — The documents before us indicate that the motion for a resolution was tabled jointly by Mrs Boot, Mrs Veil and yourself. In the case of a joint motion for a resolution there can be only one speaker. Anyway we know what you would have said to us, Mr Rogalla. You always sound a positive note.

(Laughter)

The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

Appointment of a new Commission

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-488/84/rev.) by Mr Jackson and others, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, and Mr Klepsch and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the appointment of a new Commission.

Mr Christopher Jackson (ED). — Mr President, the Commission was designed to be the motive force of the Community and never was a strong motive force more needed than today. Great opportunities which could solve Europe's problems of unemployment and growth are not being seized. Progress is being stopped by national objections which, in the context of history, must often seem of minor importance, and every single Member State is guilty of raising these objections. So we desperately need a strong and effective new Commission, a Commission with the determination, ability and, above all, sense of independence needed to steer us past sterile European wrangles towards European union.

Mr Delors, the President-designate, will lead a team in which many talents will be present, but it must be his authority, not national pressures of the sort which, for example, have led to one Member State having the same portfolio for 26 years — that is, ever since the Community was founded — which allocates responsibilities among his colleagues. It is essential for the Commission to be independent of national governments and to be seen to be independent.

So this motion, Mr President, is designed to show our will and to give Mr Delors the support of Parliament in assigning the right people to portfolios. I hope we will approve it by a massive majority.

One final point. For the first time this Parliament has been consulted over the appointment of the new Commission President. I hope that in future we will ensure

Christopher Jackson

that we are in addition consulted over the appointment of individual members of the Commission.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

Vice-President

Mr Hänsch (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen! The motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Jackson and others is superfluous. Once again, as frequently in the past, Parliament is acting against its own interests by adding to already existing motions for resolutions and decisions. Parliament has already expressed its opinion quite clearly in the Rey motion for a resolution of April 1980, when we called for the right to be consulted on the appointment of the Commission. On behalf of the Socialist Group, I urge the Bureau to ensure that the Presidents of the Commission and the Council respect our decisions. This is our due and we do not need any new motions for resolutions to this effect.

Moreover, I feel that it is a tactical error to discuss criteria and take decisions now, on the basis of which, in January or February, we shall debate a motion of confidence in the new Commission. My Group refuses to go along with this. These questions will be decided in January or February, and should not have been set down as a matter for urgent debate today. The Socialist Group rejects both the motion for resolution as well as any amendments that may be tabled.

Mr Croux (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, my group will support this resolution. I appreciate what Mr Hänsch has just said. We asked ourselves the same question, but we know the Council must be pressed into doing what it promised. As regards Mr Delors' appointment, for example, we see that the Council was rather late in consulting the Bureau of the European Parliament. Formally, the end result was the right one, but informally we know that the procedure which the Council itself established in Stuttgart on 19 June 1983 was not adhered to. We shall therefore be voting for the resolution. But we are also considering it in the general political context. We realize that this Parliament must keep a far more careful watch on the Commission, its activities and its relations with Parliament and the Council than it has done in the past, and this for two reasons.

Firstly, Parliament believes the Commission is an extremely important institution. The best proof of this is to be found in the draft of a new Treaty for the European Union adopted on 14 February 1984. We see the Commission as the forerunner of a European government. But this also means that Parliament will take a greater interest in the dialogue with the Commission and that it must also exercise stricter control

over the Commission than it has done in the past. More specifically, it must tell the Council that it wants the Commission to be able to perform its tasks in accordance with the rules laid down in the Treaty. In other words, the Commission has the right of initiative, not the Council. The Commission is the guardian of the Treaties and the executive, and the Council must delegate far more powers to the Commission than it now has.

On paper there is always agreement on this. The solemn declaration of Stuttgart says as much. President Mitterrand has said as much. When the Spaak Committee is set up, this will be one of the main issues. What we are saying is that we shall be very vigilant in this respect. This is the context in which we see the Jackson resolution, and it will therefore have my group's support. It is the preamble to the new Parliament's position on the appointment of the Commission and on its programme and activities over the next five years. After all, ladies and gentlemen, we cannot go back to our electors again in five years unless there has been a great deal of change and improvement in the European Community in the meantime. And the Commission will be one of the great levers in this respect.

Mr Spinelli (COM). — *(IT)* Madame President, I want first of all to express my amazement at the fact that something as important as the appointment of the next Commission should be treated in this hole- and -corner manner, and that recourse had to be had to an emergency debate which had to be decided yesterday, because otherwise the whole thing would have been ignored.

The appointment of the Commission is not something that happens automatically or something on which we can content ourselves, as Mr Hänsch was saying, with a resolution which we voted four years ago which the Council and Governments have shown little inclination to take into account.

I feel that the resolution by Mr Jackson and others is the one that should be adopted, because we have to point out — I shall not be repeating here the arguments advanced by Mr Jackson — some of the things that are wrong with the way the Commission operates.

But I would add that this resolution is incomplete and that we should include in it the contents of Amendments Nos 2 and 3, which, I see, are down in my name alone but in fact are also signed by Mrs Boot of the EPP, Mr Tognoli of the Socialist Group and Mr Gawronski of the Liberal Group. In these two amendments we stress two points which are part of this Parliament's philosophy, which are certainly not inventions of the moment, and which must be taken into account.

The first is that the President of the Commission should be entitled to present to the Council his own

Spinelli

proposals before the Council appoints the Commission. The Governments gave an undertaking in this sense to Mr Jenkins, but they did not honour it. Now we want it to be honoured, because the present haphazard method of appointing the Commission is bad. Each Government makes its own nomination or nominations which are then blindly accepted by the other Governments, without anyone having the slightest view of the Commission as a whole. That overall view can only come from the President of the Commission. The Governments should make the nominations, but they should first be acquainted with an overall plan for the Commission that should have at least some semblance of structuring.

The second point concerns the formal request which had already been formulated in 1980 in paragraph 7 of the Rey report, but which must be renewed today. When the Council, having promised to consult us before appointing the President, in fact only informed us of the appointment after it was made, this Parliament asked — and this is the gist of paragraph 7 of the Rey resolution — that before taking up office the Commission should consult Parliament on its policies and obtain its approval.

I feel that if Parliament has the least respect for its own role, it should now vote the resolution with the two amendments. And I can only add that I am very surprised at the attitude of the Socialist Group, which at the time voted for the Rey resolution.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Madam President, the Commission has followed this debate with interest and wishes to confine its remarks to three points.

1. Article 10 of the Merger Treaty gives the following ruling on the status of the Commission: The members of the Commission shall, in the general interest of the Communities, be completely independent in the performance of their duties. In the performance of these duties, they shall neither seek nor take instructions from any Government or from any other body. They shall refrain from any action incompatible with their duties. Each Member State undertakes to respect this principle and not to seek to influence the members of the Commission in the performance of their tasks.
2. It is clear from the above that the organization of the Commission's work and the distribution of portfolios is entirely a matter for the Commission.
3. Today's debate should properly be addressed to the new Commission which will take a decision on it. The present Commission will report to the new Commission on this debate and its contents.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the motion for a resolution)

Dairy sector

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

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-487/84) by Mr Provan, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on dairy quotas
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-500/84) by Mr Tolman and others, on behalf of the EPP Group, Mr Eyraud and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mrs Martin, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr Mouchel and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the collection from 1 October 1984 of the levy provided for by the regulation laying down the production quotas in the dairy sector.

I would inform the House that Mr Ducarme has also signed this motion for a resolution.

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-479/84) by Mr Bocklet, on behalf of the EPP Group, on measures to encourage butter sales.

Mr Provan (ED). — Madam President, I welcome you for the first time to the Chair of this House. I know from past experience of working with you in the Committee on Agriculture and in the Fisheries Working Group that your undoubted abilities will be of benefit to this House.

Now, if I may turn to the question in hand of the application of milk quotas within the Community. I welcome the opportunity to raise the matter with the House this morning, because this is not a divisive resolution which we have tabled this morning. It is intended to make sure that we see fairness for every producer within the Community. No matter whether one comes from Ireland or Italy, Holland or France, one wants to make certain that the rules are carried out with evenhandedness throughout the Community. I believe the Commission do not have the proper powers to make certain that this happens. They do not have the staff and they do not have the ability. It is, therefore, I believe, the role of this Parliament, in the same way as it tries to control the budget through the Committee on Budgetary Control, to have a monitoring committee so that we can look after agricultural policies within the Community.

The quota system is a new system. It is now the time, I believe, to bring forward a resolution of this Parliament to make certain that we can extend our powers and influence as a Parliament so that we may control, and be seen to be controlling, the situation. I would

Provan

have thought that every Member of this House, being an elected representative, wants to make sure that democracy controls bureaucracy. It is our role as individual Members of Parliament to try and make certain that these new quotas are fair for everyone. If we do not take an interest in this today and actually ask the Commission to provide us with the proper information, and if we do not set up a monitoring committee, I believe we are going to miss an opportunity that could have tremendous importance for Europe and for this Parliament.

Mr Tolman (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, my congratulations on your election as Vice-President.

Last year a majority of this Parliament adopted a resolution calling for the introduction of a quota system to govern milk production, and the Council unanimously endorsed this view. The Council's decision included the provision that producers who exceeded the milk quota must pay a fine or, more precisely, a superlevy. Payments will be due on 1 October 1984, 1 January and 31 March 1985.

This resolution, which has been signed by many Members, does not want payment waived where production exceeds the quota, merely deferred. I can name two good reasons why this should be so. Firstly, appeals against the superlevy are still being heard in some Member States. Until the producers know where they stand, I believe it would be premature to begin collecting the superlevy.

Secondly, adjusting to the lower level of milk production may entail the slaughter of 8 to 10% of all cattle, which would mean some 2 million more cows on the cattle market. The consequences for the beef market may be catastrophic. Intervention and storage facilities are inadequate, and a gradual reduction would therefore be more sensible. For the reasons I have mentioned I do not consider it wise to start collecting fines on 1 October. Stock can be taken at the end of the marketing year, on 31 March 1985, and in the meantime information must, of course, be passed on to the producers in the Community.

To summarize, Madam President, the resolution does not call for payment of the superlevy to be waived if production up to the end of the year has been too high. We simply want to prevent unnecessary payments being made on 1 October and 1 January.

Mr Bocklet (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the European Community has more than 1.2 million tonnes of butter stocks and steps must be taken to reduce them.

The Commission has taken a step in the right direction by increasing the number of countries entitled to refunds on butter exports. However, I would ask the

Commission to rectify the error that has occurred. I do not wish to go into further details. The Commission's measures must be extended in four ways: a Christmas butter sales drive, secondly permanent sales of a cheaper brand of butter in addition to such special campaigns, thirdly the expansion of the sales of *ghee* and fourthly the supply of cheap butter to small and medium-sized bakeries.

Last year, when butter stocks amounted to a mere 800 000 tonnes, the Commission claimed that there were no funds available to carry out such measures. Lack of funds is no longer a valid argument, the major issue is the disposal of these stocks. If nothing is done, the European public will have nothing but contempt for a Community that allows butter to rot instead of making it available to consumers more cheaply.

Last year, disagreement between two Commissioners led to the campaign getting off to a late start. We therefore urge you to initiate the action as quickly as possible, preferably by the middle of October; an early start is the only way to ensure maximum success with minimum costs. I therefore call upon the Commission to stop delaying matters and to take a firm decision in the next few weeks.

Mr Eyraud (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, I should like to echo the first two speakers and say how pleased I am to see you in the Chair. Very sincerely, I wish you every success in this post.

(Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, the problems attached to applying the milk quotas show — if any demonstration was called for — how right we were to oppose this sort of way of mopping up the surpluses. To start with, it means across-the-board penalization of all the producers in any given Member State, regardless of their method of production, whether they use natural forage crops, Community cereals or imported cereal substitutes now or, who knows, synthetic protein tomorrow. It penalizes them regardless of their age or geographical situation. The measures taken by the Socialist government in France fortunately rights this injustice as far as they can.

Secondly, the Commission's system of quarterly collection makes things bureaucratically completely absurd.

Because of seasonal variations in quantity and, above all, quality, the dairies will be collecting levies that they are bound to have to reimburse later. Is this not illogical and likely to discredit the Community bodies in the eyes of the rural world?

This is the meaning of the motion for a resolution that I, as vice-chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, have signed. Amendments can usefully be brought for

Eyraud

financial reasons, as our colleague Mr Woltjer suggested, or to enable the producers to see their position from statements of the level of production, as Amendment No 7 says.

The French Socialists will vote for this motion for a resolution, but they remain convinced that degressive assistance and progressive taxation are the only fair way of absorbing surpluses.

Mr Gatti (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, these motions for resolutions state that application of Regulation 1371/84 establishing dairy quotas causes grave financial problems to the producers. Members who have just been speaking have said the same. It is true enough, but I ask you: Did you not know it on 31 March when the regulation was being adopted? What did you do to prevent its adoption?

It is also being said that the producers should be able to adjust their output, that is, to reduce it. Very well. But how? A cow is not a machine that you can run for fewer hours per day. So do you kill it, as Mr Tolman was saying, or do you milk only half the teats?

Let's be serious. Let us ask Parliament to adopt a resolution that is consistent with what you were all saying yesterday when you spoke of the 1984-85 budget, that is, that the present Community policy is no good and must be changed.

You know very well that the very serious problems that the Community is facing will not be resolved by gaining a few months' grace by setting up pressure groups, or by actions for butter disposal that have proved ineffective. What is needed is a new common agricultural policy that can assure a new and balanced development in agriculture: balanced both geographically and in terms of output. For these reasons we shall be voting against the three motions for resolutions.

Mr Wolff (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, I did not table any amendments on the milk quotas, but I should like to draw your attention to the special problem of mountain areas, which is one I should like to see taken into consideration in any changes that are made.

I am not in complete agreement with our colleague Mr Eyraud when he says that the provisions the French Socialist government has introduced suit everyone. There are, in fact, considerable differences in production due to the climate, the figure being 45 000 litres per farm in some cases, as against 180 000 and even 240 000 litres in others.

It is impossible for mountain farmers to alter or change their crops. Their resources are sensitive to changes in meat and milk prices, which are indivisibly linked. Mountain farmers must get fair remuneration

for the work they put in, so there must be special rules to fix quotas for mountain areas.

Furthermore, the years taken as a basis for production were, accidentally I should say, bad ones and do not represent an average, which penalizes them even more. I should also like to stress that the figures we have at the moment suggest that payments, and large ones in some cases, will have to be made regardless of difficult conditions of exploitation. I feel that mountain farming deserves special attention and special treatment.

Mr Mouchel (RDE). — *(FR)* Madam President, I should like to start by saying that the Group to which I belong will give its complete support to the Provan motion for a resolution.

The quota system took the farmers by surprise. The decision was taken fast and with no warning — under Mr Rocard's Presidency of the Council. The milk-producers immediately made a very great effort to bring the volume of their production into line with the new demands. But an effort like that cannot have an immediate effect. When animals are producing, it takes some time to reduce their output. But the quota system, as it stands, provides for a super-levy to be collected every quarter. I think it is absolutely vital to wait for a year, because a year will allow many farmers and milk-producers to reach the prescribed level — but not until towards the end of that year. So if the super-tax is collected every quarter, a certain number of farmers will be unfairly taxed without any guarantee of reimbursement. Even if they were reimbursed, it would mean an administrative complication we could well do without.

Lastly, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that the increase in the slaughtering of dairy cows has brought about a slump in the rates the beef producers get. So, if we are to avoid penalizing the farmers' incomes and assets any further here, we must vote for Mr Tolman's motion for a resolution.

Mr Happart (NI). — *(FR)* Madam President, I should like to echo the good wishes extended to you on this your first occasion in the chair.

The Treaty of Rome provides for farmers' incomes to be increased. The farmers are part of the big family of European workers, so the agricultural sector too must play its part in the campaign against unemployment.

So the productivity principle needs looking at. Guaranteed prices have, in fact, had the unintentional effect of making giant concerns possible in agriculture in general and in the dairy sector in particular. And because the consumption of dairy products has not kept pace with the Commission's forecasts, it is the young farmers and small farmers who are bearing the brunt of this misguided estimate.

Happart

Coresponsibility levies and quotas applied blindly, on a non-selective basis, penalize the weakest farmers without affecting the real over-producers — the milk factories, for example.

Each producer should have a quota or coresponsibility levy exemption for a volume of production, 200 000 litres of milk, say, which is more or less what would be needed to guarantee a comparable income to the milk-producers, and the quota or coresponsibility levy should be applied, on a directly proportionate basis, to the surplus production until the desired reduction has been made.

If the quotas really are applied, there could well be human drama in October, with many of the younger and smaller milk-producers going bankrupt. Overall, the anticipated economic gain accruing from application of the quotas will cost a lot more than the anticipated saving. What the EEC will be saving on milk, for example, it will have to spend on supporting the price of meat, as the meat market is already collapsing.

Mr Woltjer (S). — (NL) Madam President, may I also congratulate you on your election. I hope your position will enable you to do a great deal of good work for Parliament in the future.

Three issues are being discussed at the moment. Two concern the quota system, the other the stocks that have now reached a high level in the dairy sector. Everyone will know that, as a former rapporteur on the quota system, I have considered this matter very carefully in the past. I should therefore like to begin with Mr Provan's resolution and explain why I have tabled an amendment, even though in principle I fully endorse this resolution. In the past Parliament has said that there must be a regular report on the application of the quota system and that we must keep a very close watch on what is happening in the Member States.

The amendment I have tabled calls for the involvement of the Committee on Budgetary Control in these investigatory activities for the simple reason that what we are concerned with here is not just the agricultural policy: we must also keep an eye on the application of the system. Although there are no cases of fraud at the moment, things are happening that were not supposed to happen. The fact that milk is lugged across frontiers and that kind of thing has nothing to do with agriculture: but it has everything to do with the technical aspects of transfrontier transport and so on. The Committee on Budgetary Control has a great deal more experience and has done a great deal more work on this than we have. That is why I have said: 'Let the two committees work together on this.' This will also prevent duplication of effort, and it will show that we all have the same object in mind, the Committee on Agriculture making sure that the quota system is applied correctly in agricultural terms and as uniformly as possible and the Committee on Budgetary Control ensuring that everyone is being honest and

above all that suspect methods are not being used to avoid payment of the superlevy.

I now turn to Mr Tolman's resolution. I feel it would very dangerous to adopt this resolution. I quite appreciate that, if the Council introduces a quota system so abruptly at the last minute, the producers are bound to find themselves in a difficult situation. On the other hand, we must remember the margins we ourselves have, because there is also a psychological effect to be considered, of course. I feel that Mr Tolman and his fellow signatories have not taken this psychological effect sufficiently into account. I know from a number of farmers — few of them are happy — that they are thinking it might have been worse, a solution will soon be found if we all carry on as we are and then we will not be presented with the bill. This psychological effect, which will emerge if we delay too long . . .

(Interruption by Mr Tolman)

Yes, Mr Tolman, you also know that a farmer reacts not to what you say but to what affects and what does not affect him. That is something you have to bear in mind. That is why I say we must not underestimate this psychological effect and, while I want to see a flexible approach adopted, there must also be a limit to this flexibility.

Madam President, a final remark on the Bocklet resolution, to which I have tabled an amendment. We cannot have a situation in which the emphasis is on agriculture — I fully appreciate this: I am also very concerned about these stocks — and no account is taken of the financial problems facing the whole of the Community. The Christmas butter campaign is very expensive, as you know. If we ignore the enormous deficit that is emerging, we shall not be serving the right cause.

Mr Ducarme (L). — (FR) I should like to insist, very strongly, that this House vote for Mr Tolman's motion for a resolution, because at the present time it is impossible to take stock of what the Commission and the governments have forced upon the farmers. Today, I think, we can say that the system is not reliable at all. I can see some countries trying to renationalize the agricultural policy and that there is no real justice between the small family holdings and the huge agricultural concerns — which are industrial units rather than farms. If we were to throw this motion for a resolution out, I believe it would be virtually impossible to guarantee the viability of family farms where milk payments constitute the direct income. There would be real financial drama, for the young farmers essentially. I call on all Members to vote for the Tolman motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — Madam President, I speak to support the request to postpone the dates of collec-

MacSharry

tion of the superlevy. It is only fair that this assessment be made at the end of the marketing year, 31 March 1985, and that the amounts due be paid at that time. The principle of this superlevy is wrong. It is discriminatory. The problem of surpluses exists in the Community because we continue to support production of cheap food substitutes and continue to allow imports of New Zealand butter, and we have failed to tackle this problem at Community level.

In my country, where milk production is from natural resources, we have a level of production which is only 75% of the Community average, and even with the little flexibility allowed to Irish farmers they have absolutely no prospect whatsoever of ever achieving the average level of Community production which they are entitled to under the Treaties. I am sure that in the weeks and months ahead the Commission and the Council will give further examination to this very important question affecting the farmers I represent here.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, may I, on behalf of the Commission, start off by congratulating you on your assumption of the high office of Vice-President of this Assembly. It is an important position and I am sure that you will handle it with your customary ability, determination and discipline — which will obviously be good for the Assembly, if I may say so. So, on behalf of the Commission, I congratulate you.

There are three motions for resolutions down to be debated today. If I may, I will deal with them each in turn, starting perhaps with that of Mr Provan. The Commission agrees in principle with the request for progress reports to be made to Parliament on the implementation of the superlevy system in each Member State. The way in which Parliament organizes its business in relation to the monitoring of the collection of the superlevy is, of course, essentially a matter for Parliament and I would not, on behalf of the Commission, wish to express a view one way or the other on that.

The Commission, for its part, agrees to include in such reports data on the level of dairy production, the level of dairy stocks and the amount of dairy products purchased by the intervention agencies and released for export. While we accept in principle that such reports should be made regularly, I cannot undertake, on behalf of the Commission, that they will be submitted each month, but they certainly would be presented taking account of the availability of up-to-date information and indeed of the necessity with which Parliament feels it should receive that information.

If I may turn now to the motion for a resolution by Mr Tolman, may I say, on behalf of the Commission, that I find myself in great agreement with some of the remarks made by Mr Woltjer. The Commission has

already deferred the time limit for the collection of the levy in respect of milk deliveries during the first quarter of the 1984/1985 marketing year, so that the first levy payments applicable to deliveries during the first two quarters will fall due in the 45 days following 30 September 1984. It is the Commission's view that a further deferral of the time limits for the collection of the levy would seriously question the effectiveness of the levy system. It would weaken its dissuasive impact on production, leading to producers or dairies being required to make substantial levy payments at the end of the marketing year.

In its consideration of the arrangements for applying the levy system, the Commission will, however, take account of difficulties which might be experienced with regard to the implementation of the required measures in Member States and to the time required for adjustment by purchasers to the new situation. The Commission is ready to examine these questions with the Parliament's Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food at the earliest opportunity. In other words, if I can borrow a phrase used in the course of this debate, the Commission's attitude is flexible and sympathetic. But we recognize, as I think does this House, that there are limits to flexibility and there are clearly limits to sympathy in relation to the application of the levy system.

I can now turn to the third subject raised, which is the disposal of butter. The Commission has recently taken a number of measures concerning the disposal of butter which are designed to alleviate the burden of stocks in the milk sector. The measures, providing for special sales of intervention butter for export to certain destinations and for the sale at a fixed price of butter to be exported to certain destinations in the form of *ghee*, were adopted at the end of July 1984 and came into force on 3 September. It is therefore too early, in the Commission's view, to consider whether any modification should be made to those regulations. Any possible future improvements will obviously be considered in the light of experience.

The regulation providing for the sale of butter at reduced prices for use in the manufacture of pastry products, ice-cream and other products was amended at the end of July 1984 so as to extend the product coverage to include certain sugar confectionery and fish-based products. The Commission's services will continue to examine the possibility of further extending the coverage of this measure to additional products in the food manufacturing sector.

The Commission is continuing to consider the question of making reduced-price sales of butter available to small and medium-sized firms in the food processing sector. This consideration is, however, linked to the studies being carried out in the Federal Republic of Germany on the incorporation of a tracer into the butter concerned in order to facilitate the application of effective controls.

Richard

Finally, Madam President, as far as Christmas butter is concerned, the Commission's services are studying the technical problems linked to the introduction of a possible sale of reduced-price Christmas butter, so that any possible scheme may be implemented rapidly and in good time. The Commission will continue to maintain other schemes for reduced-price sales of butter in the light of their cost-effectiveness and other relevant factors. It is not envisaged that coresponsibility funds should be used specifically for the financing of reduced-price sales of butter.

President. — The debate is closed.

(In successive votes Parliament adopted the resolution (Doc. 2-487/84) by Mr Provan, the resolution (Doc. 2-500/84) by Mr Tolman and the resolution (Doc. 2-479/84) by Mr Bocklet)

Human rights

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

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-477/84) by Mr Donnez and Mrs Veil, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on abuses of human rights in Chile
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-496/84) by Mr de Camaret and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the situation in Chile
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-512/84) by Mr Segre and others, on the situation in Chile
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-514/84) by Mr Arndt and others, on the 11th anniversary of the putsch in Chile
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-480/84) by Mrs Lenz and others, on behalf of the EPP Group, on the banning of the democratic opposition parties in Nicaragua
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-495/84) by Mr de Camaret and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the situation in Nicaragua
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-494/84) by Mr de Camaret and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the respect of human rights in the Soviet Union
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-497/84) by the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the situation of Jews in the USSR
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-501/84) by Mr Molinari and others, on the state of health of Giuliano Naria
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-513/84) by Mr Wurtz and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the situation in South Africa
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-523/84) by Mr van Miert and Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the fate of Mark Hunter and Patricia and Derek Hanekom who are accused of high treason in South Africa
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-516/85) by Mr Glinne and Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the imprisonment of Mr Wilson Ferreira Aldunate in Uruguay
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-518/84) by Mr Schmid and Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the death sentence passed on Mr Malesela Benjamin Moloise
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-521/84) by Mr Glinne and Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the immediate freeing of Adolfo Wassen Alaniz
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-525/84) by Mr van Miert and Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the massacres in Uganda
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-502/84) by Mr Vandemeulebroucke and others, on the ban on the use of plastic bullets
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-503/84) by Mr Lalor and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the need for an immediate banning of the use of plastic bullets
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-517/84) by Mrs Castle and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the use of plastic bullets.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I ask you to pay the closest attention to what I am now about to say.

We have 18 motions for resolutions to consider. If each author formally introduces his or her motion, we shall have already used up 36 minutes of our time. That will mean that we cannot close the debate in order to proceed with the vote. I would therefore propose to the House that we proceed directly to the debate without any formal presentation of each motion for a resolution.

Mr Donnez, would you agree to this?

Mr Donnez (L). — (FR) Madam President, since it is your first time in the Chair, it would be very ungracious of me to refuse to accept your proposal.

President. — I would ask the authors of the various motions for resolutions if they would forego their

President

right to introduce them formally, so that we can begin immediately with the debate.

Mr Andrews (RDE). — Are you suggesting that I should give up my time for speaking on these resolutions? I was allocated time to speak.

President. — Yes, Mr Andrews, that was my proposal.

For the benefit of those Members who came late, I shall explain briefly once again.

We have 18 motions for resolutions, and each author has two minutes to speak. That means already 36 minutes. In view of the number of Members down to speak, we shall certainly be right in the middle of the debate at 1 p.m. and will have no opportunity to go on with the vote.

What I would ask the House therefore is whether the authors of the motions for resolutions would agree to forego their right to introduce their motions formally, so that we can proceed immediately with the debate.

Mr Andrews (RDE). — I am sorry, Madam President. I do object to the procedure and I do object to being deprived of my two minutes. So I would like to have my two minutes to speak.

President. — I have spoken to a number of colleagues, who are not at present opposed to my proposal.

Mr Donnez (L). — (FR) I would like to be a good boy, but I do not want to see the word 'good' changing its meaning.

(Laughter)

If everyone agrees to do without his or her speaking time, I shall do the same, but if only one Member insists on having his speaking time, I shall insist on having mine.

President. — I take your point only too well.

We shall begin therefore with the presentation of the various motions for resolutions.

I am giving you the floor therefore.

Mr Donnez (L). — (FR) Honourable Members, the daily drama which some of the Chilean people are living through at the moment remind us once again, if indeed any reminder is needed, that, when democracy goes, arbitrariness takes its place. And when that happens, human rights go down the drain.

Just a few days ago, a French priest, Father Jarlan, died at the table where he worked — and prayed — in circumstances such, if reliable reports are to be believed, that his death has to be called murder or assassination. And his death is a symbol because Father Jarlan did not go out to Chile for some subversive purpose. He went to live among the poorest and most underprivileged people. He died amongst them and with many of them.

His death is totally symbolic and, although we have drawn the Chilean authorities' attention to our idea of democracy many times, we owe it to ourselves to use our voice of democracy and point out the meaning of tolerance and the meaning of human rights again today. I think that a House like this one would increase its stature if it took a unanimous vote on this motion on coordination which various Groups have tabled.

Mr Anthony (DR). — (FR) Madam President, Honourable Members, our Group fully shares the distress at what is happening in Chile at the present time.

(Protests from various quarters)

But we cannot forget that General Pinochet is in very much the same position today as Mr Allende was 10 years ago. Mr Allende, let us not forget, was deposed by two thirds of the Chilean members of parliament. And remember that, if General Pinochet's coup d'état was able to take place, it was because of incessant, murderous attacks from the Chilean extreme left.

(Protests from various quarters)

We see in the press even today that a passenger train was attacked in the night by manifesters throwing incendiary bombs. I think that throwing incendiary bombs at trains full of passengers is not a good thing, even in Chile.

Lastly, since we are talking about the priest who was so odiously slain, I should like to say that I have just this minute heard the news of the assassination of Gesa Palfi, another priest, a Romanian one, who was tortured by police in Romania.

When you express distaste about what is happening in Santiago, I should like to say that I should sometimes like to hear you apply the term to the Soviet Union, which, in its unsurpassed form of modern slavery, has killed 150 million people. I should like you to think about the people dying in Cabinda and Angola today. And our Parliament, which grants aid to Ethiopia, shows no distaste for the Ethiopia of Mr Mengistu, who has brought his country the bloodiest régime it has ever known . . .

President. — I am sorry, Mr Antony, I must withdraw the floor from you. You have already gone quite a bit beyond your allotted speaking time.

Mr Trivelli (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, I wish to forego my right to speak and I would appeal to the other Members that are down to speak to do likewise, so that we can get the vote on this motion for a resolution over in good time.

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — *(NL)* Madam President, Europe has had a dreadful history of exploiting Latin America since the time of Columbus. A particular victim of this exploitation has been Chile, where European and US companies and banks have interests. That is why Pinochet's military junta was helped to seize power. The Rainbow Group is baffled by the Camaret amendment tabled by the Group of the European Right, which claims that Chile and Nicaragua are identical. In Chile a military dictatorship has been in power for eleven years, while in Nicaragua the liberation of the people began four years ago. To say these two countries are identical is like saying the Nazis and the resistance movement in the last war were identical.

To conclude, I would point out that, contrary to what the Group of the European People's Party says in its resolution, the Coordinadora Democrática in Nicaragua is not banned from taking part in the elections. It has itself refused to take part. The Rainbow Group has requested the Bureau to send a large delegation to Nicaragua on 4 November, after the elections.

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, provided that no one else wishes to speak on the subject of this motion for a resolution so that we can vote immediately, I am prepared to forego my speaking time.

President. — I asked various authors by name a few moments ago, Mrs Lenz, and some of them did not want to forego their speaking time.

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — *(DE)* I am sorry, Madam President, but it was not clear whether or not they are all now prepared to forego their right to speak on the various topics. I am perfectly willing to stand down if no one else wishes to speak on these motions for resolutions.

President. — Mrs Lenz, we have to have a joint debate on this whole bundle of motions for resolutions. I cannot therefore comply with your request.

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, we are all aware of the difficulties facing those who are fighting for the introduction of a free democracy and free elections in their countries. The purpose of this motion for a resolution is to draw attention to a menacing development in one of the world's troubled regions and to enable our friends to participate in free elec-

tions which are not restricted by an election law that deprives non-voting parties of their legal status, thereby laying open the members of these parties to political persecution, denying them the right of personal fulfilment and freedom of opinion and subjecting them to serious dangers. This motion for a resolution expresses our concern at these developments.

We are all aware of the importance of free elections. It is absolutely essential that a Parliament given a mandate in free elections, even if we are still fighting for authority and real power, should adopt this motion for a resolution to protect those who are still fighting for genuinely free elections, freedom of opinion, freedom of the press, i.e. for human rights. Our motion for a resolution wishes to give expression to this.

(Applause)

Mr Tripodi (DR). — *(IT)* Madam President, the European Right, in the conviction that freedom is indivisible, has tabled two resolutions, one on Nicaragua, the other on Chile.

In both, while reaffirming the right of all countries to pursue their policies without interference, threat or intervention — of which Soviet communism provides repeated examples — the value of freedom is proclaimed and both the countries — irrespective of their directly opposed systems of government — are asked to release political prisoners, to hold just and public trials, and to arrange for free elections.

As regards more specifically Nicaragua, we cannot refrain from stressing that suppression of freedom of information, a convenient electoral law and the suppression of every manifestation of opposition to the ruling powers have nullified those principles of pluralism and democracy which five years ago the Sandinista junta promised after the overthrow of Somoza. As usual, when communism needs to gain power, it promises the protection of human rights: once power is gained, those rights are mercilessly crushed under a dictatorship.

The European Right therefore calls on the Commission to suspend the aids which have been granted to Nicaragua between 1979 and 1983 to the amount of 70 million ECU and to withhold all further aid at least until such time as civic rights are seen to be respected and put into effect in that country.

Mr de Camaret (DR). — *(FR)* Madam President, I should first like to ask you to be kind enough to go slowly on the vote on these three motions for resolutions on Nicaragua, Chile and the Soviet Union.

I should also like to ask you to take a vote by roll call for one of them, the one on Nicaragua, because I think the problems are serious. We cannot just take an

de Camaret

interest in what may only be minor issues. Human rights are the very stuff of the European Parliament and the Council of Europe. Mr Sakharov began his hunger strike four months ago. We have adopted various resolutions in recent years, but the Soviet authorities have never responded. We adopted resolutions on 27 July and there has been no response to them either. So this time, we hope that the Soviet authorities will treat us with the fairness to which we are entitled and at least respond.

Madam President, you remember us asking for a seat in this House to be kept free for Sakharov. We did not get it. We also asked for a mission to go out to the Soviet Union to investigate the health of Mr Sakharov and his wife. We did not get that either.

The third point concerns the five Georgians who were sentenced to death in the Soviet Union on 13 August. We have here a number of letters from the Georgian authorities, asking Mr Chernenko to commute the death penalty. We have had no reply and I should like to end by asking Parliament to vote for the motions for resolutions that are to be tabled and leave no doubt as to the need for an answer — which we must demand from Moscow.

Mrs Chouraqui (RDE). — (FR) Madam President, I have to defend a motion for a resolution from Mr de la Malène on Jews in the Soviet Union. I have two minutes, I think, but I think it would be better to have two minutes silence to deal with such a complex and difficult subject. However, since the elections by universal suffrage, the European Parliament has wanted to represent a non negligible section of the conscience of mankind in the field of human rights.

We saw as much again yesterday in relation to the anniversary of the death of Allende and the situation in Chile, which is certainly very painful. I saw that the Honourable Member from the German Greens who defended his point on Chile had covered his desk with white flowers — I think they are still there this morning. Well, Madam President, if we did the same for the Jews and the dissidents in the USSR, we would need whole armfuls of flowers in this House. So, on behalf of my group, we call on the European Parliament to invite the Soviet Union to fulfil its obligations under the final act of Helsinki — free movement of individuals, freedom of the press, freedom of telephonic communication and secrecy of correspondence. The European Parliament must call on the Soviet government to stop persecuting and discriminating against Jewish and other religious minorities. This is an appeal for that country to return to the path of freedom. For all the Jews in the USSR, for all the anonymous dissidents and for the Charantskys, the Danoudels and, today, for Elena Bonner, let us be able to fill this House with the flowers of peace before it is too late.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Molinari (ARC). — (IT) Madam President, I do not want this resolution to be a matter of adherence to Right or left, as happens in this House.

The Naria case, if it proves anything, demonstrates how special legislation can lead to juridical monstrosities that are distortions of law, a mockery of the rule of law.

When a man is held in prison for eight long years although he is innocent — and mind that it is not I who say he is innocent but two court verdicts — and then, as is happening at this moment, this man is very nearly sentenced to death — what we are dealing with is the overturning of the very foundations on which States that call themselves democratic have based their constitutions.

Giuliano Naria was imprisoned eight years ago for a crime related to terrorism, but in the meantime he has been exonerated of this crime. But such is the perversity of the special legislation that new crimes have been attributed to Naria and he was tried once again, and again found not guilty, but he has been put in prison again. This is because his one and only crime is that he is supposed to have taken part in troubles in the prison in which he was awaiting trial for the crimes of which he was found not guilty.

Giuliano Naria's health is now very poor. He is suffering from anorexia, he is unable to eat. The medical board which saw him considers that his life is in danger. From all sides of the political spectrum voices have called for his release, or at least that he should be granted house arrest. Even the Italian Minister of Justice has spoken to this effect.

I ask you now to add the voice of the European Parliament to this chorus. It should not be a party matter.

I hope that this appeal will find the support of the majority of Members.

Mr Wurtz (COM). — (FR) I shall be talking about South Africa. By having a parody of an election, the racialists in Pretoria expected to get the forgiveness of those whose human dignity they had stamped underfoot for years.

The poor turnout in the elections for the house of representatives alone says a lot. There is nothing surprising about the results. To begin with, before the ballot, the international community made known in a resolution of the UN Security Council that only the USA and the UK had not voted and that it considered these elections and the new constitution as null and void.

The discriminatory association of coloureds and Indians in the wielding of racist power in South Africa was rejected abroad in just the same way as the pre-

Wurtz

tended accession to independence in recent years of the Bantustans.

Honourable Members, after the bloodbath of which South Africa has once again been the scene, the vote on the resolution before you today bears witness to solidarity with the black South African nation which is fighting the white ruling class which still firmly supports apartheid.

It is particularly important for the Community to reiterate its past positions on southern African, particularly in the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly, in that we are on the point of meeting with our African partners to renew the Lomé Convention.

By voting for this resolution, this House will reaffirm the principle that peace and the abolition of apartheid are the only things that will contribute to a change worthy of the name in South Africa.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, it is 1 p.m. I made a certain proposal to the House at the beginning of our joint debate. In view of the amendments tabled and the number of Members still down to speak, it is clear that we will be going on for a further 35 to 40 minutes. However, the Rules of Procedure are quite explicit on this point: a maximum of three hours for a debate of this kind.

Even if we were to ask the various Members concerned to forego the speaking time allocated to them, we would still have to spend at least 15 minutes voting.

The sitting is closed.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

3. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

President. — I propose to the House that the deadlines for tabling draft amendments and proposed modifications to the draft general budget of the Communities for 1985 be fixed as follows:

- for individual Members and parliamentary committees: at 12 noon on Thursday, 27 September 1984;

- for political groups: at 12 noon on Thursday, 4 October 1984;
- for compromise amendments only: at 12 noon on Tuesday, 23 October 1984;
- for amendments to the draft budget of Parliament: at 12 noon on Thursday, 11 October 1984.

These deadlines could be extended if the Council does not forward the draft budget on time.

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to say a few words on the announcement you have just made. With regard to the deadline you propose for the tabling of amendments and the date of 27 September for the draft general budget, can we know exactly when that latter document will be distributed? Will we stick to 27 September or will we move it back in the event that the Council causes a delay? Would it not be better to fix the deadline for tabling amendments at a certain number of days after the budget has been distributed? Otherwise, as has already occurred, the deadline for tabling amendments could well have passed before we get the text to look at!

President. — Mr Pannella, I can only confirm what I have said just now. The deadlines I have indicated could be put back if the Council should be late in forwarding the draft budget.

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(FR)* Excuse me, Mr President, but what does 'late in forwarding' mean in this case?

President. — It means that if the draft budget were forwarded by the Council at a time such that these deadlines could no longer be observed, the deadlines would then be extended in the light of the date and indeed the hour at which the document was forwarded. However, I can neither predict whether we are likely to have a delay nor, if we should have one, how long it is likely to be! Consequently we cannot fix other deadlines at this precise moment.

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(FR)* I am sorry for insisting, Mr President, but who will decide on the deadlines if, say, we get the basic document on 27 September when we are not sitting? In that case, no decision can be taken until the next sitting. That is why I suggest the deadline be fixed a number of days after the draft budget has been distributed to Members. I think a decision could reasonably be taken then.

President. — No, we cannot proceed along these lines, because, depending on the lateness of the date at which the draft budget might be received, we could find ourselves forced to fix somewhat tighter deadlines. We are in the dark, you see. However, it is the

¹ *Membership of committees: see Minutes.*

President

enlarged Bureau that will decide on the matter. It meets on 27 September, while the Council meets on 17 and 18 September. The enlarged Bureau will know therefore by 27 September how matters stand. Be that as it may, your wish to see the deadlines possibly extended is quite reasonable and it will be taken into account.

Mr Hume (S). — On a point of order, Mr President. This morning this House discussed a large number of issues which it considered to be matters of extreme urgency. Indeed, they were so urgent that the House was not able to cast a vote or express its opinion on a single one of them. Indeed, the issue in which I have a particular interest, the use of plastic bullets in Northern Ireland, was not even reached.

Could you give me an indication of how we can avoid what I believe to be an embarrassing situation for the reputation of this House where we raise matters of great urgency and then do not arrange our business so that we can cast a vote on them? Could you tell me when I shall be able to raise the issue in which I am interested?

Mr Taylor (ED). — Mr President, the point raised by the honourable Member for Northern Ireland, Mr Hume, is relevant. The fact is surely that we are given three hours for urgent motions. In fact, Madam Pèry, who was in the Chair, did envisage Members debating, and then voting on the matter of plastic bullets in Northern Ireland. It was a Member from the southern part of Ireland, Mr Andrews, who, by objecting to her ruling, required everyone to speak and therefore made it impossible to have the vote.

(Cries of 'Rubbish!' from certain quarters)

I think it should be put on the record that it was due to southern Irish initiatives that there was no discussion and no debate on the use of plastic bullets.

President. — Mr Taylor, this will certainly be mentioned in the Minutes. However, by way of reply to Mr Hume, I must say that the deadline for tabling motions to be dealt with by urgent procedure is fixed for 3 p.m., as has already been pointed out. The agenda was drawn up in accordance with this and we cannot change it, I regret to say. A very large number of requests for urgent procedure were tabled, 49 in all. At a meeting of the political group chairmen, at which I myself presided, an attempt was made to cut down on this number, which in fact we did. However, the number of motions kept on the list was still extremely large, and it proved impossible to deal with all the matters concerned in the time at our disposal.

Furthermore, this morning the President chairing the sitting warned the House that the debate on the urgencies and the voting would have to finish at 1 p.m.

and that there could be no question of having an extension. There is nothing more that I can do about it. The issue with which Mr Hume is concerned — and it is undoubtedly an important one — will therefore be considered, but unfortunately it can no longer be done during this part-session.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — When these rules on urgent procedure were first introduced, it was intended, and laid down accordingly, that a meeting of the political group chairmen presided over by you, Mr President, should decide on the priorities and list sufficient urgency motions to fill the three hours. This was quite obviously not done this time. Obviously between you all you managed to get far too many urgencies on the list. I know it is a difficult task, Mr President, for the chairmen and yourself, but you really must make an effort next time to reduce them to either two or three, or at the maximum four, for the urgency debate. Then we have a chance of actually debating them properly and coming to conclusions. That was the original purpose and I do beg you to go back to it.

President. — Sir James, you are perfectly right. However, I would point out that if there is a very large number of requests for urgent procedure, it is because they have been tabled by Members of this House, using a right that is unquestionably theirs. Thus, there can be no improvement in the situation unless members impose a certain discipline on themselves.

Moreover, urgent procedure is not the only way in which issues can be raised here. There is also the oral question procedure. And I would urge the political group chairmen and all Members to try to make the best possible use of all the possibilities, other than tabling requests for urgent procedure, that are offered by our Rules of Procedure. I am well aware that there is a general tendency, and one which I perfectly well understand, to avail oneself of the urgency procedure. However, experience shows that if it is over-used, the final result will be exactly the opposite of what one had hoped to achieve. Urgent motions will run the risk of not being considered at all, whereas in certain cases a different procedure, such as that of the oral question, could give better results.

Mr Andrews (RDE). — Mr President, it seems to me as a new Member here that a little misunderstanding took place at the start of this debate. It no longer seems to me extraordinary that, because of lack of flexibility in the procedures for voting and discussing these motions, the people of Europe simply do not vote for this Parliament. It seems to me that there is a very good reason why people have been switched off this Parliament. People come into the House; they make proposals; they develop their proposals; they discuss them among their groups; they go to enormous trouble, and at the end of that we haven't even two

Andrews

minutes to discuss those proposals. At the very end of it all we cannot even vote on them!

I feel that some measure of flexibility should be introduced to allow us to vote on the proposals that were worked on so hard by individuals, individuals committed to social justice and freedom, as we are in the condemnation of the use of plastic bullets in the Six Counties of the occupied part of my island.

(Applause)

Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC). — *(DE)* On a point of order: Mr President, we appreciate your use of pedagogical and didactic methods in an attempt to enforce a certain degree of self-discipline on Members. I believe your intentions were understood. However, I would ask Parliament to consider whether we could go into these matters during a night sitting. Night sittings are usually scheduled for Thursdays but none has been scheduled for this part session. Given the mood of the House, and the interest shown in the various subjects raised under the heading of matters for urgent debate, I feel that we should consider the possibility of a night sitting. Your intention of imposing self-discipline has met with approval, but we should deal with the topics that have been raised but not covered properly.

President. — I am perfectly willing to put to the Bureau any practical proposal for a change in our working procedures. It is quite true that in the last Parliament there were frequent night sittings. However, as far as this part-session is concerned, the agenda has been adopted by the House. Consequently I am not empowered to change it, especially by now adding another agenda to the agenda already adopted, which in any case is scheduled to be completed this afternoon.

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(FR)* Mr President, it is for a reminder of the Rules of Rules of Procedure — paragraph 48(3 and 4). Mr President, I ask for your patience and your attention.

You are quite right to say that, when this House votes on an agenda, it ought to pay attention to what it is doing and to what its President has prepared and that it is pointless to come complaining afterwards.

But we do not vote for an agenda if it is not a wise one and it was not wise to give up the idea of working on Friday and fail to have a night sitting. It is as well for every Member to realize that, in this case, complaints are perhaps in order afterwards, but not before.

Paragraph 3 of Article 48 provides for topical and urgent debates to last a maximum of three hours per part-session. There is nothing to say that these three hours have to be consecutive, which is why I referred

to your attentiveness and your ability to create situations that are favourable to this House.

This morning, we in fact debated for two hours and 27 minutes, because at the beginning, at 10 o'clock, we all had the debate on the minutes and other matters. I do not mean to say that there was not a long debate on matters of procedure, but two hours and 27 minutes is not three hours. This is why, Mr President, I think we are entitled to a further half hour. I do not think we can simply forget it.

But the problem is as follows. Paragraph 4 of Article 48 says that, as soon as the debate is over, the motion for a resolution is put to the vote. Well, Mr President, we have finished a number of debates on a number of urgent resolutions and we have adopted a somewhat strange method whereby we leave the votes to the end of the whole debate, not after each urgent resolution. Mr President, according to the Rules of Procedures — even if the Bureau seems to have other ideas that it is trying to get across at this very moment — we ought to have gone straight to the vote on Chile and the other urgent resolutions on which everything is clear.

But since Article 57 of the Rules of Procedure allows us to suggest a change in the agenda to the House — and I think the House would be grateful for this — I would ask you to be so good as to propose that we vote on the urgent things now, without debating, so that this three-hour debate and this part-session have not been in vain — in spite of the fact that Parliament is responsible for having shown no critical spirit in voting a poor agenda presented by the President — and so we can still say we worked properly.

Mr President, please, the Rules of Procedure enable you to do this and I think the whole House would be grateful if you allowed us to vote now.

President. — No, I am verry sorry, Mr Pannella, but I cannot do as you ask. You tell us that, according to the Rules of Procedure, the vote must follow on immediately on the debate. We have had a joint debate on a whole series of motions for resolutions concerning human rights; this debate could not be finished. Consequently we are not in the position where a debate that has been closed must be followed by a vote. I am sorry, but that is the position.

Your idea would mean opening the floodgates now, and I simply am not prepared to do that. We are launching the work of a newly elected Parliament, and I feel that we must all impose a certain discipline on ourselves.

(Applause)

If we allow our agendas to be trampled underfoot by a thundering herd of requests for urgent procedure, we

President

cannot get through our work in a serious manner and we shall only confirm the impression — an impression indeed that the public already has of us — that we are spreading our efforts too widely for proper effectiveness.

(Applause)

Mr Elliott (S). — Mr President, on a point of order. I also am a new Member and I would like to support those speakers who deplored the failure to vote on the crucial issues which were on our agenda this morning. I think it is nothing short of tragic that this Parliament has not been able to discuss and debate the vital issue of human rights. In Britain a great number of the people who voted us here regard this kind of issue as one of the major reasons justifying the existence of this Parliament. It is tragic that we cannot debate these issues.

Earlier this week certain people decided that we should not have a session on Friday morning. It would have been possible, had we met on Friday morning, to have more time to discuss these issues. We did not have the full three hours and I must say that, as a new Member — I may be stepping out of line — I question whether we really need to limit ourselves to three hours on issues of this degree of importance.

President. — I am sorry. I can well understand the regrets that have been voiced and I may add that I myself share them. However, the conclusion that must be drawn is that at future part-sessions we must make a serious effort to limit the number of urgencies, so that our debates can be held in accordance with the Rules and within the period of time stipulated.

(Applause)

4. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the proposals of the enlarged Bureau concerning the timetable of part-sessions for 1985.

Since no amendments have been tabled, I declare this timetable adopted.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Mr President, we did not really have time to put any amendments down. The calendar did not come around until this morning; at least it was not available to me until this morning. Therefore we did not have any time to put down any amendments, such as holding the September and January sessions one week later. Would you allow oral amendments to be introduced or not?

President. — No, not today. Later on we shall see if any changes to the timetable have to be proposed during the course of the year. As of the moment, however, we cannot go tinkering around with the timetable. I think you will agree with that.

*
* *

SCRIVENER REPORT (DOC. 2-475/84 — BUDGETARY SITUATION)

Mr Cot, chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Mr President, Mrs Scrivener will be speaking on behalf of the Committee on Budgets to present our proposals on the requests that have been received. Before that, I should like to say a few words to explain why resolutions put before this House were withdrawn after the budget debate on the part-session and make a statement on behalf of the Committee on Budgets.

I should like to thank Mr Langes and Mr Pasty for withdrawing their Groups' motions for resolutions after the long debate by the Committee on Budgets. In view of the present situation, it was important for Parliament to be united following the proposals by the Committee on Budgets, to say how things stood and to be able to give a clear answer to the precise question which Mr O'Keefe put on behalf of the presidency of the Council of the European Communities.

Mr President, the spirit in which the Committee on Budgets looked at Mr O'Keefe's declaration and Mr Tugendhat's declaration and the whole of the budget debate led it to wish, as far as it was concerned, to bring the debate to an end. This will be its attitude throughout the quarter, which will be difficult from a budgetary point of view, as we know. I understand the concern various people have shown over the calendar for the budget. Believe me when I say that this concern is shared by the Committee on Budgets itself and that, when the time comes, when it knows exactly how things stand, it will make proposals to the presidency so that every Member of this House and every Committee and every political Group can table amendments and proposed modifications in good time.

This general spirit, Mr President, is marked by three concerns that I shall sum up in three words.

First, firmness, the firmness that the Committee on Budgets will be proposing throughout the quarter in the defence of Parliament's rights — but not just in order to assert the need for democratic control, even if that in itself was enough to justify this position. Also because we are convinced that, as things stand, it is important to ensure that the Treaties are respected, because that is the only way of consolidating our Community in the trials it is undergoing — particu-

Cot

larly the problem of Community finances, which are the expression of these difficulties.

The second word is responsibility. We are fully aware of the seriousness of the situation. We do not intend to go in for pointless and prejudicial harrassment of the other institutions. We intend to contribute to finding a solution to the difficult problems facing us.

The third word is discernment, because we intend to separate the wheat from the chaff — which leads us to the problem of payment authorizations. Here, Mr President, we feel that the resolution this House adopted in July is explicit and still valid. Your Committee on Budgets has seen how the situation is developing and seen the prospects emerging now after the various (but by no means complete) discussions of the summer. It in no way wishes to hold things up. That is something I should like to insist on. It intends proposing that our Parliament contribute to finding a solution to the problem, within the framework of its particular responsibilities. We hope that the solution will have become clear by our next sitting. Your Committee expects to be given a supplementary budget and a further request for a payment authorization, as we have to have another such request before we can take a decision and authorize the release of the payments requested for the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic.

Mr President, I am confident that we can give a favourable answer in October, during the next part-session, when we have received the supplementary budget — which will of course not affect the way our discussions on the content of this supplementary budget go.

Mr Ducarme (L). — (FR) Mr President, I wanted to ask you whether, in future, whenever a debate is closed and whenever we are due to vote on amendments, the committee chairmen could open a debate, because, if they can, the Members should, I think, be told and the Groups could get organized to speak.

I do not quite understand the full import of what the Committee chairman said, but if this is to become regular Parliamentary practice in the forthcoming part-session, then the Groups have to be told. Otherwise, I think, there is no point in the Committee chairmen explaining their views every time.

President. — Mr Ducarme, Rule 66(4), second subparagraph, lays down that the chairmen and rapporteurs of committees shall be allowed to speak.

In this particular instance, I think that the speech made by the chairman of the Committee on Budgets was an important one, because he explained the circumstances in which certain motions for resolutions were referred back to committee. I feel that his statement threw a great deal of light on the situation.

In any case, it is customary — as well as being envisaged by the Rules of Procedure — that the chairmen of the committees concerned are allowed to speak.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Perhaps I might point out that the Committee on Budgets agreed to instruct its chairman to give an explanation at this stage. He was not expressing his personal opinion, but spoke on behalf of the committee and on behalf of the large majority of its members. This is the traditional method of proceeding — it is not that long since Mr Lange left our ranks.

(Applause from various quarters)

Commission proposal — First indent of the preamble: Amendments Nos 18 and 2

Mrs Scrivener (L), rapporteur. — (FR) To make debating easier, Mr President, I should like to explain where I stand on all the amendments. I am in favour of all the Committee on Budgets' amendments and against all the others. It will be easier now I have made things clear from the start. So I am against amendment No 18.

After the adoption of the Commission proposal

Mrs Scrivener (L), rapporteur. — (FR) When the time comes — now or a bit later — I should like the Commission to tell us what it thinks about what Parliament has voted. I know it wants to say something about this.

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — This is a matter on which the Commission has already made important amendments in response to Parliament's views. We have amended our original proposal from interest-bearing loans to non-interest-bearing advances. We have incorporated a reference to Article 5, and we have agreed that the reference figure should be indicative rather than mandatory. I should add that the final amount will, of course, be fixed in the budget and so by the budgetary authority, which means that Parliament's powers will have to be fully respected. In these circumstances, I explained in my closing remarks in the debate yesterday the reasons why the Commission has reservations about some of the amendments envisaged in Mrs Scrivener's resolution. The Commission cannot, therefore, undertake to endorse all the new amendments which have just been voted.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, I had expected, in accordance with the decision by the Committee on Budgets, that this report would be referred back to committee. I had understood that Mrs Scrivener intended to do this. It surprises me that you are now calling for the vote.

President. — Such a referral has not been proposed up to now.

Mr Dankert (S). — (FR) Mr President, I am somewhat surprised at what Mrs Scrivener has said. It does not matter whether the Committee speaks now or later. But I am speaking after the Committee on Budgets, which wants the *rapporteur* or the Chairman of the Committee to mention the provisions of Article 36(2). There is no other way.

Mr Cot (S), chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Mr President, bearing in mind Mr Tugendhat's answers, I should like to ask for Article 38(2) to be applied. I think the committee could look at these questions very rapidly and put the Scrivener report to the vote in the House in the light of them.

President. — We have therefore a request from the chairman of the Committee on Budgets that the report be referred back to committee.

(Parliament agreed to this request)

Mr Cryer (S). — Under Rule 80 Members have the right to give an explanation of vote. I indicated to an official yesterday that I wished to be called to speak on the Scrivener report and was told that before the final vote you would call those people, and I understood there were several, who wished to give a 1½-minute explanation of vote.

President. — Mr Cryer, there can be no explanation of vote because there is no vote. The whole matter has been referred back to committee.

(Applause)

Mr Pitt (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, forgive me if I am misunderstanding you in your haste, but I thought we had also tabled Amendments Nos 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, which we have not voted on. They have not been withdrawn by the authors and I am asking for an explanation, please.

Secondly, there has been no explanation as to why Doc. 2-531/84, which is on our agenda, has been withdrawn. Is it simply to avoid the embarrassment of British Conservatives having to vote with Communists, Fascists and Christian-Democrats on the matter of Britain's rebate?

President. — It is simply because, on a proposal from the chairman of the Committee on Budgets, the motion for a resolution has been referred back to committee. As a result there is no need to vote on the

amendments to this motion for a resolution, which has gone back to the committee.

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, you are quite right. The Scrivener report and therefore also the amendments to it have been referred back to the committee. However, the motion for a resolution by Mr Langes is a quite separate one.

(Mixed reactions)

It is on the agenda. Is it in order, Mr President, for cowards to withdraw motions for resolutions that have been printed on the agenda just because they give some of us the opportunity to demand an immediate vote on Britain's right to have her rebate paid? Are we to be the sacrificial lambs of the cowardice of the British Conservatives?

(Protests from the right)

I demand, Mr President, the right to have the motion for a resolution by Mr Langes, which is printed on today's agenda, moved. Have we not got a rule of Parliament which says that what is on the agenda shall remain on the agenda until Parliament votes otherwise?

President. — Mrs Castle, I am always happy to hear your remarks, charged as they are by such splendid vigour, but I must point out to you that the Langes motion for a resolution was withdrawn and that the House was told of it this morning. Mr Langes will be able to confirm that.

Let us hear what Mr Langes has to say, since the matter concerns him.

Mr Langes (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, I cannot understand Mrs Castle's attitude, nor, in particular, can I understand Mr Pitt, who is, after all, a member of the Committee on Budgets. The first item on the agenda this morning very clearly stated that all my amendments and those of the Gaullists had been withdrawn. I find it very regrettable, Mrs Castle, that you were not listening when the chairman of the Committee on Budgets quite clearly repeated, at the express wish of the Committee, that all the motions for resolutions on this subject had been withdrawn. In my opinion this was a parliamentary correct and politically sensible action.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, it will be a sad day for this Parliament when the majority view in the Committee on Budgets dictates what is the decision of

Castle

this sovereign Assembly. I am raising two constitutional points.

(Protests from the European Democratic Group)

Firstly, I raise the question as to whether it is permissible under our Rules for a verbal withdrawal to supersede what is on the written agenda. That is a very serious point.

Secondly, I want to ask whether it is not possible, in keeping with the procedure in a number of national parliaments for another member of the committee to take over an item which is on the agenda and therefore before Parliament when somebody else tries through cowardice to withdraw it.

(Protests from the European Democratic Group)

President. — You were perfectly entitled to raise this question, but a reply has been given. The situation seems to me to be perfectly clear and we can now continue.

Mr Cryer (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, may I raise this question of the UK rebate? The matter has now been referred to the Committee on Budgets, but surely the United Kingdom rebate is not going to linger in the Committee on Budgets. Last July at the first meeting of this Assembly there was a clear understanding that the UK rebate — and this Assembly was taking on very dubious powers — would be deferred only until September. Now, by means of subterfuge, Parliament is trying to keep this rebate for purposes of attempting to dictate to the United Kingdom Government. I think that is most unfair and unconstitutional and I would be glad of some clarification. When the Scrivener motion for a resolution was referred back to the Committee on Budgets, there was absolutely no reference whatsoever to the United Kingdom rebate. However, in my view and in the view of many Members here, during the debate in July the question of the United Kingdom rebate was entirely separate and distinct, and so it should remain.

(Loud protests from the European Democratic Group)

President. — Please forgive me, Mr Cryer, but I cannot allow a debate to be launched on this matter. The statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Budgets is extremely clear. He mentioned the problem with which you are quite rightly concerned. Consequently, at the point that we have now reached in our proceedings, there can be no question of going back over this substantive issue, extremely important though it is.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, perhaps you could ask the leaders of the Socialist Group to

explain our Rules of Procedure to the new members from the Labour Party one afternoon. We are tired of the constant explanations of the Rules of Procedure that appear to be necessary to counter their assertions as to how matters are handled in the British House of Commons. We handle matters as laid down in our Rules of Procedure. Please let us dispense with these endless debates on the Rules of Procedure.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

*
* *

Amendment No 1 seeking to replace four motions for resolutions¹ on the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal

Explanations of vote

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* On behalf of my group I would like to give a brief explanation of vote. We are glad the version of the motion for a resolution that we supported has been adopted. We attach importance to three points: firstly, Parliament must express its wish that all outstanding matters be dealt with speedily. Unfortunately, we have the impression that the Council and the authorities involved are taking their time as far as certain areas are concerned and that there are still a large number of points needing clarification.

Secondly, all major queries must be settled before accession and not, as has often been the case, be left open, thereby creating numerous difficulties for the Community.

Thirdly, Parliament intends to do all in its power to ensure that the negotiations proceed rapidly. However, in the interests both of the people of the Community and of the peoples of the applicant countries, the negotiations must result in clear decisions. We are pleased that the motion for a resolution has been adopted in its present form.

Mr Prag (ED). — We have heard a great deal in yesterday's debate about the difficulties involved in the negotiations. What on earth did the Commission and the Council expect? It was not as if they had never had accession negotiations before. Perhaps we should follow the biblical rule of jubilee and after seven years give the negotiators their freedom and get new ones.

My group insists particularly on four points. The first is the opening up of the Spanish market. That has got to happen. There are many parts of the Community's industry suffering heavy competition and, indeed,

¹ Docs 2-528/84, 2-529/84, 2-539/84 and 2-540/84.

Prag

damage from multinational companies operating from Spain against very low tariff barriers in the Community and in industries where Spanish tariff barriers are very high. The Spanish market must be opened up, even though we understand the problems of many small to medium-sized firms in Spain. Secondly, in the agricultural sector we must have production, restraint for wine and for olive oil, preferably through guarantee thresholds. That we want before the accession of Spain and Portugal is completed. Otherwise there is certain to be chaos and uncertainty afterwards. There cannot be any question of beginning another unlimited, open-ended commitment to subsidize however much of these products farmers care to produce.

Thirdly, we cannot allow our fishing fleets to be damaged further. That is a simple requirement.

Fourthly, we want this Parliament to be consulted in the way described in the compromise motions. Spain and Portugal are essential parts of Western Europe, geographically, historically and culturally. The full cooperation of both Spain and Portugal is an essential part of our Western European security. Let us not forget that our Treaties are open to all the countries of Europe, and that is a solemn commitment. It is high time that that commitment was applied to Spain and Portugal. The date of 1 January 1986 must be kept. That is why my group is wholeheartedly in favour of the balanced and sensible compromise motion. That is why we shall vote for it.

Mrs Piermont (ARC). — (DE) The compromise amendment has nothing to do with the motion for a resolution I tabled on behalf of the Federation of the Green-Alternative European Link. I therefore call for a separate vote to be taken on this motion for a resolution, which points out that Spanish and Portuguese membership of the Community is a separate issue from their membership of Nato.

President. — We shall take note of that.

Mr Coste-Floret (RDE). — (FR) On behalf of my friends in the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, I should like to say why we have been unable to rally to the compromise text the Socialist Group, the Group of the European People's Party and the European Democratic Group have just presented and why we are sticking to our resolution.

Ladies and gentlemen, everyone here is convinced of the need to expand the European Community of democracies to include the whole of the map of Europe and, now that Spain and Portugal have thrown out their totalitarian dictatorships and, happily, become democracies, there is no political obstacle to their accession.

I should add that their accession would make for a good balance between northern and Mediterranean

countries within the Community and it is therefore politically desirable.

However, if we leave principles and look at reality, there are serious obstacles, because, if we are not to compromise the achievements of the Community — and it is important to safeguard them — there are essential points to settle and, as the Commission itself admits, we still have not settled them. Everything — wine and oil quotas, tariffs for manufactures, fishing in Community waters and migrant workers from Spain — is still to be settled and Spain has to make a considerable effort to solve these problems.

Who does not see or feel or know that the Community is facing an important financial issue of its own, since the Commission has said that the effect of Spain joining would be very considerable. Can we, with Community resources as they are, let Spain and Portugal in? That is the question.

There are three possible solutions for these difficulties. We could let Spain and Portugal in and solve the problems afterwards. That is out of the question because it would upset the running of the Community and compromise its achievements. We could, as the Commission says, hope the problems will be solved before and not afterwards and set a precise date for accession. We cannot have this. We think that accession is not something that is tied and linked to a specific date. It must be tied to obtaining concrete results.

(Applause from various benches)

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — (FR) Is there any need to reiterate the Group of the European Right's interest in enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal? It is our ardent hope that these two peoples, with their wealth of history and their religion, culture and language that have gone a long way to shaping the civilizations of the new and old worlds, will become full members of our Community.

But it is important, first, to have the means of extending our house and we have neither the money nor the tools to do so.

Yesterday, I had the honour of reminding you of the three vital conditions for enlargement — settling the Member States' contributions once and for all, producing regulations to preserve the Mediterranean productions of these States and the means of seeing they are adhered to and increasing the Community's own resources in proportion to enlargement.

These conditions have not been fulfilled, far from it, and so the Group of the European Right will be voting against the so-called compromise text. The difficult situation surrounding the negotiations can no longer tolerate hesitation or subterfuge or lies. What it needs is the bold, vital decisions which are the only way to make enlargement a success.

Mr Sutra (S). — (*FR*) Honourable Members, we note the salutary evolution of our Parliament with pleasure and some pride.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the proposed synthesis from the two main Groups in this Parliament represent a position which the French Socialists defended all by themselves during previous debates and which are now mentioned in the first recital — that political solidarity, however strong it may be, cannot wipe out the practical problems and that negotiations are called for.

Two years ago, in this House, my colleague Mrs Péry was called a hypocrite — not into the microphone — by someone, a French-speaker, on the right, for having dared say that we were both in favour of enlargement but would not agree to it without these points being negotiated.

How pleased I was yesterday to hear Mrs Veil, who needed only a few words to rid the policy to which my reports and my name are attached, of everything that has been said against this policy over the past seven years. That proves that the French can unite, because Mrs Veil was speaking over the strong applause from the Gaullist Group. Uniting — and I am proud of this — means nothing more than taking the socialists' proposals.

I shall summarize this position in one word. General de Gaulle said no to Great Britain and Mr Pompidou said yes. They were both wrong. De Gaulle was wrong because he weakened Europe and prevented a great democracy from taking its place and sitting, with its problems, in this House and Pompidou was wrong because he sunk us in 14 years of permanent renegotiation which we hope Fontainebleau will have brought to an end.

However, things are still not settled. So we need to negotiate now, so as to avoid having to negotiate afterwards.

These negotiations must be the occasion to finish with the 14 year-old wine war between France and Italy. And we must not replace this war of the poor with another war of the poor from the Bay of Biscay or the Basque fishermen.

We cannot agree to Spain and Portugal joining the Community, even if olive oil and fats stay outside Community jurisdiction for 10 or 15 years, in accordance with what I have no hesitation in calling the shameful proposal the Commission has dared to present.

We shall vote for this text, but please realize that we are particularly keen on paragraphs 2 and 3, which reflect points of view we have always defended, often all by ourselves.

Mr Marshall (ED). — I wish to refer to the impact of Spanish accession on the relationship of the Com-

munity with our traditional Mediterranean suppliers, such as Morocco, Tunisia and Israel. Some Members may forget the importance to these countries of their trade with Europe. But we must remember that somewhere between 30 and 60% of their agricultural exports come to the Community.

We must also remember that those countries are terribly important for Community trade. 12.3% of the Community's exports go to those traditional Mediterranean suppliers. We send five times as much goods and services to those countries as we send to Japan. There is a huge trade deficit in our favour between ourselves and those traditional suppliers.

So, apart from self-interest, there is also a moral argument that it is wrong for the Community to ignore the impact of its policies on people much less well off than ourselves.

I should also like to refer to a political problem, which is that Spain does not recognize the State of Israel. If Spain joins the Community, it will eventually take over the Presidency of the Council of Ministers and it is quite wrong to have a Council Presidency that does not have any diplomatic representation in Jerusalem or the State of Israel. Spain is now a democracy and should recognize the only true democracy in the Middle East.

Mr Pranchère (COM). — (*FR*) In spite of the fact that the Brussels, Madrid and Lisbon round of negotiations has speeded up, we are forced to admit that they are stagnating. Declarations of principle are no longer the order of the day. The real issues have to be put on table and each of these issues brings out fresh contradictions, particularly in agriculture and fisheries where competition is getting fiercer.

I understand Mr Natali not thinking it was the right moment to go into details. He would still be there. These difficulties are the expression of the awareness of our populations on both sides of the Pyrenees of the dangers of enlargement. The french right is forced to take this into consideration and set up a camouflage operation while remaining in favour of the basic ideas and as a question of principle, as it said in its speeches. These EPP Members even go so far as to ask for a fair distribution of sacrifices in the resolution they, and others, signed. The wine-growers, the farmers, the fruit and vegetable producers and the fishermen will appreciate . . .

The debate strengthens our idea that enlargement is not something ineluctable that we need no longer discuss. The die is not yet cast, particularly since, even after the negotiations are over, our national parliaments still have to ratify. We continue to think that another solution is possible if we implement a policy of cooperation with the applicant countries. It can be done without waiting any longer and that, as we see it,

Pranchère

is the best way of promoting economic and social progress and strengthening democracy. The compromise resolution takes the opposite tack and aims to speed up the process of accession and that is why we shall be voting against it.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — I just want to make two short points.

We have had too much linkage between Spain and Portugal in these debates. It must be remembered that Portugal applied to join before Spain. Therefore there is, in my view, no reason why Portugal should not join before Spain. My colleague, Peter Beazley, made this point yesterday, and I think it is extremely important that we should be quite clear about the fact that if there is any delay in Spain's joining, that delay need not be transferred to the accession of Portugal as well. After all, Portugal has been Britain's oldest ally and is noted for its fidelity to the European ideal. Portugal is not the same as Spain: it has a different language and different ideals. It applied before Spain thought of it.

I would further say — and Members will know that I usually take an interest in the security aspects of these affairs — that Portugal is a loyal member of NATO and has important bases in Madeira and the Azores which are valuable to the western European powers. If Portugal joins us — as I hope it will, regardless of Spain; indeed I think it will draw Spain in — then I think we have the possibility and even the probability of Portugal joining the Western European Union, taking an interest in the independent European production group and lending its military strength to our endeavours to correlate our reactions to threats from the East.

Mr Taylor (ED). — The accession of Portugal and Spain to the European Community raises problems, particularly the accession of Spain. There is little difficulty in accepting the application of Portugal. For us in the United Kingdom, however, there are clearly major problems ahead insofar as the application of Spain is concerned. I am disappointed that, with the honourable exception of the Socialist Member from Great Britain, Mr Lomas, no mention has been made of the particular problems of a present member of the EEC, namely Gibraltar.

Gibraltar is by international treaty linked with Great Britain and outside Spain. It is by constitutional law separated from Spain and, most important of all, by self-determination the people of Gibraltar have decided to remain within the British family, I am disappointed that this major issue has not been raised in this debate. I agree with Mr d'Ormesson that many of the real issues that face us when we consider the application of Spain have been avoided by platitudes on both sides of the House during this debate. Insofar as Gibraltar is concerned, before I can agree to sup-

port the application of Spain, we must see both vehicular and pedestrian freedom of movement between an existing member of the EEC, Gibraltar, and Spain. Secondly, we must see the application of the daily allowances that apply between all other EEC countries.

Mr President, it may not have been an issue for Members of this House as yet, but certainly back in the United Kingdom the British people want to see the interests of Gibraltar preserved when Spain joins the European Economic Community. Only one month ago the United Kingdom Prime Minister said that Britain will veto the application of Spain unless freedom of movement is guaranteed and barriers against the territory of Gibraltar are lifted. In that statement she has the support both of the United Kingdom Parliament and of the British people. In those circumstances, until this issue is resolved I will abstain on this vote.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1)

*
* *

Motions for resolutions — Enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal

- **Piermont (Doc. 2-530/83):** rejected
- **Ewing (Doc. 2-533/84):** rejected
- **de la Malène (Doc. 2-534/84):** rejected
- **d'Ormesson (Doc. 2-535/84):** rejected

*
* *

President. — Parliament is now asked to vote on the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-361/84 — COM(84) 368 final) on

- I. a proposal for a Directive amending Directives 72/159/EEC, 72/160/EEC and 72/161/EEC on agricultural structures;
- II. a proposal for a Decision amending Decision 76/402/EEC on the level of the interest rate subsidy, provided for by Directive 72/159/EEC on the modernization of farms, to be applied in Italy;
- III. a proposal for a Decision amending Decision 81/598/EEC on the modernization of farms, provided for by Directive 72/159/EEC on the modernization of farms, to be applied in Ireland;
- IV. a proposal for a Decision amending Decision 82/438/EEC authorizing certain member States to raise the level of the interest rate subsidies provided for by Directive 72/159/EEC on the modernization of farms.

President

I would remind the House that this item was down to be dealt with by urgent procedure and that Parliament is being asked to vote on the Commission's document.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I wish merely to inform Parliament that there are four amendments down which are precisely to the same effect. The Commission is not in a position to accept these amendments, and if you would allow me 30 seconds I shall tell Parliament why.

The purpose of the proposal was to ensure that existing agricultural structure policy measures can continue to apply without interruption pending the adoption by the Council of the Commission's new policy proposals. It envisages a rollover of the existing directives at 31 October. The amendments that are being submitted to Parliament would in fact extend that time limit from 31 October to 31 December.

The Council, at its meeting of 18 June, has already given its informal agreement to the rollover at 31 October. The Council will be resuming its discussion of the new policy proposals at its meeting on 17/18 September. While agreement is still required, it is hoped that final decisions will be taken by 31 October. In those circumstances, Mr President, it would not seem sensible to the Commission that the rollover should be extended to the end of December.

(Parliament approved the Commission proposals)

*
* *

Proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-443/84 — COM(84) 375 final) on a regulation on the conclusion of the Agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the EEC, on the one hand, and the Government of Denmark and the Home Government of the Faroe Islands on the other hand, establishing measures for salmon fishing in the North Atlantic: approved

Proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-445/84 — COM(84) 390 final) for a resolution on the conclusion of an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the European Economic Community concerning fisheries off the coasts of the United States: approved

*
* *

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED). — Mr President, I noted earlier this afternoon that you did not put to the vote the Bureau's proposal for the 1985 calendar of plenary sittings. May I seek your advice as to when you intend to give the House the opportunity of voting on that proposal and, since the original deadline

has now passed, will the Bureau propose a revised deadline for the tabling of amendments?

President. — This proposal was put to the House. In fact, it elicited some comment from the Member who is, I think, your neighbour, Sir James Scott-Hopkins. I did point out that I could not accept any proposals for changes in the agenda made in this informal way while the House was sitting but that it might be possible to contemplate such changes in the course of the year.

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED). — Mr President, with great respect, I do recall that exchange, but you did not put the proposal to the House to vote on, and the agenda states that the House should vote on the Bureau's proposal. The House did not vote on it.

President. — Oh yes indeed, there was a vote. After all, all votes do not have to be taken by a show of hands or by electronic vote. Whenever I find that there are no objections to a particular proposal, I deem that proposal to have been adopted, as was the case in this instance.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, my point of order is an enquiry as to whether copies of the Rules of Procedure of this House have been fully circulated.

We have had today examples of such woeful ignorance, not only of the Rules but also of the consequences of their not being observed, that it is quite evident that of the new Members here there are several whose colleagues prefer — as we might also — not to talk to them. Only this can explain their woeful ignorance. Have they, in fact, been issued with copies of the Rules?

President. — Copies of the Rules have been sent to all the Members of this House. In fact, to be more precise, they have been sent to all Members at their home addresses. Can it be possible that some copies have not arrived? Well, I suppose that is possible. In any case, I would inform all Members that copies of the Rules — in all the official languages, of course — may be had at any time at Distribution, which is quite near here on our floor.

5. Adjournment of the session

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.¹

(The sitting was closed at 4.30 p.m.)

¹ *Setting up of a Committee of Inquiry — Declarations entered in register (Rule 49) — Forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting — Dates of next part-session: see Minutes.*

**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. 512 00 26
CCP / Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /
Europese Boekhandel**
Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

CREDOC

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34
Bte 11 / Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag
Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95
Girokonto 200 11 95

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger
Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0
Fernschreiber:
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA

International Bookstore
4 Nikis Street
Athens (126)
Tel. 322 63 23
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

Molho's Bookstore
The Business Bookshop
10 Tsimiski Street
Thessaloniki
Tel. 275 271
Telex 412885 LIMO

FRANCE

**Service de vente en France des publications
des Communautés européennes**

Journal officiel
26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office

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
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

Annual subscription 1984/1985 ECU 63.30 BFR 2 900 IRL 46 UKL 36.50 USD 55

Single issue price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 10.90 BFR 500 IRL 8 UKL 6.50 USD 10



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

