

Annex

# Official Journal

of the  
European Communities

No 177  
June 1974

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

---

1974-1975 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 10 to 14 June 1974

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

<b>Monday, 10 June 1974</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Resumption of session, p. 2 — Apologies for absence, p. 2 — Congratulations to Mr Jarrot and Mr Rossi, p. 2 — Verification of credentials, p. 2 — Membership of committee, p. 2 — Authorization of reports, p. 2 — Reference to committees, p. 3 — Documents received, p. 3 — Reference of a report to committee, p. 5 — Allocation of speaking-time, p. 5 — Order of business, p. 6 — Overall results of cooperation within the framework of the EEC-AASM Association, p. 11 — Receipt of a petition, p. 2 — Directive on indirect taxes on the raising of capital, p. 22 — Third directive on taxes other than turnover taxes on manufactured tobacco, p. 23 — Oral Question with debate: Effect of the release of gold reserves on Community trade, p. 23 — Oral Question with debate: Threat to the Dollard Nature Reserve, p. 29 — Agenda for the next sitting, p. 34.	
<b>Tuesday, 11 June 1974</b> .....	<b>35</b>
Approval of the minutes, p. 37 — Statement by the President, p. 37 — Documents received, p. 37 — Forwarding of a document by the Council; Statement by the President-in-Office of the Council, p. 37 — Question Time, p. 41 — Welcome to a Delegation from the Turkish Parliament, p. 49 — Oral Question with debate: Political rights of migrant workers, p. 49 — Change in the agenda, p. 54 — Oral Question with debate: Political rights of migrant workers (resumption), p. 55 — Election of a vice-president, p. 55 — Oral Question with debate: Political rights of migrant workers (resumption), p. 56 — Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, p. 59 — Commission Memorandum on measures relating to point 16 of the Hague Communiqué, p. 61 — Importation of cultural materials - Decision to postpone consideration of a report, p. 88 — Agenda for the next sitting, p. 89.	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

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

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

(Continued)

Wednesday, 12 June 1974 ..... 92

Approval of minutes, p. 93 — Apologies for absence, p. 97 — Documents received, p. 97 — Membership of committees, p. 97 — Receipt of a petition, p. 97 — Presentation of an opinion on a petition - Forwarding of a document to the Council, p. 97 — Authorization of reports, p. 97 — Petition No 1/73 : International Charter of Migrant Workers' Rights - Petition No 1/74: European Migrant Workers' Charter, p. 98 — 1974-75 Information Programme of the Commission, p. 115 — 1974-75 Information Programme of the Commission (resumption), p. 119 — Adaptation to technical progress of directives on the protection and improvement of the environment - Recommendation on cost allocations and action by public authorities on environmental matters, p. 132 — Regulation on the creation of a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions, p. 141 — Agenda for the next sitting, p. 152.

Thursday, 13 June 1974 ..... 153

Approval of minutes, p. 154 — Economic situation in the Community, p. 154 — Membership of committees, p. 166 — Oral Question with debate: European technological cooperation in specific industrial sectors, p. 166 — Directive on aid to the shipbuilding industry - Commission Memorandum on procedures for action in the shipbuilding industry - Decision on assistance from the ESF for persons employed in the shipbuilding industry, p. 175 — Community measures for the desulphurization of fuels - Directive on the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels, p. 199 — Directives on the activities of self-employed persons engaged in the retail sale of pharmaceuticals, p. 206 — Oral Question with debate: Harmonization of nationality laws, p. 212 — Agenda for the next sitting, p. 215.

Friday, 14 June 1974 ..... 216

Approval of minutes, p. 217 — Documents received, p. 217 — Regulations on the maximum quota applicable to sugar during the 1974-75 marketing year - Regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar, p. 218 — Directive on the stunning of animals before slaughter, p. 222 — Regulation on pure-bred breeding cattle, p. 222 — Regulation on the fat content of whole milk, p. 223 — Regulation suspending autonomous customs duties in the CCT on certain agricultural products, p. 229 — Directive on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultry-meat - Reference of a report to committee, p. 231 — Oral Question with debate: Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, p. 232 — Agenda for the next part-session, p. 236 — Approval of minutes, p. 238 — Adjournment of session, p. 238.

*Resolutions adopted at sittings from 10 to 14 June 1974 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 76 of 3 July 1974*

## SITTING OF MONDAY, 10 JUNE 1974

### Contents

1. Resumption of the session .....	2	14. Directive on indirect taxes on the raising of capital — Debate on report drawn up by Mr Artzinger on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 75/74):	
2. Apologies for absence .....	2	Mr Artzinger, rapporteur .....	22
3. Congratulations to Mr Jarrot and Mr Rossi .....	2	Adoption of resolution .....	22
4. Verification of credentials .....	2	15. Third directive on taxes other than turnover taxes on manufactured tobacco — Report drawn up by Mr Artzinger on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 76/74) .....	23
5. Membership of committees .....	2	Adoption of resolution .....	23
6. Authorization of reports .....	2	16. Oral Question with debate: effect of release of gold reserves on Community trade (Doc. 123/74):	
7. Reference to committee .....	3	Mr Durieux, author of the question; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Artzinger, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Lange, on behalf of the Socialist Group and in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs; Mr Cousté, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Van der Hek; Mr Bersani; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza; Mr Durieux .....	23
8. Documents received .....	3	17. Oral Question with debate: threat to the Dollard nature reserve (Doc. 62/74):	
9. Reference of a report to committee ..	5	Mr Della Briotta, chairman of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Scholten, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Laban, on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza; Mr Della Briotta .....	30
10. Allocation of speaking time .....	5	18. Agenda for the next sitting .....	34
11. Order of business:			
Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Seefeld; Mr Kirk, chairman of the European Conservative Group; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Pisoni; Mr Wieldraaijer; Lord Chelwood; Mr Lange; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Walkhoff; Mr Cousté; Mr Laban	6		
12. Overall result of cooperation within the framework of the EEC-AASM Association — Debate on report drawn up by Mr Dewulf on behalf of the Committee on Development and Co-operation (Doc. 111/74):			
Mr Bersani, deputy rapporteur .....	11		
Mr Achenbach, on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group; Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Laudrin, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Lord Reay; Mr Van der Hek; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Lord Reay .....	13		
Adoption of resolution .....	22		
13. Receipt of a petition .....	22		

IN THE CHAIR: MR BERKHOUWER

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 4 p.m.)*

1. *Resumption of the session.*

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 15 May 1974.

2. *Apologies for absence.*

**President.** — An apology for absence has been received from Mr Schuijt, who regrets his inability to attend.

3. *Congratulations to Mr Jarrot and Mr Rossi.*

**President.** — As you all know, two of our Members have been appointed to the French government. I feel I am speaking on behalf of you all when I congratulate Mr Jarrot, Minister for the Quality of Life, and Mr Rossi, State Secretary to the Prime Minister and government spokesman. I am sure that our colleagues will continue in their new posts to devote themselves to the European cause.

4. *Verification of credentials.*

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

On 14 and 16 May 1974 the Chamber of Representatives and the Senate of the Kingdom of Belgium renewed their delegation to the European Parliament.

The following were appointed: Mr Alfred Bertrand, Mr Pierre J. F. Bertrand, Mr Willy Calewaert, Mr Paul de Clercq, Mr Paul de Keersmaecker, Mr Fernand Delmotte, Mr Pierre Deschamps, Mr Ernest Glinne, Mr Norbert Hougardy, Mr Lucien Martens, Mr Lucien Outers, Mr René Pêtre, Mr Lucien Radoux and Mr Marcel A. Vandewiele.

Pursuant to Rule 3(1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau has made sure that these appointments comply with the provisions of the Treaties.

It therefore asks the House to ratify these appointments.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

I congratulate those Members whose mandate has been extended and wish the new Members a warm welcome to the European Parliament.

*(Applause)*

5. *Membership of committees.*

**President.** — I have received requests for the appointment of the following Members to the following committees:

- Mr Outers to the Legal Affairs Committee;
- Lord O'Hagan to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment;
- Mr Nyborg to the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport;
- Mr Covelli to the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology;
- Mr de Sanctis to the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth;
- Mr Pierre Bertrand to the Committee on External Economic Relations;
- Mr Romualdi to the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

I have also received from the Christian-Democratic Group a request for the appointment of Mr Creed to the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport to replace Mr McDonald.

Are there any objections?

The appointments are ratified.

6. *Authorization of reports.*

**President.** — Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Rules of Procedure I have authorized the following committees to draw up reports:

- Committee on Agriculture:

Report on the amended proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to honey;

The Committee on Public Health and the Environment has been appointed to deliver an opinion.

- Committee on Regional Policy and Transport: Report on the problems of transit traffic passing through Switzerland and Austria.

**President**

— Committee on Public Health and the Environment:

Report on the results of the Third Inter-Parliamentary Conference on Environmental Protection held in Nairobi from 9 to 11 April 1974.

— Committee on External Economic Relations: Report on the development of the political situation in Greece, insofar as it affects relations between Greece and the EEC.

— Committee on Development and Cooperation: Report on the overall results of technical and financial cooperation within the framework of the EEC-AASM Association; Report on the Communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council: Attempt to neutralize certain international price movements for the most affected developing countries;

The Committee on Budgets has been appointed to deliver an opinion on this document.

7. *Reference to committee.*

**President.** — The recommendations adopted by the EEC-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee on 28 March 1974 in Berlin (Doc. 71/74), which were referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible, have now also been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, at this committee's request, for an opinion.

In addition, the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a revision of the multi-year research programme (Doc. 89/74), which was referred to the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for its opinion, has now also been referred to the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, at its own request, for an opinion.

8. *Documents received.*

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

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

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending Directive No 71/307/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to textile names (Doc. 107/74).

This document has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible and to the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for their opinions;

— the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on the resolution concerning animal and plant health and animal nutrition (Doc. 108/74).

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

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a decision on the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee (Doc. 117/74).

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

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation extending and modifying Regulation (EEC) No 2829/72 of the Council of 28 December 1972 regarding the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road between Member States (Doc. 120/74).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport;

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the liberalization of co-insurance operations and the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to co-insurance (Doc. 121/74).

This document has been referred to the Legal Affairs Committee as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for its opinion;

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation on the opening, allocation and administration of a Community tariff quota for certain eels falling within sub-heading No ex 03.01 A II of the Common Customs Tariff for 1975 (Doc. 127/74).

**President**

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

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation laying down special provisions applicable to trade in tomato concentrates between the Community as originally constituted and the new Member States (Doc. 128/74).

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

- (b) from the Council of the European Communities, a consultation on the request for the non-automatic carrying forward of appropriations from the financial year 1973 to the financial year 1974 submitted by the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 110/74).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Budgets;

- (c) from the Commission of the European Communities:

- second financial report on the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund for 1972 (submitted by the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament) — (Doc. 109/74).

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

- third report on competition policy (annexed to the 'Seventh General Report on the Activities of the Communities') — (Doc. 118/74).

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

- (d) from the committees, the following reports:

- report drawn up by Mr Broeksz on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth on the 1974/1975 Information Programme of the Commission of the European Communities (Doc. 106/74);

- report drawn up by Mr Dewulf on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on the overall results of technical and financial cooperation within the framework of the EEC-AASM Association (Doc. 111/74);

- report drawn up by Mr Martens on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 99/74), for a regulation modifying Regulation (EEC) No 1411/71 as regards the fat content of whole milk (Doc. 112/74);

- report drawn up by Mr Bousch on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive obliging the Member States of the EEC to maintain minimum stocks of fuels at thermal power stations (Doc. 113/74);

- report drawn up by Mr Jarrot on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a recommendation to the Member States regarding cost allocations and action by public authorities on environmental matters (Doc. 114/74);

- report drawn up by Mrs Orth on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending the Council Directive of 15 February 1971 on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultrymeat (Doc. 115/74);

- report drawn up by Mr Früh on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation temporarily suspending the autonomous duties in the Common Customs Tariff on a number of agricultural products (Doc. 116/74);

- report drawn up by Mr Schwörer on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the harmonization of procedures for the release of goods for free circulation (Doc. 119/74);

**President**

— report drawn up by Mr Schwabe on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation extending the period of validity of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1174/68 of 30 July 1968 on the introduction of a system of bracket tariffs for the carriage of goods by road between Member States (Doc. 125/74);

— report drawn up by Mr Herbert on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation on the customs treatment applicable to goods returned to the customs territory of the Community (Doc. 126/74);

— report drawn up by Mr De Koning on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation laying down special measures for soya beans (Doc. 131/74);

— report drawn up by Mr Jahn on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the disposal of waste oils (Doc. 132/74);

(e) the following motions for resolutions:

— from Mr Bousch on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, a motion for a resolution on the economic situation in the Community, with request that it be dealt with by urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure (Doc. 129/74);

— from Mr Franco Concas on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, a motion for a resolution on the third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, with request that it be dealt with by urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure (Doc. 130/74);

(f) the following oral questions:

— from Lord O'Hagan, Lord Chelwood, Lord St Oswald, Mr Hougardy, Mr Bousch, Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker, Lord Mansfield, Mr Brewis, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Noè, Mr Terrenoire and Mr McDonald, pursuant to Rule 47A of the Rules of Procedure, for Question Time on 11 June 1974 (Doc. 122/74);

— oral question, with debate, put by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Marras, Mrs Iotti, Mr Fabbrini and Mr Sandri to the Council of the European Communities on the political rights of migrant workers (Doc. 14/74/rev.);

— oral question, with debate, put by Mr Durieux on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group to the Commission of the European Communities on the effect of the release of gold reserves on Community trade (Doc. 123/74);

— oral question, with debate, put by Mr Laban on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture to the Commission of the European Communities on the third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 124/74).

#### 9. *Reference of a report to committee.*

**President.** — I have received from Mr de la Malène a request that the report drawn up by Lord Lothian on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the recommendations adopted by the EEC-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee on 28 March 1974 in Berlin be referred back to the committee.

I would remind the House that pursuant to Rule 26(2) of the Rules of Procedure reference to committee is allowed if the committee responsible so requests.

The report has therefore been referred back to the committee.

#### 10. *Allocation of speaking time.*

**President.** — In accordance with the usual practice and pursuant to Rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure, I propose that speaking time be allocated as follows:

— 15 minutes for the rapporteur and one speaker for each political group;

— 10 minutes for other speakers;

— 5 minutes for speakers on amendments.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I also propose that speaking time for oral questions with debate be allocated as follows:

— 10 minutes for the author of the question;

— 5 minutes for other speakers.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

### 11. Order of business.

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

In accordance with the instructions given to me by the enlarged Bureau at its meeting of 15 May 1974, I prepared a draft agenda, which was published in the Bulletin of the European Parliament and distributed to members of the press.

Since then, however, I have received a number of requests for the withdrawal or amendment of items of the agenda and for the addition of new items.

At its meeting of 4 June 1974 in Copenhagen the enlarged Bureau pointed out that normally only those reports are placed on the agenda which have been submitted 10 days before the part-session and that it is in the interests of Members and political groups of the Commission and the press not to change the order of business. This has in fact been said by the Assembly itself more than once, and I feel that it would be a wise policy not to diverge from the draft agenda once it has been set up, in view of the particularly unpleasant remarks in the press on various occasions in the past after we had made changes at the eleventh hour.

I would remind the House that we shall be meeting again in two weeks' time and again in July.

I would therefore appeal to you all to abide by the request that you yourselves have repeatedly made, and not continually change the agenda.

I have received from Mr Bousch on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs a motion for a resolution on the economic situation in the Community.

This document has been printed and distributed under No 129/74.

Pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, a request has been made for this motion for a resolution to be dealt with by urgent procedure. Are there any objections to the request for urgent procedure?

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed. I propose that this motion for a resolution be placed at the end of this afternoon's agenda.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange**, chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. — (D) Mr President, I am grateful to Parliament for

putting Mr Bousch's report on the agenda. However, the rapporteur is not able to attend today. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs would therefore like to suggest that this report be taken as the first item of Thursday morning's agenda.

I am making this proposal to ensure that such important matters as the economic situation in the Community are not discussed at a time when there is no-one to take note of what is said.

I would appreciate it if we could agree to the report being debated as the first item on Thursday morning's agenda. The rapporteur will then be available.

**President.** — Mr Lange proposes that this motion for a resolution be debated at the beginning of the sitting on Thursday morning.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

It is agreed that this motion for a resolution will be debated at the beginning of Thursday morning's sitting.

I have also received from Mr Concas on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee a motion for a resolution on the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

This document has been printed and distributed under No 130/74.

Pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, a request has been made for this motion for a resolution to be dealt with by urgent procedure.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — This is, no doubt, Mr President, an important subject. I do not suggest that it is not. But if we are to be strict in our interpretation of the Rules of Procedure—and I understand from your earlier remarks that we are to be strict—then it would be better, instead of adding the subject to the agenda as a matter of urgency, for us to consider it at a later part-session, in June or July, when all of us who are involved in the matter would be better able to give it the consideration that it deserves. While I do not question its importance, I feel that it does not qualify under a strict interpretation as a matter of urgency.

**President.** — For the sake of objectivity, I should like to point out that I understand the reason why Mr Concas finds this matter urgent is that



**President**

the conference begins next week. This might be countered by saying that it will continue for several months, an argument in favour of Mr Scott-Hopkins' objection.

Mr Scott-Hopkins is therefore against urgent procedure.

Pursuant to the Rules of Procedure I must now give the floor to one Member in favour of urgent procedure.

I call Mr Seefeld.

**Mr Seefeld.** — (D) Mr President, I am neither a member of the Legal Affairs Committee nor did I table the motion for a resolution. Nevertheless, I should like to oppose Mr Scott-Hopkins. This matter is important and should be discussed here. You yourself have said that the conference will begin this month. Mr President, I should just like to point out that this subject has been on the agenda for the last few Question Times, in other words almost every month. From this you will gather that some of the Members of this House consider it an important matter. Following the answers given by the Commission and Council the opinion has evidently formed in the Legal Affairs Committee that this motion for a resolution should be tabled. I am therefore in favour of it being placed on the agenda of this part-session.

**President.** — I put to the vote the request that the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Concas be dealt with by urgent procedure.

It is adopted.

I propose that this motion for a resolution be discussed at the end of Thursday's sitting.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk, chairman of the European Conservative Group.** — It has become apparent from recent Question Times, Mr President, that the problem relating to the Conference on the Law of the Sea rests with the Council of Ministers and not with the Commission. Therefore, can we be assured that a member of the Council will be present to reply when this matter is debated? We have had answers from the responsible member of the Commission on many occasions, and he has made it plain that he can take the matter no further. It is therefore important to know whether the responsible member of the Council can be here on Thursday afternoon to reply to the debate; otherwise there is no point in having the debate

**President.** — I find Mr Kirk's remarks particularly relevant. I assume that everyone interested in this debate agrees with him.

I would therefore ask you to leave it to me to put this debate on the agenda at a time when an appropriate member of the Council is present to comment.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I shall now read out the draft agenda as published and distributed today.

*This afternoon:*

- Order of business;
- Report by Mr Dewulf on cooperation within the framework of the EEC-AASM Association (Doc. 111/74);
- Report by Mr Artzinger on taxes on the raising of capital (Doc. 75/74);
- Report by Mr Artzinger on taxes on manufactured tobacco (Doc. 76/74);
- Oral Question with debate to the Commission on the effect of the release of gold reserves on Community trade (Doc. 123/74);
- Oral Question with debate to the Commission on the Dollard Nature Reserve (Doc. 62/74).

Are there any objections?

This afternoon's agenda is agreed.

*Tuesday, 11 June 1974:*

*11 a.m. and 3 p.m.*

- Question Time (Doc. 122/74);
- Oral Question with debate to the Council on the political rights of migrant workers (Doc. 14/74);
- Oral Question without debate to the Council on relations with the countries of the Mediterranean Basin (Doc. 34/74);
- Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Concas on the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 130/74);
- Report by Mr Seefeld on measures relating to point 16 of the Hague Communiqué (Doc. 41/74);
- Report by Mr Lange on the importation of cultural materials (Doc. 72/74).

As I have just announced, Lord Lothian's report on the recommendations adopted by the EEC-

**President**

Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee (Doc. 91/74) has been referred back to the committee responsible at that committee's request.

I call Lord O'Hagan.

**Lord O'Hagan.** — May I congratulate you, Mr President, on your safe return from London.

I understand that there is a meeting of the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs tomorrow when a decision will be taken on some of the Social Action Programme. There are three debates this part-session dealing with the problem of migrant workers. Are there arrangements for a member of the Council to make statements to Parliament tomorrow or later in the week?

**President.** — The Council's representative will be present tomorrow. I hope that he will then be able to make the statement requested by Lord O'Hagan.

Are there any other objections?

Tuesday's agenda is agreed.

*Wednesday, 12 June 1974:*

*10 a.m. and 3 p.m.*

— Report by Mr Broeks on the 1974/1975 Information Programme of the Commission (Doc. 105/74);

— Joint debate on

— the report by Mr Willi Müller on the adaptation to technical progress of directives on the protection of the environment (Doc. 101/74)

— the report by Mr Jarrot on action by public authorities on environmental matters (Doc. 114/74);

— Joint debate on

— the report by Mr Jahn on a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions (Doc. 93/74)

— a report by Mr Marras on the same subject (Doc. 94/74);

— Report by Mr Wieldraaijer on two petitions concerning a Charter for migrant workers (Doc. 84/74).

I call Mr Pisoni.

**Mr Pisoni.** — (I) Mr President, although I do not want to make an issue of this matter, I wonder whether, in view of our engagements in Italy, you could move the debate on the Wieldraaijer

report from the last to the first item of Wednesday's agenda so that we open with consideration of the Wieldraaijer report rather than the Broeks report.

**President.** — If the Assembly approves, we can accept Mr Pisoni's request.

I assume that the discussion of this matter will not take too long.

I call Mr Wieldraaijer.

**Mr Wieldraaijer.** — (NL) Mr President, I have no objection to the report being discussed on Wednesday morning. I would not, however, like you to think that the debate on this report is a mere formality. I hope that everyone will take advantage of the speaking time allocated to him. It is after all a not unimportant matter.

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

Mr Wieldraaijer's report will therefore be inserted as the first item of the agenda.

Are there any objections to this agenda?

Wednesday's agenda is agreed.

*Thursday, 13 June 1974*

*10 a.m. and 3 p.m.*

— Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Bousch on the economic situation in the Community (Doc. 129/74);

— Oral Question with debate to the Commission on European technological cooperation (Doc. 11/74);

— Joint debate on

— the report by Mr Krall on aid to the shipbuilding industry (Doc. 58/74)

— the report by Miss Lulling on assistance to persons employed in the shipbuilding industry (Doc. 85/74);

— Joint debate on

— the report by Mr Kater on measures for the desulphurization of fuels (Doc. 22/74)

— the report by Mr Rosati on the sulphur content of fuels (Doc. 103/74);

— Report by Mr Vernaschi on the retail sale of pharmaceuticals (Doc. 102/74);

— Oral Question with debate to the Commission on the harmonization of nationality laws (Doc. 63/74).

I call Lord Chelwood.

**Lord Chelwood.** — I wish to ask about the first debate on Thursday, on the subject of the report by the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Turkey Association. It came as a surprise to me that a motion for a resolution was being presented. I know that we have already voted to insert this as the first item on Thursday. I understand that the motion has been tabled on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, but none of us has seen it. The report which had been deferred was unanimously passed by the Committee on External Economic Relations.

The motion for a resolution has not yet been distributed. Will it be distributed very soon, and has it been tabled on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs?

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) I have the impression that there is some confusion here. The Bousch report has nothing at all to do with the report of the Committee on External Economic Relations. I spoke just now in support of the Bousch report being dealt with by urgent procedure, but you, Lord Chelwood, are talking about something else. We should make that quite clear.

The Bousch report will be dealt with first, and then the question put by Lord Bessborough. But I was not talking about the other report which you mentioned and on which the Committee on External Economic Relations has not as yet said anything.

**President.** — On Thursday, then, we will deal first with the Bousch report by urgent procedure and second with Lord Bessborough's question on technological cooperation.

Are there any objections?

Thursday's agenda is agreed.

*Friday, 14 June 1974:*

9.30 a.m.

- Report by Mr Martens on the common organization of the market in sugar (Doc. 92/74);
- Report by Mr Houdet on the stunning of animals before slaughter (Doc. 82/74);
- Report by Mr Gibbons on pure-bred breeding of cattle (Doc. 83/74);
- Report by Mr Martens on the fat content of whole milk (Doc. 112/74);

- Report by Mr Früh on the suspension of customs duty on certain agricultural products (Doc. 46/74);
- Report by Mrs Orth on health problems affecting trade in poultrymeat (Doc. 115/74);
- Oral Question with debate to the Commission on the third Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 124/74).

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — My difficulty regarding Friday's agenda concerns Report No 82 by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment.

It is my belief that this report unfortunately did not comply with the rules of procedure laid down in committee, namely, that there should be a sufficient number of members present and voting for it. It therefore may be *ultra vires* to have it on the order paper.

Obviously at this stage in the proceedings, if the House so wishes it, I would be the last person to stand in the way of debating the report. It is not new; it is a report which has been going around for a long time.

I wish to draw your attention to the difficulty which arises in these cases. I believe—and I may be proved right or wrong—that the rules of procedure were not complied with as a quorum was not present.

Two points are involved. First, members who do not attend debates have no right to leave their vote to be counted at the end of a debate on a particular issue. This is underlined on page 13 of the English translation of the report from the Schuijt study group.

The second point concerns substitutes taking part in the debate. Rule 40(3) states clearly that the committee has to be notified in writing of the substitute's name. Frequently, of course, this does not occur. Members turn up in other people's places, as they are perfectly entitled to do, and they then take part in the vote, which they are not entitled to do.

I am not asking that the order paper be changed or that Report No 82 be removed from it, but I am asking for reference of the matter, for a conclusive decision, either to the Bureau, if that is your wish and your decision, or to the Legal Affairs Committee. We need a firm ruling regarding the question of a quorum, possibly along the lines of the Schuijt report, a ruling whether members have to be present at committee meetings. In my view they should be present if they intend recording their votes.

**Scott-Hopkins**

They should be present for the majority of the debate. Notification of substitutes for committee members should be given in writing 24 hours beforehand, if they are to vote. This has not been happening recently.

Therefore, I would ask you and the House to take note of my difficulties regarding Report No 82 by Mrs Orth, and I hope you will be able to take action along the lines I have suggested.

**President.** — I have just been informed that a corrigendum is to be distributed regarding the technical details of the report.

The other two points will be studied in the appropriate manner.

I call Mr Walkhoff.

**Mr Walkhoff.** — (*D*) Mr Scott-Hopkins, as one who was present at the meeting of this committee during the discussions and the vote, I must say that there was in fact a quorum—though admittedly quite a number of votes were delegated. But if you are putting forward the case you mention as an example and passing on to a question of principle concerned, you would surely have to remove the majority of reports to be debated this week from the agenda, because it is the custom in committees for members leaving early to delegate their votes to others. If we cease to do this, we might as well give up committee work altogether. One need only think of the level of attendance at committee meetings. You, too, occasionally leave committee meetings—as you did in this case—before they have finished. We must therefore accept this means of delegating votes.

When a Member has been outvoted, he should not resort to formalities to undo work that has already been done.

**President.** — Mr Scott-Hopkins has not proposed that Mrs Orth's report should be removed from the agenda. He has merely raised a specific problem and I have promised him that it will be looked into. The report remains on the agenda.

I call Mr Cousté.

**Mr Cousté.** — (*F*) Mr President, I believe that if we are to take account of Mr Scott-Hopkins' comments—without generalizing from the particular, which in my view would have an effect on our work and that of the committees and the Assembly—it will be sufficient to consider

the problem at the Bureau meeting on Thursday morning.

**President.** — Or on another occasion. I have in any case already granted Mr Scott-Hopkins' request.

For Friday I also have the oral question with debate put by Mr Laban to the Commission on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

As we have just decided to have a debate on this conference on Thursday, I would like to propose that Mr Laban's oral question be dealt with at the same time.

I now hear, however, that Mr Lardinois can only attend on Friday.

I call Mr Laban.

**Mr Laban.** — (*NL*) Mr President, I would have appreciated it if in connection with the Commission's communication on the common position to be adopted in Caracas, Parliament could have drawn up a general report dealing in particular with fishery problems. As there is no such report, the Committee on Agriculture feels that fishery problems, which undoubtedly fall within the EEC's terms of reference, should at least be on the agenda here.

On this point a common position must in any case be established by the Member States. It would, however, obviously be more appropriate for this aspect to be discussed together with the general position on the other aspects of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Personally I therefore have no objections to this proposal. As regards procedure, I myself would think it better to have a joint debate, but if Mr Lardinois cannot be present and if we intend to go into some detail on these problems, we will perhaps have to discuss them separately.

I willingly leave the decision to the committee, but I have no objection to my question being placed on Thursday's agenda.

**President.** — We will revert to this question in due course.

Does anyone else wish to speak on Friday's agenda?

Friday's agenda is agreed.

Are there any objections to the order of business as a whole?

The order of business is agreed.

12. *Overall result of cooperation within the framework of the EEC-AASM Association*

**President.** — The next item is the report drawn up by Mr Dewulf on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on the overall result of financial and technical cooperation within the framework of the EEC-AASM Association (Doc. 111/74).

I call Mr Bersani, deputizing for the rapporteur, who has asked to present the report.

**Mr Bersani, deputy rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, in introducing the debate on this report, I should like first and foremost to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mr Dewulf for the clarity with which he has outlined the problems that are at the heart of his report, for the magnificent personal contribution that he has made to the continual improvement of the EEC-AASM Association and for his enthusiastic and creative efforts to help attain the Association's objectives and strengthen relations between the EEC and the countries of Africa, Madagascar and Mauritius. The Development Fund has a particularly central and vital part to play in this entire matter so that Mr Dewulf's report is even more important.

Now that our colleague Maurice Dewulf is being forced by the vicissitudes of parliamentary life to leave our parliament and lay down his vice-chairmanship of the Committee on Cooperation and Development, we salute him with special gratitude and, while we keenly regret his departure, we convey to him our sincerest good wishes and our earnest hope that it will not be long before we see him again in this Chamber.

Mr Dewulf's report, which was approved unanimously by the committee, deals with the activities of the European Development Fund in the past year. The judgement which we must make today is doubly important. In practice, on this occasion, we are not just evaluating the last year of operation of the third Fund, since we should now tackle the problems related to the new guidelines for, and claims on, the fourth Fund (which, in accordance with the wishes expressed on many occasions by this Assembly, should come into effect within the time limits laid down, that is to say, at the beginning of the new year). This is a particularly responsible occasion for the European Parliament, which has always taken great interest in the problems of the Association in general and those of the Development Fund in particular (and the various other kinds of financial interventions associated with the EDF in recent times) and played a remarkable initiatory role in this field.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it should be pointed out first of all that, in the year which we are considering, the third Fund achieved results which, by and large, may be considered very positive. It was able to disburse the sums envisaged fairly regularly, while observing the time-limits and improving its administrative methods and its ability to make accurate forecasts. It is worthy of note that it was also guided by the criteria and suggestions put forward by our Assembly on many occasions.

The motion for a resolution stresses the fact that in the year under review the European Development Fund has improved its own operating machinery in three main areas: firstly, programming, increasingly shifting away from occasional contributions to better coordinated and worked out ones, something that has always been one of our chief concerns: secondly, sales promotion, using a more varied and articulated series of measures to work towards a more balanced economy and improvement of the balance of trade of the countries in question. This will mean that these countries will be better protected against both internal and external influences. From this point of view, the system of aids for sales promotion, publicity and the opening of new sales outlets has been intensified and improved by means of a series of measures which should enable stronger provisions to be developed to guarantee both regular commercial outlets and profitable prices as well as adjustments and harmonization of health measures and measures to combat plant disease.

The EDF's third important achievement is that it has improved the use made of the funds earmarked for basic vocational training and the training of technical staff. This will be a vital factor in the development of these countries, and we are glad to note that the recommendations put forward on many occasions by our Assembly have not been ignored. As a result of these contributions, a large number of scholarships and grants to students, many new courses of studies and a large number of new schools have been set up in the AASM, as is shown so clearly by the tables of figures attached to this year's EDF budget. Here we really have one of the most positive budgets. We must keep up the good work that has been begun by using the available resources as effectively as possible to build up African educational structures.

I should like to refer here to a new factor which attracted particular attention at the Rome conference and more recently at the Joint Committee's meeting last week in Dinard. I refer to the need for an improvement in the methods of allocating aid, so that more emphasis may be laid on the needs of the less developed coun-

**Bersani**

tries, which are amongst the 25 poorest countries of the world in the special table drawn up by the United Nations and at least some of which are the poorest countries of the world in absolute terms.

In the financial year we are considering there has been some progress and the beginnings of coordination; we welcome this as an indication that there is a shift towards a more equitable distribution of aids under the fourth Development Fund.

This is the sunny side of the picture, but there are also some negative aspects which should be pointed out. Certain aid practices, described by the last conference I mentioned as over-paternalistic in the use of the Fund, still continue. The African partners are not yet adequately involved in effective joint management and development policies have not developed enough at regional level. The regionalization policy has met with some difficulties on the part of the AASM, though the Europeans have encouraged this approach as the best way to overcome the more obvious technical and economic obstacles. However, the problem highlights some of the delicate aspects of intra-African politics, though it should be pointed out that, if the nature and aim of the most suitable measures were more clearly explained, there would be more hope of achieving progress in the present situation and highlighting the deeper significance of cooperation between Europe and Africa.

To return to the question of improving the management machinery, it should be pointed out that there is now basic agreement between the two parties involved in the negotiations on the renewal and enlargement of the Association, so that, in line with the opinions expressed by our Assembly, the fourth Fund may be regarded as representing a turning point of the utmost importance, to which our African partners rightly attach the greatest value.

In the motion for a resolution, the various headings under which aid from the Fund is classified are given special consideration: measures designed to increase employment, the promotion of the agricultural sector (which remains essential), the integrated agro-industrial projects (which are destined to be of growing importance in the future) and industrialization projects which reflect the constant concern of this Assembly and the specific arguments advanced on many occasions by the rapporteur, Mr Dewulf. The effectiveness of action in this latter sector, especially with regard to medium and small industrial activities, will undoubtedly be one of the touchstones of the effectiveness and the breadth of vision of our aid, even

though we should not underestimate the absolutely fundamental value of an agricultural industry organized along sound lines at both technical and social levels.

The motion for a resolution recommends further encouragement in the commercial sector and even more dedication to training, in particular by directing the training of managerial and supervisory staff.

The specific experience gained during the period of activity of the third Fund, which we are considering, has resulted in the flowering of these new guidelines, which were the subject of such a vigorous debate recently in Dinard at the meetings of the Joint Committee, as I have already mentioned.

Speaking of Dinard, I should like to emphasize that, at a time of such serious general difficulties, the Joint Committee confirmed its political value. At a recent conference in Milan, one of the spokesmen of our partners rightly said: 'The Association has been saved by the institutions'.

In Dinard, the work was done in a climate of great seriousness and responsibility and of exemplary mutual understanding. Both the AASM and Europe clearly and confidently expressed growing interest in the progress of the negotiations, anxiety about the passing of the months, leaving fundamental mandates still not carried out, and the tedious progress of negotiations which must be concluded within the time-limits laid down by the agreements now about to expire.

Mr Callaghan's recent statements to the Council of Ministers, calling for stronger measures of aid to the Third World in general and the Associated States in particular, could, I hope, make a very valuable and helpful contribution.

However, Mr President, we are encouraged to continue our efforts in this direction by the improved working, from the point of view of both quantity and quality, of the Fund and the appreciation of it shown on numerous occasions by the leaders of the Associated countries, not to mention the image this gives of us to the world. The development of the situation requires that, even while we are engaged in this discussion and noting both the positive developments and the less praiseworthy aspects of the EDF, we should re-affirm in this political arena the crying need to get things moving and rapidly overcome the present difficulties, with regard both to the size of the fourth EDF and to the final obstacles and difficulties that lie in the path to ultimate success. We must set our sails in this direction with a fresh political resolve;

**Bersani**

a favourable and speedy conclusion of the negotiations would not only be of great value to the Associated African States (who we hope will be joined by the new partners from the Caribbean and the Pacific in the negotiations) but also help to foster the moral and political developments of our own Community. The discussions at Dinard also included the three new African countries which, as a consequence of recent developments in Portugal, we all keenly hope are about to achieve independence. A readiness on the part of both parties to open negotiations was noticeable in Dinard. That occasion also confirmed that the EEC, through its own development cooperation policy (which in the matter of the Sahel countries went beyond the EDF and was able to lay its hands on greater resources by means of a new chapter in the budget), fully intends to respond more and more to those demands of solidarity which stand at the centre of all the problems of international society.

'From receivers of aid to partners in development.' This is the new orientation which emerges from the experience gained in the course of this year, the new vision opened up for us by the most recent experiences of the European Development Fund.

In this spirit of effective solidarity with the countries associated with us, with particular consideration for the poorer countries and those most concerned about their future, I recommend to the Assembly that the motion for a resolution be adopted, together with the report so ably and enthusiastically drawn up by Mr Dewulf.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Achenbach to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group.

**Mr Achenbach.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation I should first like to join Mr Bersani in expressing before this House my particular thanks to Mr Dewulf, who was vice-chairman of the committee, for his excellent report. Mr Dewulf has always devoted a great deal of energy to the interests of our friends in Africa. We will certainly not forget his valuable cooperation.

At the same time I should like to thank Mr Bersani for so accurate and clear a presentation of the contents of the report and in particular for emphasizing that this report and motion for a resolution are positive in tenor. I do not intend to repeat everything that Mr Bersani has said. I fully share the opinions he has expressed and

would merely like to underline them and ask as many Members of this Parliament, which has always actively supported this Association, to agree to the conclusions reached.

We established in Dinard—as Mr Bersani has said—that like us, our African friends want this Association to continue, and I feel that it has been a great success. It has created a genuine relationship of mutual trust between the Associated States and Europeans and moreover has, in my view, even contributed decisively to European solidarity, for all Europeans have cooperated very satisfactorily in Africa and have, if I may put it this way, really provided the evidence that there is a European identity. If only for this reason, the Association should be continued.

I should like to take this opportunity—although I should perhaps first say that my Liberal friends are in favour of this report and motion for a resolution—to call in this Chamber on the Council and Commission under no circumstances to lose any more time. This time we must begin the negotiations on the new agreement, which is of course to be extended to include the English-speaking countries in Africa and certain Caribbean and Pacific countries, early enough to avoid difficulties as regards transition after the present agreement has expired on 31 January 1975.

I should also like to emphasize in this connection—the last Council of Ministers gratifyingly issued a number of new mandates for the agricultural sector—that it must be established as quickly and accurately as possible what monies can be made available to the new Development Fund. We all know that there are many problems facing the world. Some European countries are also having difficulties. But we have always stressed before our old African friends that what the present Associated States receive must be updated and that as the new Associated States are not to be placed in a less favourable position than the old ones, the funds must of course be considerably increased.

But, as they say, the most beautiful girl in the world cannot give more than she has. We must decide as soon as possible how much money we in the European Community have. And we must inform our partners as quickly as possible how large that sum will be because they want to know what their position is. On the other hand, as they share our view that this cooperation has been very fruitful—as all Members will know who have been in Africa and have seen the results on the spot—I am convinced that we must make an effort to influence public opinion in the various countries to promote the continuation of this Association as best we can.

**Achenbach**

I feel the European Parliament would emphasize this view best by adopting the motion for a resolution contained in Mr Dewulf's report if not unanimously, then at least by a large majority. *(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker.** — I have great pleasure in supporting Mr Bersani in his presentation of this report and congratulate him on doing so. I also have great pleasure in supporting what Mr Achenbach has just said about the necessity of a decision being reached, before long, on the fourth Fund, which as Mr Bersani said, is to go into operation on 1 January 1975. I believe I am right in saying that this is the first EDF before the enlarged Community. I hope that the three new members will play their full part in operating it in due course.

I regret that Mr Bersani had to make this presentation because of the absence of our former colleague, Mr Maurice Dewulf, and I would say on behalf of the European Conservative Group how sorry we are that Mr Dewulf is no longer one of our colleagues. We hope that one day he will come back to join us once again.

This is a very full, definitive report. It will be useful not only in looking back over the first three EDFs but also in looking forward. I would like briefly to make three points. First, paragraph 2 of the motion for a resolution underlines the importance of Community aid to the Associated States. Some time ago Mr Bersani used the term 'the Fourth World'—the 26 least-favoured nations of the UNCTAD 106, of whom 17 are among the 44 African, Caribbean and Pacific territories with which negotiations are going on at the moment. They are countries without any raw materials and worst hit by the present oil crisis.

I much regret, as I am sure all of our colleagues will, the report from the Organisation of African Unity from Mogadishu yesterday to the effect that no special arrangements were to be made by OPEC to supply oil at a reduced price to the developing countries. I have taken this up in the past. I hope that perhaps in the future the Commission will be able to take it up on Parliament's behalf to see whether some such reduction can be made, particularly for these countries of the Fourth World. It makes a mockery of what we are trying to do if they have to pay twice or three or four times as much for their oil, as it is even more important to them, in many cases, than to the developed world. I hope, therefore, that the Commission will see its way in the future to make representations

to OPEC, whose reserves, I understand, are rising by 1,000 million dollars a week, to make some greater contribution to the Fourth World. Paragraphs 10 and 12 speak of agriculture and rural development. I believe one mistake we made, having spent some years trying to do something about these problems, was to attempt to hurry on industrialization rather than trying to develop food production in rural areas, particularly in view of the population explosion which is taking place in so many parts of the developing world. I believe, therefore, that we should give assistance to our friends in these countries to stop the world-wide drift from the countryside to the towns and to provide as much food as possible for them. It is difficult to provide jobs and housing in urban areas. It should be much easier—difficult though it may still be—to provide them with more food in the rural areas in which most of them live.

Very often this necessitates a priority for water supplies and later in the report emphasis is laid on the necessity of well drilling, which in many parts of Africa in particular is of the utmost importance. What is needed is well digging, food production and also better transport in many parts of Africa in particular to enable the distribution of food surpluses which are to be found in certain areas.

Paragraphs 19 and 20 make particular reference to training, the greater part of which was carried out in Africa. When we started on this programme, people came to the developed countries for training, but increasingly emphasis has been on training the teachers *in situ* and letting post-graduates come overseas for advanced training. It is essential to place emphasis on the question of local staff taking over greater responsibilities, as is set out in paragraph 32 on page 23 of the report, so that more individuals locally trained can take on the technical and financial application of the plans and effort which we make from this end. At the same time we should provide a greater amount for local costs in local currency, and perhaps there should be, as set out in that paragraph, some change from the system of grants to a system of loans and, possibly, an increase in the amount. This will need greater contributions from the personnel of the developing countries themselves, not only in future joint planning, but also in the application of the effort being made. Therefore, I hope and believe that as we move into the fourth European Development Fund it can be a tribute to the work carried out for so many years by the rapporteur, whose report was so ably put forward by Mr Bersani, whom I congratulate on this report.

*(Applause)*



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

**Mr Laudrin.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our group is sorry that Mr Dewulf was unable to present his excellent report himself. He had acquired considerable authority in view of his knowledge of the problem and his relations with the people whom we are constantly meeting.

We would like to see this Assembly paying him a tribute by adopting the report and the motion for a resolution presented by Mr Bersani.

Everyone has said that cooperation within the EEC-AASM Association has been fruitful, since 90% of the funds distributed by the EDF have in practice been granted in the form of non-repayable advances. It is also obvious that the Associated African States, Madagascar and Mauritius, while not opposing enlargement to include countries of the Caribbean and Pacific, wish to preserve securely what was achieved under the Yaoundé Convention, which, as we all know, expires on 31 January 1975.

We must continue to extend European action towards developing countries without losing sight of the original purpose of our agreement. I should like to make a few remarks on all the ideas that have been put forward, disagreeing perhaps with certain points in the opinions which have been expressed.

In view of the grave raw materials crisis which we are experiencing and of the fact that the economy of certain states is beginning to find its feet, the time has come to encourage industrialization. Industry, however, requires substantial financial investment and supervisory staff. It is no use dreaming of proceeding at high speed in this area. Life runs at a slow pace in these regions, which are entering an era of achievements and great enterprises.

What we are going to ask for and encourage is that the necessary foreign investment should form part of a plan controlled solely by the state concerned, which must be responsible for its profitability. However, certain American businesses with shared risks have recently failed in the commercial distribution sector as a result of a lack of local capital.

The fund must therefore be more selective by encouraging European manufacturers to invest, and a guarantee should be given to them for capital which may be lost as a result of the frequent social or political disturbances in these developing countries.

However, and this is an aspect which we have experienced even in our own countries—and it is even truer of the African countries—industrialization causes urbanization, a drift from the land, such is the attraction of a regular wage.

This is why, it seems to me, we must make greater efforts to create a real agricultural environment. This is a prime requirement for the European nations and for the developing countries. It is more difficult, as I said recently at Dinard, to make a farmer than to make a worker. One must teach people to fish rather than give them fish, as the little red book would say. If we want these developing countries to resolve their own basic food problems, they must be taught not only to love the soil but also the arts of cultivation and of fishing. Which of us, on visiting the Caribbean and seeing the fish swimming in the clear water, has not been surprised to find that the shore dwellers never think of reaping the excellent food offered to them by the sea? Already certain African nations are beginning to industrialize their deep-sea fishing.

Our own European countries have their roots in farming and the sea; we shall not be working any miracles in this. These workers of the land and of the sea form the basis of our civilization and its industrial development. Financial aid and technical cooperation are urgently needed to encourage these primary activities, whose development is slow but vital. I really wonder whether the EDF, which has built roads, schools and hospitals, should not also be directed towards the major task of encouraging these peoples to remain near their rivers, their oceans and their soil, while safeguarding the nomadism which is necessary in certain regions. Industrialization will then come as a logical conclusion.

We must help to install workers on the land, teach them crop rotation, provide them with the machinery and technical aid, help them to form cooperatives and build the fertilizer factories which are needed for poor land that has been abandoned for too long.

As we have very little time, I should like to conclude, Mr President, with a statement which no doubt is pessimistic. It is admittedly essential for us to preserve what was achieved at Yaoundé and Arusha. It is obvious that the EDF is to undergo substantial development as a result of the enlargement of Europe itself. But I fear that discussions with the countries of the Pacific and the Caribbean will complicate or delay agreements with these 44 developing countries.

Obviously the first requirement is not to lose ground but to go forward, but I am convinced

**Laudrin**

that we must be wary of delay and that, in the coming months, we must speed up the work of the committees and all the competent authorities so that, if necessary, transitional measures can be taken if delays occur.

I therefore expect the Commission to provide us with the necessary assurances. As from July I believe that certain decisions have to be revised and submitted to the competent authority: I should like this immense work, which affects 400 million people whom we propose to aid, should be undertaken without delay, but without trying to do too much.

There is a tendency to extend our generosity and I am wondering whether it is not a good idea to limit to these 400 million people the aid which we can provide, while preserving both the commercial agreements we have concluded and the institutions we maintain and increasing the financial aid, in proportion with both our ambitions and the requirements, to these 44 countries, which have placed their trust in Europe.

It is a very grave problem. I believe that the Commission should tell us this very evening that it is optimistic and has the means for resolving the serious problems with which it is faced.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Lord Reay.

**Lord Reay.** — I am afraid that the absence of Commissioner Cheysson imposes considerable limits on the possibilities of our debate. We cannot possibly expect Commissioner Scarascia Mugnozza, with hardly any notice, to be able to respond in depth to questions on this subject. It makes one wish for a system in which we have, say, junior ministers just as familiar with the subject as their superiors to share the burden of parliamentary work with them.

I have some questions I wish to put to the Commission. If they cannot be answered this evening, I hope that the staff of the Commission will ensure that what is said here is passed back to the Commissioner responsible and that answers to specific questions will be given in some form on another occasion.

Quite properly, the rapporteur, Mr Dewulf, in his valedictory intellectual message to Parliament, has left us with a text which at certain points goes considerably beyond the question of the appraisal of the second EDF. He raises and reintroduces ideas which will provide stimulating discussion for the future.

I wish to start by referring to a matter he raises which in part may have nothing to do with the EDF. Mr Dewulf asks whether there is no chance of offering a greater opportunity to African insurance, for example, in the insurance of EDF projects, and to African shipping, for example, in the transport of food aid—I imagine that the latter could also be used in the transport of supplies for projects—as a means of compensating the Associated territories for the loss of their privileged trading position vis-à-vis other developing countries as a result of the extension of the generalized preferences scheme.

We know that the Associated countries are currently demanding something else by way of compensation, which goes beyond the limits of this debate, but it would be interesting to hear from the Commission what the chances are of making more use of African shipping and insurance at present, or, alternatively, of building them up with EDF funds so that greater use can be made of them in the future.

A criticism I have of Mr Dewulf's admirable report is that it is unclear on the subject of priorities under the next EDF. In paragraph 7 of the report he lists so many things as being needed to be treated as priorities that one has to ask which of the priorities is to have priority. For example, I do not see how rural development and industrialization can both be given priority, at least at the same time. In the first EDF, the priorities were transport and communications followed by rural production and education and training, and in the second, rural production and transport and communications. It would be interesting to hear from the Commission what view they have as to the sectors which should have priority under the fourth EDF.

Mr Dewulf forcibly states, and on several occasions in his report insists, that more should be done to base investment in the Associated countries on the use of labour-intensive rather than capital-intensive technology. We know that these countries are substantially dependent for their investment on foreign companies whose natural tendency is to use the same technology as they would use, for example, in Europe. However, I wonder what practical scope there is in fact for the EDF to introduce any deviation from the basic modern principle that you use a machine wherever you can to do the work that has previously been done by human labour. It would be interesting if the Commission could throw any light on what the attitudes of the governments of the Associated States are in this matter.

If the Commission accept that they should orientate the EDF along these lines, I wonder

**Lord Reay**

whether it would be possible, in order that we should be able to measure future progress in this direction, for figures to be published showing the amount of employment created by projects, both full-time and part-time, both in the implementation of the project itself and as a result of the project which has been created.

I think it is right that Africans should be brought into the management of the EDF, as Mr Dewulf proposes, or that they should be trained in order to be brought in. I am attracted by the idea of turning the EDF into a kind of development agency controlled—to use Mr Dewulf's words—by all the partners in the Association in some suitable way.

On the other hand, legitimacy needs to be established more clearly for the right of European partners to be involved in the formation of development strategy, to propose certain lines of action and to make it plain that it would be difficult for the European countries to support other lines of development strategy.

Whatever happens in private, there is at the moment a discrepancy at public level between, on the one hand, the proper demands of this Parliament and of the Community to have a greater say in how funds are spent—very much as we are doing in this discussion—and, on the other hand, the constant insistence not only of the Commission but of other European elements that the selection of a development strategy is a matter for the Associated countries themselves in that it is up to them to propose the projects that they wish to have financed. In other words, it is said our whole tendency should be to lean over backwards to avoid the accusation of being neo-colonialistic. In fact, this is a conflict between two attitudes on our part, and something needs to be done to reconcile these into a single philosophy.

The fact that projects need to be put forward by the Associated countries, which is a requirement under the EDF, and the practice of allotting to the different Associated territories their own share in the EDF impose limitations on the use of the funds. I suspect that this is one reason why regional projects—Mr Bersani referred to this point—have been a disappointment. The Associated countries are not likely to ask for the funding of projects in cases where there is no certainty as to which country will be the beneficiary—for example, in certain research projects, in projects which will have a long maturity or, I suspect, in projects in which they think that the Community may in any case be interested enough for there to be a chance of devoting additional funds to them.

This brings me to the size of the EDF. Although it is reasonable that this should be the last

matter to be agreed in the negotiations, it is important that, when the time comes, the Council should not drag its feet on this subject. It is also important that, given the turn that events have taken in the world, the amount should be generous. But, equally, we should bear in mind that much constructive financial aid would probably have to be given to these countries outside the framework of the EDF—aid with long-term structural, perhaps regional, implications and objectives—if it were to be given at all. Therefore, we should not commit to the EDF the limit of what we think we shall be able to afford or the limit of what it would be reasonable to spend on that part of the world, given the fact that we are at the moment developing obligations and responsibilities to other parts of the world outside the framework of the Association.

I should like to end by paying tribute, as others have, to our absent colleague Mr Dewulf at the end of what, let us hope, is only his first career in this Parliament. Those who have worked with him, for a short or a long time, have been deeply impressed by his imaginative intelligence, his apparently inexhaustible capacity for work, and perhaps, above all, by his extraordinary devotion to his subject. He was able to bring his experience of his country's colonial history into the broader development of a modern relationship between Europe and Africa. In this process he not only showed himself a true European but formed friendships in Africa. We feel that his departure is a great loss. This Parliament can ill afford to lose people with his dedication.

It only remains for me, Mr President, to wish this report and its author a successful and influential future.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Van der Hek.

**Mr Van der Hek.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I am glad that I am able to say a few words on this report by Mr Dewulf. I should like to express my admiration for this detailed, thorough and excellent piece of work, in which Mr Dewulf has tried to appraise the policy on the third Development Fund in the light of the general concepts of development cooperation. He has not therefore restricted himself to reporting on behalf of the committee but added a philosophy, with which I can largely agree.

At the same time, I would point out that a discussion of this report is rather like being wise after the event. It concerns, after all, events which occurred on the eve of the new Asso-

**Van der Hek**

ciation. I am therefore particularly curious to know when Parliament will be able to discuss Mr Achenbach's report, which will constitute its opinion on the new Association. The debate on that report will, in my view, be more relevant. There is not therefore much point spending a great deal of time on the operation of the European Development Fund in the past.

Mr President, after making these general remarks I should like to raise four points. The first concerns the machinery involved in the granting of aid. In the motion for a resolution now before us this machinery is approved. I do not intend to diverge from this view, but I do want to add a critical marginal note. From the tables in the report it would seem that aid is too closely linked to projects and to an analysis of the financial, economic and social situation of the country concerned. There is consequently no proper allocation of funds per country based on a real evaluation of requirements per country. At the same time, there are four general surveys on the priorities to be set as regards spending.

I agree with Lord Reay when he asks which of the priorities is ultimately to have priority. I do not think that the Commission can give a general answer to this question because the operation of the fund makes this impossible. At any rate, priorities will differ from country to country, and priorities cannot be set for the fund as a whole. This reveals a weakness in the method hitherto applied in granting aid to the Associated States and Territories.

I therefore wonder whether the Commission has contemplated the possibility of perhaps changing the system in two respects. Firstly, there should be proper development planning or programming, in the light of which projects can be drawn up, appraised and financed. Secondly, as the report rightly states, Community development cooperation is a matter for both the givers and the takers. This is very important because a proper evaluation of the requirements of the developing countries is only possible if they are involved and if they have a very big say—if not the biggest say—in the matter.

Mr President, I have mentioned that it is said too little is allocated to each country, too little analysis is carried out of each country, too little appraisal is made of projects and their effects on each country and priorities are too general.

I should also like to ask the Commission whether it has considered asking countries that already have a reasonable system of development programming to provide programming aid as well as project aid. I would, however, insist on it being a condition that proper development programming be carried out in the Associated State

concerned. So far there has been no talk of this. But it would seem to me desirable because it is more logical and, from a financial, economic and social point of view, more responsible.

I should now like to refer to the tables in the report, which show which countries have received funds, but in no way reveal how these funds were distributed. Some countries receive a great deal, others considerably less, without any explanation being given. If we have programme aid, based on the development programmes and plans of the Associated States concerned, the link will seem much clearer, and Parliament can better judge whether a fair, logical and successful policy has been pursued.

On the effect of aid granted—this is my third point—I also have a critical question. It is said that aid granted within the framework of the Association can be called more than usually successful. I do not believe, however, that the same applies to the Sahel, where this aid has been far from successful, otherwise there would not have been the disaster that there has been. I admit that this is a rather serious criticism. It is not simply an incidental problem of a drought that has suddenly occurred and as suddenly will end; it is also a structural question. For centuries these areas have had to contend with drought and the various problems that it brings with it. These countries are also aware of the fact. The question is whether the European Development Fund has taken sufficient account of the fact. The question is whether the European have occurred have become any less serious as a result, although I would add that I do not suffer from the illusion that the problems could have been anticipated.

I should therefore like to ask the Commission bluntly whether it has realized that the Sahel region must be granted aid on the basis of, in particular, ecological criteria. If these ecological criteria are ignored, the European Development Fund and the countries concerned will run the definite risk of aid granted appearing absolutely inadequate and absolutely unproductive, with problems perhaps being created rather than solved.

I have also put this question in writing, but I have not yet received an answer. In the past, too, the Members of this Parliament have put written questions on this subject and in reply received the assurance that ecological criteria would be considered when projects were appraised, but in view of the seriousness of the situation I would repeat with some emphasis the question as to whether full account is now taken of this aspect in the case of all projects for which the affected areas request financing by the European Development Fund.

**Van der Hek**

My last point concerns the promotion of exports from the Associated States. The Dewulf report rightly points out that as the tariff question becomes less important because tariffs are abolished, a solution is more urgently required to other problems connected with the marketing of products and the promotion of exports. But this is only one side of the coin. I feel that the Community itself can do what is necessary to stimulate imports from these countries. It is not only that the trade structures in the Associated States concerned must be improved. It is also essential that the Community pursue an active policy to encourage imports, with potential suppliers from the Associated States being put into contact with potential buyers in the Community. It is two-way traffic. Exports cannot be effectively stimulated if the Community does not encourage imports at the same time. I also wonder if the Commission has practical proposals on this point. It is an old question, which regularly comes up in connection with international agreements and I wonder why, to judge by the report, this element is still overlooked.

Finally, one brief remark. I feel that the European Development Fund and the common association policy will remain acceptable only if they fit in with development cooperation at world level. If this is not the case, the Community is exposing itself to serious criticism because there is poverty not only in Africa but to a much greater extent in other countries in the world, particularly in Asia. Only if this policy remains adapted to development cooperation at world level will it be acceptable. One of the means of achieving this would be closer cooperation with international organizations and the implementing of the Community development policy in consultation with these organizations.

In this connection I have two questions. How intensive is the cooperation between the EDF and, for example, the World Bank, the International Development Association, the United Nations, with its development programmes, and the African Development Bank? How intensive is this cooperation between the organizations in the Associated States themselves? I feel that this is one of the most obvious criteria for discovering whether the Community is in fact prepared to remain active at world level. I have found only vague statements on this in the relevant documents and I hope that a more detailed explanation will be given.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, who will explain the Commission's position

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Bersani warmly and to associate myself with the compliments already paid Mr Dewulf on his excellent report.

Unexpectedly, my colleague Mr Cheysson has to attend the Council meeting. A decision to this effect was taken only on Saturday. He has given me the French text of the speech which he would have made in this Chamber which, with your permission, Mr President, I shall read. I should, however, like to follow it with a comment on the interesting debate we have just heard and attempt to answer the various questions raised. I shall begin therefore by reading the text of Mr Cheysson's speech.

*(The speaker continued in French)*

'The report by Mr Dewulf on the overall result of cooperation within the framework of the EEC-AASM Association represents, in the view of the Commission, a work of fundamental consideration of one of the principal aspects of Community policy on development cooperation. For very nearly 14 years the Yaoundé Association, originating from the Treaty of Rome and adapted and transformed after negotiation between the Community and 18 African and Malagasy states, has been organizing the trade and cooperation relations between these states and the Community. In 1972 Mauritius joined the AASM. This Association constituted, and still constitutes today, the only framework within which it has been possible to establish and implement a real policy of development cooperation, employing for this sole purpose a consistent set of instruments and, in particular, financial and technical cooperation.

Within Parliament's Committee on Development and Cooperation, Mr Dewulf's report has given rise to very favourable discussions. During these discussions, the representatives of the Commission were able to compare their ideas with the thoughts of parliamentarians who were aware of the developments taking place in relations between industrialized countries and developing countries. These detailed discussions enabled both sides to develop new ideas, particularly with a view to increased participation by the receiving countries in the implementation of financial and technical cooperation.

The fact that this joint consideration is taking place at a time when more than 40 countries of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific are engaged in negotiations with the Community with a view to concluding a global economic cooperation agreement enlarging and extending

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

the Association agreements already concluded is not a matter of indifference to the Commission.

To conduct the negotiations under way the Commission needs the assistance of the European Parliament and in particular its Committee on Development and Cooperation, which constitutes an essential link with public opinion in our Member States.

In the motion for a resolution on the overall result of cooperation within the framework of the EEC-AASM, it seems to me that three points should be emphasized.

You have placed particular emphasis on training and the various problems raised by technical cooperation within the Associated States. This is a fundamental aspect of our development cooperation policy which is not always sufficiently emphasized, no doubt because it is less spectacular than highways, railways or ports. However, if as President Senghor has said 'man is the beginning and end of development', the training of men, and supervisory staff in particular, remains one of the major concerns of the new African States. This is why the Commission supports the desire expressed in your motion for a resolution for Community cooperation policy to lean towards the training of native staff able to assume progressively the task of technical assistance. With the same idea in mind, the Commission is endeavouring to take practical measures enabling the national administrations of the Associated States to carry out increasingly by themselves the tasks involved in the conception and implementation of projects.

The action which has begun in the field of scholarships and which, as you have noted, has been redirected towards training in Africa itself in accordance with the wishes expressed by the European Parliament, has been supplemented by other initiatives in the area of training: a programme of vocational and practical training scholarships, training courses and traineeships for officials of Associated States and in particular 'specific projects' for vocational training. These are projects designed to supplement an economic or rural investment project with on-the-spot training. It may involve projects for training by instructors in the development of a crop, for example rice, or projects for training women or training supervisory staff for cooperatives or in various economic sectors.

You have also placed particular stress on the development of agriculture and breeding. We must emphasize that rapid rural development by means of integrated action can itself make an essential contribution in raising the standard

of living of the great mass of the population in the Associated States and at the same time slow down the drift from the countryside. Your rapporteur quite rightly emphasizes the continuing importance of agricultural projects in the activities of the European Development Fund and the social implications of these projects, particularly in resolving employment problems. At the structural level, development in the Associated States of varied crops can itself enable them to meet the difficult balance of payment problems frequently imposed on them by the continuing growth of food imports. At the same time, and although the main concern of the Associated States is to diversify their rural production, the European Development Fund is called upon to support a number of modernization programmes needed to make more competitive the products on which the Associated States depend and which provide a substantial proportion of their national revenue and are capable of industrial exploitation.

Both in Mr Dewulf's report and in your motion for a resolution you have emphasized the importance of development of industries in the Associated States. Without seeing this as the miracle solution for which some people seem to take it, the Commission has endeavoured in the application of the third EDF to develop its activity within this area from the threefold aspect of *in situ* processing of raw materials, development industries, to provide substitutes for imports, and the promotion of export undertakings directed in particular towards the European market. Here again the social implications of the action taken must be emphasized, particularly with a view to the training of African managerial staff in small and medium-sized undertakings. The same concern for industrialization can be found again in the stress which our partners are now placing on outlining a basis for industrial cooperation with us.

I have emphasized these few points, and many others also call for comment, in order to show how your concerns are shared by those responsible for the implementation of the Community policy of financial and technical cooperation.

Thus, behind all your resolutions—and this was mentioned some time ago in the report by Mr Metzger—there is a desire for increasing participation by the Associated States in all stages in the orientation, preparation and implementation of Community aid.

The new powers given to the Association Council, the introduction of planning undertaken in conjunction with the Associated States, the price preference granted to their national undertakings, have already marked stages in this direc-

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

tion in the third EDF. The present progress of the negotiations indicates new developments.

In conclusion, I should like to acknowledge before you today the value of the work carried out by your committee and by Mr Dewulf. In the past there have been many examples of lines of action in which cooperation between Parliament and the European Commission has enabled real progress to be made. I may quote in particular the special aid to the countries of the Sahel affected by drought.

Some of the ideas which we have proposed have been echoed in international bodies or bilateral aid bodies in our Member States. For its part, the Commission intends to continue to look periodically at its own activities with a view to intensifying and extending them. The constant references which Mr Dewulf has made to the Commission's memorandum are, for the Commission, an encouragement in its work of deliberating and making proposals. However, the Commission cannot carry out this work alone, and this is the point of the debate today.

I would not like to complete this brief statement without paying tribute, on behalf of the Commission, to Mr Maurice Dewulf. When speaking of politicians, public opinion does not always have in mind the sound and competent work to which Mr Dewulf has devoted himself with a view to improving the Community policy on development cooperation, and in particular technical and financial cooperation. And yet, if, in the words of Richelieu 'politics is the art of making necessary what is possible', how can one fail to see that the establishment of balanced and durable relations with our partners in the Third World is essential to our future?

The establishment of such relations takes time and can only be achieved in a dialogue which is open to all the parties concerned, in particular the European Parliament. This is why the Commission wishes to pay great tribute to the work accomplished by your Committee on Development and Cooperation, by its chairman Mr Achenbach and by its rapporteur Mr Dewulf, who has been called to undertake other work and is regrettably no longer a Member of your Assembly.'

*(The speaker continued in Italian)*

Mr President, I have strictly adhered to Mr Cheysson's text since, if I had used my own words, I might have misinterpreted his ideas whereas I was anxious to reproduce them exactly.

I should like to pay a personal tribute to Mr Dewulf, with whom I have worked in this

Parliament for many years. I very much want to stress the dedication and passion which he has put into every political action. I hope that the political situation will develop in such a way that he returns to this Parliament so that, in this Chamber, he may continue to show the enthusiasm and passion with which he has always followed European affairs. I should also like once more to thank Mr Bersani who, in dealing with African affairs, exhibits the same devotion as Mr Dewulf. Today, he has clearly outlined Mr Dewulf's report to us and the possible outcome of the recent meetings with the representatives of the African states.

I also have good cause to thank Mr Achenbach, both for his work and his words. I should like to assure him that the Commission does not intend to waste any time and will do everything possible to ensure that the fourth programme is implemented as soon as possible.

I have listened to all the speeches made here today very carefully and I think that, in reading Mr Cheysson's text, I have given a satisfactory reply, especially as regards scholarships and industrialization.

Personally, and on behalf of the Commission, I should like to express wholehearted support for Mr Laudrin's ideas stressing the fact that a stable agriculture and a developed fishing industry are needed to meet the situation in which many African countries find themselves (customs cannot be immediately changed without seriously jeopardizing their future) and, at the same time, to resolve many problems which are still pending.

Both Mr Laudrin and Mr Van der Hek are perfectly right to express concern about the priorities which have been established. However, I must point out that it is up to the Associated States to fix the priorities in the negotiations, particularly at the stage of planning and financing projects. The various African countries belonging to our Association are obviously not all in the same position and it is therefore hardly surprising that their assessment of priorities should vary according to their needs. I imagine that this will be all the more true when, as we hope will soon be the case, the Association expands from 18 to 44 partners. We shall then be faced by an even wider range of priorities and requirements in the countries with which we have to deal.

I should like the Members of the European Parliament to regard these priorities as a list of measures which the Commission and the partners intend to take, to be applied according to the effective needs of each Associate. Priorities established on the basis of needs must

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

clearly be the first thing which the Commission considers in implementing any programme which concerns the African countries.

Mr Van der Hek has raised a number of questions. I am afraid he must excuse me if do not reply to them all. Some are extremely technical, and I must admit that I am not briefed to give the answers. I shall refer myself to Mr Cheysson to that he can reply, more satisfactorily than I would be able to, as soon as possible. As regards priorities, I think I have already replied to Mr Van der Hek's points but I should like to repeat that the Commission is fully aware of the truth of his final remark, that development must be thought of in the context of world-wide cooperation. There can be no doubt about this point and it is, in fact, the Commission's attitude. I hope that it is clear that at this point Europe must consider all the countries in the world, not just the African states.

It is essential that everyone should understand that isolated action in the field of aid and the development of technical cooperation and assistance is doomed to failure.

A general network of measures and agreements should be developed —unfortunately there has so far been little success along these lines. Europe, it is true, decided that it had to face the problem of relations with the African states, but this was largely due to a feeling of responsibility for countries which had been linked to it for many decades and to whom it owed both cooperation and assistance.

The Commission hopes that current European initiatives, some of which are being discussed at this time in the Council of Ministers, will make it possible for the European Community to conduct a broad dialogue with the rest of the world so that the question of aid and development can be seen in a wider framework of balance, progress and peace.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

I call Lord Reay.

**Lord Reay.** — I am grateful for what Mr Scarascia Mugnozza has said. He said that he would refer back to Commissioner Cheysson some of the questions he had been unable to answer, as proposed by Mr Van der Hek. I asked him some additional questions. Would he be willing to give me the same assurance?

**President.** — The Commissioner's answer is positive.

Does anyone else wish to speak.

The general debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

13. *Receipt of a petition*

**President.** — I have received a petition from Mr K. Zimmermann and Mrs H. Zimmermann on a draft constitution for the creation of a European Government.

This petition has been entered under No 4/74 in the register provided for in Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR WOHLFART

*Vice-President*

14. *Directive on indirect taxes on the raising of capital*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution contained in the report drawn up by Mr Artzinger on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending Article 5(2) of the Directive of 17 July 1969 concerning indirect taxes on the raising of capital (Doc. 75/74).

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

**Mr Artzinger, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, thank you for giving me the floor. I do not intend to introduce my report, but simply to add what was omitted by mistake.

The Committee on Budgets adopted the report without waiting for the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. This committee adopted an opinion drawn up by Mr Hougardy, which confirms the content of the report. That is all I wanted to add.

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.



15. *Third directive on taxes other than turnover taxes on manufactured tobacco*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution contained in the report drawn up by Mr Artzinger on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a third directive on taxes other than turnover taxes affecting the consumption of manufactured tobacco (Doc. 76/74).

The rapporteur has informed me that he has nothing to add to his written report.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

16. *Oral Question with debate: effect of release of gold reserves on Community trade*

**President.** — The next item is the oral question with debate put by Mr Durieux on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group to the Commission of the European Communities on the effect of the release of gold reserves on Community trade (Doc. 123/74).

The question is worded as follows:

Subject: Effect of the release of gold reserves on Community trade

Does the Commission not feel that the Italian measures affecting imports could have been avoided, at least as far as agricultural products are concerned, if the agreement in principle to release gold reserves at the free market price concluded in April between the Finance Ministers had already been implemented?

If so does the Commission not consider that negotiations in the International Monetary Fund should be speeded up in order to reach a satisfactory solution?

I would remind the House that speaking time has been limited as follows:

— 10 minutes for the author of the question;

— 5 minutes for other speakers.

In all other respects the provisions of Rule 44(3) of the Rules of Procedure apply.

I call Mr Durieux to present his question.

**Mr Durieux.** — (*F*) Mr President, honourable Members, first I should like to express my surprise and regret at not seeing Mr Haferkamp

here today. I know that Mr Scarascia Mugnozza will deputize for him very well, but I believe Mr Haferkamp would have been particularly well qualified to speak on this important subject since this matter is at the heart of various international discussions, particularly in the Committee of 20 meeting now in Washington. I do not quite know what to think of Mr Haferkamp's absence, for even if he has to go to Washington tomorrow, he did tell us that he would be here today, and this question was brought forward to today's agenda for that reason.

Having said this, I should now like to tell you that the decision taken on 22 April at Zeist by the nine Finance Ministers of the Community to exchange gold between the central banks at the real price of 150 to 160 dollars per ounce represents one of the most original initiatives since we embarked on the road to Economic and Monetary Union in 1970.

The basic idea underlying this initiative is strikingly simple: the western countries' balance of payments, already hit by the rise in the price of raw materials, had suffered a severe shock since the price of oil had been forced up to more than 9 dollars per barrel. Until a fair solution to this dispute was found, some way had to be devised of stopping the drain on available reserves. We must remember that Italy has, since the beginning of this year, incurred a deficit of 3,000,000 m lire in its balance of payments and that France between now and the end of the year will have a gap of 30,000 m new francs. The whole situation is becoming impossible, and external loans can bring only temporary relief.

It is true that the sale of the most highly valued component of these reserves cannot be a long-term solution, but at least it averts the danger of unemployment which has been hanging over the Community countries for six months.

This whiff of oxygen should also allow the western economies to resist protectionist ideas which would drag us back to the terrible times of the thirties.

We shall therefore, make practical proposals for mobilizing gold reserves in order to do away with the trade measures recently taken by the Italian government. The pundits have all too often accused the champions of the gold standard that accumulating the yellow metal in the coffers of the central banks only served to make all this wealth useless, taking it out of circulation and depriving the industries of the Community when they most needed it for investment.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**Durieux**

Now is the time to restore a dynamic role to this wealth: what nobler role could there be than that of safeguarding the employment of our workers?

It is not our intention today to start the more complex debate which would inevitably be followed by violent polemics on the subject of the role of gold in the international monetary system. Our wish is not to see gold take on the role now filled by the dollar and the special drawing rights, but to see it used as a support measure for economies in difficulties, and it can be used in this way in the present situation.

We feel sure that those responsible in the monetary field will take the necessary measures to avoid the resumption of trading between central banks causing a new rise in the price of gold, for this price cannot be allowed to settle at 280 dollars per ounce as some experts are prophesying on the grounds that the Sheiks will invest most of their additional revenue in purchases of gold. Without wishing to accuse anyone we do think that the alarming rise in the price of gold could have been checked if the two markets had not been artificially separated.

It had been suggested by some that the Council of the Communities should hold final deliberations at the meeting of 6 June in Luxembourg: this was not really possible, since it would have created difficulties for either the Japanese or the Americans.

If the Group of 20 reaches a clear and definite decision, it will show that it has at last come to grips with the task of reforming the international monetary system instead of merely tinkering with the problem.

But what will it do and at what price?

Let us be realistic: who could believe that our Italian partners would get rid of their gold stocks at a price which had sunk to ridiculous levels in relation to the price being obtained on the free market?

If firm action is not taken there will be the risk of one or other of the EEC partners quickly running out of reserves and therefore being forced to resort to closing frontiers and taking protectionist action. Accompanying the reforms there will also have to be, in the framework of the European Monetary Cooperation Fund, a stabilizing device which would intervene automatically when balance of payments difficulties arose.

At the same time everything must be done to restore a link between European currencies so that there can be coordinated floating.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the essential purpose of monetary reserves is to open up greater possibilities of adjustment to a country in difficulties, without encroaching upon the freedom to conduct transactions. There can therefore be no doubt that a substantial increase in the value of Italy's gold reserves, along the lines which have been mentioned, would give the Italian authorities extra room for manoeuvre, which would be particularly useful under the present circumstances. In view of the nature of the difficulties which Italy, like other Community countries, is encountering, these lines should be clearly defined in order to reach agreements and find a satisfactory solution to the problems referred to by Mr Durieux. It must, however, be stressed that, whatever the size of reserves, persistent disequilibrium must be met by a strict policy of regulation of internal demand, such as that followed by the Italian government. The compulsory deposit measures referred to by Mr Durieux are only short-term and are only useful as a support for such a policy.

This is the official reply which my colleague Mr Haferkamp would have given you, Mr Durieux, if he were here today. Unfortunately, since he had to be in Washington a few hours before the opening of the conference, he was forced to leave early in order to catch his plane. You referred to the recent meetings between the European ministers and I would like to point out that the ministers took no decisions in Zeist. No such definite conclusion was reached. It was announced that a consensus had been reached—the European ministers were agreed on the need to implement certain solutions but they did not actually take a decision to this effect. As you rightly observed, they avoided taking a decision in order not to create international difficulties. We are now awaiting what we hope will be the successful outcome of the Washington meeting.

This is the climate we are living in. We know that there is a certain opening which might just lead to a solution to this problem. However, I should like to add that, should it prove impossible to reach a world agreement at the present time, (for that must be our aim) the European ministers could—though no decision to this effect has yet been taken—work towards an intermediate solution at European level to tide us over pending the implementation of a wider agreement, such as the world-wide one I have been talking about.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza. I call Mr Artzinger to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Artzinger.** — (D) Mr President, as spokesman of my group I should first like to express my regret that we are discussing this important subject on such a limited scale. My group would welcome it if the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs could give the Assembly an opportunity to discuss this question in greater detail than is possible today. Perhaps the report by Sir Brandon Rhys Williams will give us this opportunity. Secondly, I should like to stress that we view the efforts to release gold reserves with a very open mind. In view of the acute difficulties facing Italy and France, we consider it desirable and even necessary for steps to be taken as soon as possible, particularly from the points of view already mentioned by Mr Durieux.

But we realize—and to this extent agree with Mr Scarascia Mugnozza—that this does not exactly presuppose a world-wide agreement, although it does make it appear desirable. The Europeans should not act in this field in such a way that other countries are—let us say—unpleasantly affected.

We therefore welcome the fact that the Committee of 20 will discuss this matter. It seems to us, however, doubtful whether they will come to a decision.

We also find it important, as Mr Scarascia Mugnozza has said, for a European agreement to be reached if necessary.

It is said here that under April's basic agreement gold reserves should be released at the free market price. I should like to point out that it has never been a question of this. In fact, the Dutch Finance Minister, Mr Duisenberg, who was in the chair at that meeting at Schloss Zeist, emphatically stated that it was not the free market price of gold that was concerned but a price close to it, in other words a price chosen for accounting purposes, which exceeds the present official price of gold, but is not as high as the free market price.

Mr President, we support the efforts being made by the Commission and others to release gold reserves to give the countries in the greatest difficulties at least some breathing space.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Lange to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group and as chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as Mr Artzinger has referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I must ask to be allowed to make a few remarks in both my capacities, spokesman of my group and chairman of the committee.

Like Mr Artzinger, I regret that so difficult a subject is being discussed here on so limited a scale. The information I have to give is that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has undertaken to discuss the whole question of the reform of the international monetary system with particular reference to the European aspects. What is at stake is mutual assistance in the monetary field, the monetary agreement that four Member States have left and that they must return to. However, the governments of the countries that want to or are to or, due to circumstances, must return to the fold, must also of course, if they receive aid from the Community, put up with Community controls on the use to which credits are put. To this extent, we are therefore in line with what the Commission proposed some years ago, on which the Council has still not been able to reach a decision.

In other words, these matters must be handled in such a way that effective assistance is possible, on condition, however, that those concerned help themselves. In the near future we shall be submitting a report, which will not, however, deal with the question of the working efficiency of the capital market. That will come in Sir Brandon Rhys Williams' report. We must not confuse the two. The working efficiency of the capital market is one thing, Mr Artzinger, and the question of organizing the international monetary system is another, and of the latter European currencies are a subject in themselves. I would therefore appreciate it if honourable Members would not continually try to have this difficult subject put on the agenda with the aid of an oral question, because we cannot within this framework give any binding or satisfactory answers, one reason being—and this applies both to the Commission and Parliament—nobody has had enough time to prepare for this question. The outcome should after all be a well-founded proposal, and we of the committee want to submit that well-founded proposal in discussions with the Commission.

I should also like to add that it sounds good to say that gold reserves should be released to give those concerned some breathing space. Both the previous speakers have said this in almost the same way. Mr Scarascia Mugnozza made a similar implication. But until certain conditions have been fulfilled, until it becomes clear what becomes of the profits from increased raw

**Lange**

material prices, what effect they have on the international monetary system and the capital markets—until these questions have been answered, I would warn against releasing reserves for any short-term considerations. Otherwise we shall find ourselves without any one day.

That cannot be completely denied, Mr Artzinger, much as you may shake your head in doubt. It is, of course, very nice to have something put aside for a rainy day. But what is required now is that in the present circumstances all the nine Member States of the Community agree on a uniform course of action and not that we give each one an opportunity—to put it bluntly—to fritter away its own reserves.

And I have another reason for issuing this warning: some years ago it was largely agreed not only in Europe but also by those involved in the International Monetary Fund that gold should be demonetized. If we now try and retract on this subject and give back to gold the role it once played, we will again be creating, at least as far as the gold producers are concerned, an opportunity for measures that we consider undesirable or that would have an undesirable effect on us. We cannot allow that to happen.

To this I would warn against discussing things in the way that this question is being discussed. I don't like it at all. We need a little more solidarity, and for that we need a little more time. We also have to wait and see what the Committee of 20 actually achieves within the framework of the OECD; then we will have to discuss these questions.

The efforts of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs are aimed at the submission of a report in the autumn. We may then have a chance to discuss these matters more thoroughly and on the basis of more relevant information than is possible in an *ad hoc* debate of this kind.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Cousté.** — (F) Mr President, honourable Members, we are grateful to Mr Durieux for his initiative in raising what is in my opinion such an important matter.

My first comment is to regret that the Commission should give us such an inadequate reply, however pleasant since it comes from the Commissioner responsible for relations with Parlia-

ment. After all, we are truly—as Mr Lange quite rightly said—confronted with a really weighty problem, and the proposal made at Zeist is unlikely to get at the root of the problem. This, as Mr Durieux has just said, is the disequilibrium in the balance of payments. To solve it, as we in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs are fully aware, we have to find the root cause. And, in my view, the solution requires an organized effort of national discipline in each country. Only national discipline combined with Community discipline can, in spite of the problem of the increasing cost of raw materials, ensure that we do not become an area of permanent inflation, but on the contrary an area of monetary stability, under the control of national discipline and where social progress can be achieved.

This is the real question, as Mr Durieux himself stressed just now when he spoke of the problem of employment. Like Mr Lange I do not think that this conjunctural measure can solve the fundamental problems facing us. Draconian measures are required to combat the disequilibrium of overall balance of payments referred to in Article 104 of the Treaty of Rome, and that means that this measure should be accompanied by a whole set of support measures and that it is not a real initiative at all, however well intended—and indeed one sometimes has the impression that the intention has been to avoid responsibility.

This is why I personally believe that these measures should be as rigorous as those one can expect from a country like Italy, or France for that matter. Internal demand must be limited and the capacity of supply from outside increased. This is a problem we are all confronted with and it demands effort, coherence and, I would add, a global approach.

I would say that a start has been made towards achieving this global approach, this coherence and solidarity, in the setting up of the European Monetary Cooperation Fund. Political and Community will is needed to make this instrument effective; at present it is not used because of a lack of means—yes, lack of means. Beyond this aspect, the Community aspect if I may say so to those representatives of the Commission who are with us today, there lies the essential problem of the identity of Europe.

What is the real significance of Mr Haferkamp's presence in Washington? Does it mean that if we take initiatives, by revaluing gold or in any other sphere, we must first obtain the consent of the United States? Does it mean that in the last resort Europe has no personality of its own even in the sphere of its economic monetary

**Couaté**

or social action? If such is the case, Mr Haferkamp's absence would be valuable not simply on this particular occasion but in a more significant way, and I hope that this is not the interpretation we have to accept.

I will therefore conclude by saying that each of our states, each of our governments, must make the necessary national effort and beyond that the effort required to achieve solidarity among the Nine. Only by this means shall we be able to settle the problems of inflation which, approaching a rate of 20%, threatens us with grave economic and social dangers. My principal reason for asking for the attention of this House was to make this appeal for solidarity and for European identity.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Van der Hek.

**Mr Van der Hek.** — *(NL)* Mr President, it was not originally my intention to ask for the floor, but after Mr Scarascia Mugnozza had spoken, I thought what a wonderful answer. He said that the release of gold reserves is a matter for which certain agreements must be concluded. The question immediately arises as to what he means by this. What agreements and with whom must they be concluded?

From his digression it would also seem that he is primarily thinking of international deliberations with all concerned taking part. I assume that he is thinking in this connection of the IMF. He then said something which I found unusually intriguing, namely that if it does not succeed at that level, Europe will have to find a solution on its own. That surprised me in view of what I have heard of the present state of the discussion. What does the Commission mean when it says that if the successful result is not achieved at international level a European solution within the framework of the Community is not excluded? Does it mean that gold is released as a means of payment between the central banks of the Nine? Does it mean that gold is released not only for transactions between the Nine but also for transactions with third countries? Did the Commissioner when making this remark, stop and think what the consequences would be? Did he not realize when making such remarks that in view of the Commission's responsibility towards this Parliament and also towards public opinion, consideration must be given to the fact that very special conditions are attached to this and that very special problems arise as a result?

Releasing gold for transactions between the Nine is, I feel, both superfluous and dangerous:

superfluous because the mutual granting of credit may be an adequate solution for such limited use; dangerous because it may delay or hamper the creation of mutual monetary and economic discipline among the Nine.

Releasing gold for transactions with third countries is, I feel, even more dangerous because it will intensify the conflicts which exist with the United States and other industrialized countries and be greatly to the disadvantage of the Third World. It will, in short, lead to a distribution of liquidity throughout the world which cannot be justified by the application of any criterion.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza should in my view add something to the remarks he has made to make it clear exactly what he means because we will otherwise be having an extremely curious debate here.

**President.** — I call Mr Bersani.

**Mr Bersani.** — *(I)* Mr President, I am fully aware of all the considerations referred to, in particular, by the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, Mr Lange. It is obvious, as the Vice-President of the Commission, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, pointed out, that the general context must not be forgotten, particularly when we are dealing with the delicate and important questions which arise in the monetary field. In this framework, which comprises both the capital market and the reform of the monetary system, I feel there are ample grounds for Mr Durieux's oral question. At a time when the problem has become so urgent, it would have been strange if our Parliament had not discussed it, acting as if we were totally unaware of its existence and the practical consequences which a solution might have. Though we must certainly bear the general approach in mind and support it, taking account of general interests, at the same time I do not think that we can afford to ignore some problems which urgently call for greater discipline (my own country is an obvious example) and solidarity.

I do not know whether unfreezing the gold reserves is a prerequisite of solidarity in the financial field. A possible solution has been mooted, which I think justifies the questions. We have arrived at a point at which I think that the two things must go hand in hand. However, I hope that in dealing with this problem we do not run into the same problems as the agricultural policy, which incidentally, is one of the underlying causes of the Italian balance of payments disequilibrium. In other words, I hope that we will not have to wait until it is a prob-

**Bersani**

lem of common interest, affecting all countries, before a solution is reached. So long as the problem was serious and urgent in only one or two countries, there was little solidarity in evidence.

I therefore think we should begin to think of the problem in these terms and bear in mind the extremely urgent grounds for so doing. I agree that we should follow the paths of strict discipline and practical solidarity. The latter must, however, become a reality in the near future, not just when we discover that the problems are greater than we expected. It is in this light that I welcome the opening of discussions in a more general framework. These discussions must certainly not be allowed to jeopardize the more general ones to come, since we should certainly make more progress in a wider context, but neither must they neglect certain urgent considerations which I feel are of great importance.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Though it in no way detracts from the value of Mr Durieux's question, particularly wisely put to the Commission, I feel that Mr Lange's statement is particularly interesting.

In other words, I feel that such a serious problem, touching on so many spheres of responsibility, which might have such consequences for a Community state, the Community as a whole and its relations with the outside world, cannot be fully dealt with in a 15 or 20-minute speech in an Assembly such as this, which, though undoubtedly concerned, has not yet had the chance to go into the matter thoroughly.

I therefore welcome the fact that Mr Lange has expressed his intention of submitting a detailed report on this problem in October.

I should, however, Mr President, like to add a few remarks in order to avoid any misunderstanding since I feel there was something behind Mr Couste's and Mr Van der Hek's remarks.

I clearly said that that there was no question of being dependent on anyone—during the meeting of the European Finance Ministers no agreement was reached, simply a general consensus that a solution must be found at international level. The reason for this is very simple. In his question, Mr Durieux suggests that if Italy had revalued its gold reserves it might have been better equipped to deal with its present position.

Mr Durieux is perfectly aware that such a revaluation of gold reserves could only have given Italy a few months' breathing space without resolving the underlying problem and that, if this manoeuvre had not been accompanied by internal measures, such as those now being implemented by the Italian government, within but a few months Italy would have found itself in an even worse position. This also obviously applies to other Community countries which find themselves in a similar position. I believe that if even the strongest country in the European Community took this path alone, it would find that it had gained an advantage vis-à-vis Italy or other countries for only a few months, but the end result would be failure.

This then is how I view the problem as a whole. It is not a question of waiting for others to give their consent. We are seeking an international consensus. However, I have already stated that if this consensus takes some time to achieve, the Community will be forced to follow a path of its own, if only for a certain period of time. Mr Van der Hek wonders what means will be employed, how relations with third countries will develop and who will be invested with the decision-making power—the council of Ministers or the Members of Parliament. This certainly has still to be established but it is already obvious that all the institutions must have some say in the matter. I simply said, that if a wide international consensus is not reached, Europe will have no choice but to strike out on her own, using the means and methods appropriate to the path chosen.

I felt, Mr President, that it was necessary to clear up these points, and I hope my remarks will have the effect of defusing the atmosphere.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

I call Mr Durieux.

**Mr Durieux.** — (F) Thank you Mr President. I should like to say in reply to Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Mr Bersani and Mr Van der Hek that the measure we are proposing today can only help us to solve a short-term economic problem. If we want to tackle the roots of the evil, we must act with great firmness, as Mr Cousté has reminded us.

If we hope to see fat years again, we must act with energy, determination and great firmness. But until order and stability are re-established we ask that all available resources be mobilized. The revaluation of gold stocks will not solve all the problems, but it will give

**Durieux**

us some temporary relief while we are tackling them.

It is true that dealing with gold is not the only feasible method, but it is one of the most important, and its importance, particularly for the Community countries, has been proved throughout this debate.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza has told us that no decision was taken at Zeist, only an agreement on principle. I should not like to accept the verdict of various newspapers which have unhesitatingly condemned it as a 'tin-can agreement'. I cannot believe that this decision is nothing more than a simple intellectual exercise on the part of those in authority in the Community. That would sow dismay among the public—troubled by the serious threat of unemployment—which was hoping to escape from the difficulties with the help of an oxygen balloon in the form of the revaluation of gold reserves.

If we give way to American pressure and renounce our ambitious project, we shall show weakness in face of our responsibilities, and that is not worthy of a Community which wants to claim political authority.

Once again I had hoped that Mr Haferkamp would have been with us just before his departure for Washington. I could simply have told him that at the various meetings he will be attending this week he should bear these instructions in mind: we should inform our partners on the other side of the Atlantic that our proposals allow of negotiation; we should re-assure them that we are determined not to increase the overall reserves of gold retained by the central banks; we should warn them against trying to sabotage our proposal, which I think remains valid in the circumstances I have described.

In spite of everything the Community gave proof of so much determination at Zeist that it cannot withdraw now. I believe its credibility is at stake.

Mr President, the oral question posed today would undoubtedly warrant a very long debate as some speakers have said; but it needed to be raised at a time when our Finance Ministers have been speaking about it on the eve of their discussions in Washington in the Community of 20. We have indeed barely touched on the problem, but nevertheless I thought we should do so.

**President.** — I have no motion for a resolution on this debate.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The debate is closed.

*17. Oral Question with debate:  
threat to Dollard nature reserve*

**President.** — The next item is the oral question with debate put by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment to the Commission of the European Communities on the threat to the Dollard nature reserve. (Doc. 62/74).

The question is worded as follows:

Subject: Threat to the Dollard nature reserve

Since 1966 there have been plans in the Netherlands to dig a canal through which waste water from the Provinces of Groningen and Drenthe would be discharged into the North Sea; this canal would pass through the Dollard and the committee accordingly wishes to put the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of the intention to run this canal beyond the dike through the Dollard-Watt, a bird and nature reserve which is well-known and arouses keen interest in Europe, and is it also aware that the Netherlands Government is shortly to take a final decision on the project?
2. Does the Commission realize that the implementation of this plan would have disastrous consequences for millions of breeding and migratory birds and seriously disturb the ecological balance of this area?
3. How has the Commission reacted to the strong protests by the Netherlands population and experts throughout the world?
4. Does the Commission know that an alternative solution might consist in running the waste water canal inland of the dike which would apparently not even involve greater expenditure?
5. In view of the facts that
  - a) the Dollard is a frontier area within the Community,
  - b) the Commission is granted a right of initiative by the European Treaties,
  - c) the European Communities' programme of action on the environment proposed by it and adopted by the Council on 22 November 1973, includes provision for the protection of birds and some other species of animals<sup>1</sup>,

is the Commission willing to urge the Netherlands Government without delay to choose the alternative solution, in order to prevent destruction of the nature reserve?

I call Mr Della Briotta to present the question.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 112 of 20 December 1973, p. 40, reads as follows: 'Policy for the protection of the environment should therefore include measures to prevent the large-scale destruction of birds, particularly songbirds and migratory birds, and more generally to protect the existence of certain animal species threatened with extinction.'

**Mr Della Briotta**, *chairman of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment*. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after the tortuous problems raised by Mr Durieux's question, which are certainly important especially at this time, I should like to raise on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment a problem which is certainly less important in immediate economic terms but is essentially linked to other problems upon which depends the very life of our planet.

I very much regret the fact that, as a result of some misunderstandings and disagreements, it has not been possible to postpone this discussion in which my colleague Mr Jahn would certainly have passionately intervened on behalf of our committee. It was he who first raised the problem. I shall therefore be very brief. The text of the question is in any case very clear and requires no explanation.

The essential facts behind our question to the Commission is that, since 1966 there have been plans in the Netherlands to dig a canal through the Dollard to drain off waste water into the North Sea. This raises a number of points to which our committee intends to draw attention. Of course, these questions only concern one region, of limited area, but they are linked to more general questions. Does the Commission realize that this project questions the need for, and may even jeopardize, a nature reserve whose significance extends to all of Europe, not just the country in which it is situated.

Secondly, we ask the Commission if it is aware of the extremely serious consequences for millions of animals, at the same time drawing attention to the fact that there have been unfavourable reactions by both local inhabitants, the circles affected and experts all over the world. We accordingly ask the Commission whether, depending on the framework and possibilities open to it, it could not encourage a study of alternative solutions in order to avoid the destruction or jeopardization of this nature reserve. Naturally, we base ourselves on a clear point that the Dollard is a frontier area within the Community and that the Commission should therefore have the right of initiative in this regard.

Our committee felt that attention should be drawn to this problem because it raises a question of principle, since the European Community's action programme, which we approved last November, includes provision for the protection of some birds and some other species of animal.

This then is the question which the Committee on Public Health and the Environment wishes

put to the Commission's representative, hoping that its concern may be alleviated.

**President**. — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza**, *Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities*. — (I) I thank Mr Della Briotta for having put this question, which I have dealt with personally in order to give Parliament as detailed a reply as possible.

First of all, I must point out that the Commission has not been officially informed of the plan to build a waste water canal through the Dollard nor of the various versions of this plan. We learnt about it in the press and now from this Parliamentary question.

The study which the Commission has ordered, within the framework of the Community's programme on the environment, on the management and ecological arrangement of the Community's coastal regions has so far shown that the Dollard estuary is ecologically important and its ecological role goes far beyond the local, regional and national framework.

The Commission realizes that digging the canal outside the dike would have many unfavourable consequences for the natural life of this region and those beyond and understands that the alternative solution of running the canal inland of the dike would have much less serious ecological repercussions.

We are fully aware of the relevance of these remarks. The Commission has noted the protest against this project by certain groups in the Netherlands and Germany and various national and international organizations interested in the protection of the environment. It has also noted the arguments in favour of this plan, which would put an end to the serious pollution of the internal waters in the south-west of the Province of Groningen and the north-east of the Province of Drenthe, which has the most serious economic and employment problems.

As regards the last question, I should like to say that the Commission feels that a decision on this matter cannot be postponed. On the other hand, it will be some time before the studies on the protection of natural areas and characteristic biotypes in the Community are concluded. Under these circumstances, given that a solution must be immediately found and that it is impossible to conclude the studies immediately—they should be completed towards the end of the year—we have opened consultations, which are still in progress, with the Dutch government to consider the various aspects of these problems.



**Scarascia Mugnozza**

I can therefore confirm that, in view of the urgency of the problem and given the seriousness of the problem and the fact that the region has an ecological significance beyond mere local interest, the Commission, pending the completion of its study on ecological areas (towards the end of the year), has opened a dialogue with the Dutch government. We have sent a note and asked to have some points clarified. We hope that we will soon be able to negotiate with the Dutch government to eliminate this danger.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

I call Mr Scholten to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Scholten.** — (NL) Mr President, it is to be welcomed that environmental considerations should play an increasingly important role in our policy at both national and European level. The time is past when mere economic and financial considerations predominated in questions such as the one we are now discussing. On the other hand, we must take care not to go to the other extreme and allow environmental arguments to hold the balance all the time when policy is established and decisions are taken.

Nor must we see environmental problems in too narrow a sense. I would point out that this question also concerns the safety of citizens. I am referring to their protection against water, a problem that has occupied the Netherlands for many centuries.

This, too, is part of the question of control of the environment that must be considered.

The question is not whether there must be a waste water canal for Groningen—on that point Mr Scarascia Mugnozza was not very clear—but *where* it must be, inside or outside the dike. We have unfortunately seen emotions flare up during the argument on this question both in my country and in this Parliament. I put Parliament's concern down to the wording of this question, which is not completely fair.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza has just said that we have not been officially informed on this question and he had heard about it from the newspapers. My question is why the Dutch Minister, well known in this Chamber, the Christian-Democrat Westerterp, who spent so many years in this House, was not asked to attend this debate. He could then have immediately given the explanations that Parliament requires.

Mr President, what are, then, the facts? In 1966 the then cabinet gave, after detailed discussions,

its approval to the implementation of a plan set up by the Province of Groningen to construct a waste water canal through the Dollard. To this end part of the Dollard will have to be reclaimed, and through this reclaimed part the canal will run and at a later stage be made suitable for shipping. As a result of this reclamation it will no longer be necessary to increase the height of the existing sea dike, a measure required under the Delta Law passed in the Netherlands after the flooding in 1953.

For this work a number of plans have been drawn up, which have long been the subject of discussion. Finally, two alternatives remained, a canal inside the dike or a canal outside the dike, the latter being a variation of the original proposal.

What are the arguments for and against?

One argument in favour of the canal outside the dike—the solution to which the environmentalists are so opposed—is that in this way the problems involved could be solved sooner than with the canal inland of the dike. Completing the project within a short period is important not only for financial reasons but also, and in particular, in view of the safety aspect I have just referred to. A second aspect is that according to the present calculations a canal inland of the dike would cost 40 million guilders more than a canal outside the dike.

A third aspect is that 350 hectares of extremely valuable agricultural land would be lost as a result of the solution proposed by the environmentalists.

Further delay in the implementation of the proposal may also retard the development of the whole of East Groningen.

These arguments and circumstances must be weighed up against the advantages of a canal inland of the dike, one of which is that it would not affect the marshy areas without which the bird population in particular would suffer considerably. After considering the facts, the Dutch cabinet is to take a decision this summer.

I feel that until this decision, which will be based, among other things, on a technical report on safety aspects, is taken, there is no need from a European point of view to bring the pressure to bear on the Dutch government that this question requests.

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

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, the Socialist Group welcomes the fact that the Committee on

**Laban**

Public Health and the Environment and the Commission are trying to preserve irreplaceable nature reserves, but I would like to point out that—as Mr Scholten has already said—what has to be done here is to weigh various interests one against the other. Mr Della Briotta stated in his presentation of this question that the problem is somewhat less complicated. I must dispute that.

The Dollard canal is a bone of contention in the Netherlands. The Dutch government has taken another decision on the subject because an investigation had to be made into three aspects of the consequences of a canal inside the dike.

Firstly, the question of the safety of the people had to be looked into. This is the most important aspect for our group. It must be realized that a canal inland of the dike would necessitate a break through the existing sea dike. A new dike takes quite a time to settle. All the water must be removed from under the dike because otherwise weak points form over a number of years at the joins. It may be possible to combat this risk with various technical aid such as sand columns and the removal of water by a vacuum method.

However, the question of cost then immediately arises. To exclude the safety and other risks, the cost would, as things now stand, rise by 50 to 80 million guilders. Mr Scholten was therefore being somewhat modest with his 40 million. I am well aware that this money will have to be spent in the longer term, but this does not alter the fact that this aspect carries some weight in view of the limits to the expenditure by the Dutch government for the implementation of a number of collective projects.

A further aspect is that the delay which would occur if the alternative solution were selected would amount to at least or at the most—this is not clear at present—ten years.

It must be realized, Mr President, that East Groningen is one of the poorest areas of the Netherlands and that it has been repeatedly affected by flooding. People in the area have in fact been waiting since 1966 for direct drainage into the Ems, which would prevent floods.

Finally, a direct connection—as Mr Scholten has pointed out—would provide the potential for the settlement of industry in this poor area of the Netherlands. The government has repeatedly given assurances on this point.

On the other hand, it is just as certain that all the reclamation work going on in the Netherlands and Germany is constantly reducing the brackish water that is so important for many

types of bird. According to international standards for marshy areas, the Dollard is almost unique in Europe as regards 15 types of bird, among them waders and avocets. We are sure that the Dutch government will give this very serious consideration when reaching its decision. It will also be in line with the present cabinet's programme, which pays particular attention to aspects of nature conservation.

We of the Socialist Group are in no way averse to the idea of the European Parliament and the Commission underlining the importance of preserving this nature reserve. There are, however, a number of omissions and an obvious mistake in the question in the way it is worded by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment; Mr Scholten has also pointed this out. There is no mention of the safety aspects or of the considerable increases in costs that would result. In our view the wording of the question consequently lacks the necessary nuances. One of the most important points is after all the safety of the people living in the area concerned.

On behalf of my group I can support the question provided that the spokesmen of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment and of the Commission take the safety of the population in this underprivileged area adequately into account when making any approach to the Dutch government; safety must be guaranteed. Consideration must also be given to a possibly acceptable delay and to the cost aspect; these points must under all circumstances be brought up in discussions with the Dutch government. If I can be given this assurance, my group is prepared to give its whole-hearted support to an approach to the Dutch government—if this should be necessary.

**President.** — I call Mr Baas to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group.

**Mr Baas.** — (NL) Mr President, it will not surprise you that I, who spent my youth in the area we are now discussing—as a boy of ten to twelve I stood by the dikes to see if they would hold; that was about 40 years ago—should feel that the question to the Commission somewhat rashly skips over the safety aspects affecting an area of about 100 thousand hectares.

This is a question that has really been topical since the year 1300, part of this area having been completely flooded in about 1300.

It will therefore be realized that the signing of the intended agreement in 1966 by the then cabinet and the then Social Affairs Minister Suurhoff was of considerable importance to the

**Baas**

area concerned. If greater consideration had been given to the safety aspects, the question would certainly have been worded differently.

It should not be thought that all the things that are now being said were not considered in 1966. It is extremely questionable whether the construction of the canal would really affect the large area that the Dollard covers. I feel that the ecological balance is all too easily referred to as a statistic. I must correct Mr Scarascia Mugnozza when he says that the ecological balance in this area is so unique. The question of water pollution does not play any part in this. It may be that water pollution in the Groningen area itself made the Dollard so unique. Pollution has produced food, a tremendous amount of food. I can, however, assure you that this food will shortly cease to be produced because water pollution in the East Groningen area is now being taken in hand, which will definitely result in a change in the balance. I have in any case the feeling that we are being all too quick to adopt a position and that—as Mr Scholten has also said—certain factors are being pushed to the fore which are perhaps somewhat one-sided.

I am able to tell you that the reclamation of land from the Wieringermeer and of other parts of the Ysselmeer have created a unique area where birds rest on their long journey from the north to the south, an area where certain types of bird have never before been seen; the creation of a large peaceful area in the middle of the Netherlands has made it possible to observe large numbers of migrating birds.

Then there is of course the alternative of constructing a canal inland of the dike. As Mr Laban has already said, the existing sea dike would have to be broken at three points in this case. It should be understood that this is almost impossible because then a new dike would have to stand behind the sea dike for at least three years before breaks could be made in the existing sea dike. But the line which this new dike would follow is not suitable because the line consists of peat-soil, on which it is not technically possible, except at enormous expense, to build dikes. A canal inland of the dyke is therefore not feasible. The cost factor may not be the most important, but the reliability of the sea dike must be mentioned.

I would like to ask Mr Scarascia Mugnozza to view this matter in the light of the gravity of the situation. Reference is made to loud protests among the Dutch population, but I can assure you that the counterprotests from the area affected are also very loud at the moment. The canal itself was begun in 1966. It is in the

process of construction; part of the project has been completed. If reference is now made to loud protests, I can refer to the loud protests being made by people from the area who feel that they are in danger. It is not simply a question of this canal now becoming a subject of discussion again. The area concerned is one of the few in our country where the height of the sea dikes has not yet been increased. In the west and south of the Netherlands the sea dikes have been raised in the last 15 years, but this one has not. It is definitely too low, and if the autumn storms again bring high water, the consequences for this area are likely to be serious.

I should therefore like to join Mr Scholten in saying we as a Parliament should only put questions and the Commission should only answer questions if the information necessary to reach a balanced view of the matter involved is available. I would draw the Commission's attention to the considerable concern of the inhabitants of this area for their safety.

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Mr President, I think it would be both unjust and unreasonable to regard the Dutch as insensitive to environmental and ecological problems. Given that I am specifically responsible for this sector, I can say this in the full light of the facts.

In my repeated contacts with experts and the Dutch government I have continually seen proof of their interest in these problems. I have a very vivid memory of a visit to some polders a little less than two years ago during which I saw thousands of pheasants—more than I had ever seen before. This is not merely a personal experience, it also demonstrates the sensitivity of the Dutch people to this problem, and I should like to pay tribute to them.

Now, a question has been put. I am not interested in why it was put or whether every part of it is complete or not. I have carefully listened to what Members have had to say and I am sure that all the necessary facts will emerge in the course of the current consultation with the Dutch government. However, I should like to give you my word that these consultations will be conducted with the greatest care and that I personally shall attach extreme importance to the safety question because I feel that in a country such as the Netherlands, in which safety from the sea has given rise to so much discussion in the past, this problem can

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

never be forgotten even in order to face another which, though undoubtedly important, must be secondary to the question of safety.

I should like to conclude by assuring the questioners that talks are in progress and that, whatever facts emerge, the safety question will not be forgotten.

**President.** — I call Mr Della Briotta.

**Mr Della Briotta.** — (I) I simply wish to thank Vice-President Scarascia Mugnozza for the courtesy with which he has replied to our question. This question, as my colleague Mr Baas pointed out, may not be complete, but it was designed to add to our information. If we had known the arguments, there would have been no point talking about it at all.

In any case, in putting this question we did not intend to imply that we do not agree on certain subjects or think that only one aspect of the problem should be considered. The Committee on Public Health and the Environment would simply like the problem to be carefully examined and discussed, taking account of not only the problems of ecological and animal balance, but also the population problems, their safety, and the economic costs which would fall upon them if alternative solutions were chosen, as Mr Laban has said.

It only remains for me to thank the Members who have taken part in the debate, and express my conviction that the Commission will do its duty, in our common interest.

**President.** — I have no motion for a resolution on this debate.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The debate is closed.

18. *Agenda for the next sitting*

**President.** — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Tuesday, 11 June 1974, with the following agenda:

11 a.m. and 3 p.m.

- Question Time (Doc. 122/74);
- Oral Question with debate put by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Marras, Mrs Iotti, Mr Fabbrini and Mr Sandri to the Council of the European Communities on the political rights of migrant workers (Doc. 14/74/rev.);
- Oral Question without debate put by Mr Memmel to the Council of the European Communities on relations with the countries of the Mediterranean Basin (Doc. 34/74);
- Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Concas on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee on the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 130/74);
- Report by Mr Seefeld on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth on measures to be taken in application of point 16 of the Hague Communiqué, with particular reference to the setting up of two youth committees (Doc. 41/74);
- Report by Mr Lange on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the importation free of Common Customs Tariff duties of educational, scientific and cultural materials (Doc. 72/74).

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 7.15 p.m.)*

## SITTING OF TUESDAY, 11 JUNE 1974

### Contents

1. Approval of minutes .....	37		
2. Statement by the President .....	37	— Oral Question No 4 by Mr Hougardy on State aid to students:	
3. Documents received .....	37	Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Hougardy .....	43
4. Forwarding of a document by the Council — Statement by the President-in-Office of the Council:		— Oral Question No 5 by Mr Bousch on free movement of persons and goods (cf. Annex) .....	43
Mr Wischnewski, President-in-Office of the European Communities; Mr Spénale; Mr Giraud; Mr Aigner; Mr Pounder; Mr Wischnewski .....	38	— Oral Question No 6 by Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker on the sending of an observer from the Government of the United States:	
5. Question Time (Doc. 122/74) .....	41	Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker; Sir Christopher Soames	44
Question to the Council of the European Communities:		— Oral Question No 7 by Lord Mansfield on opium production in Turkey: postponed .....	44
— Oral Question No 1 by Lord O'Hagan on the budgetary powers of the European Parliament:		— Oral Question No 8 by Mr Brewis on food prices:	
Mr Wischnewski, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Wischnewski .....	41	Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Sir Christopher Soames .....	44
Questions to the Commission of the European Communities:		— Oral Question No 9 by Mr Blumenfeld on meeting the cost of training Palestinian refugees:	
— Oral Question No 2 by Lord Chelwood on the concern of the New Zealand Government over present and future exports of dairy and sheep meat products to the Community:		Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Cheysson; Lord Chelwood; Mr Cheysson; Mr Giraud; Mr Cheysson .....	45
Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Lord Chelwood; Sir Christopher Soames; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Sir Christopher Soames ....	41	— Oral Question No 10 by Mr Noè on Community participation in the development of the Amazon basin:	
— Oral Question No 3 by Lord St. Oswald on trade relations between the Community and New Zealand:		Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities .....	47
Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Lord St. Oswald; Sir Christopher Soames .....	42	— Oral Question No 11 by Mr Terre-noire on relations with certain Mediterranean countries:	

<i>Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr de la Malène; Mr Cheysson; Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker; Mr Cheysson</i>	47		
— Oral Question No 12 by Mr McDonald on the system of monetary compensatory amounts:			
(cf. Annex) .....	48		
6. Welcome to a delegation from the Turkish Parliament .....	49		
7. Oral Question with debate: Political rights of migrant workers (Doc. 14/74 rev.):			
<i>Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli; Mr Wischnewski, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities; Mr Glinne; Mr Bersani; Mr Alfred Bertrand; Mr Della Briotta</i> .....	49		
8. Change in the agenda:			
Procedural motion:			
<i>Mr Memmel; Mr Wischnewski, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities</i> .....	54		
9. Oral Question, with debate: Political rights of migrant workers (Doc. 14/74 rev.) (resumption):			
<i>Sir John Peel</i> .....	55		
10. Election of a Vice-President .....	55		
11. Oral Question with debate: Political rights of migrant workers (Doc. 14/74 rev.) (resumption):			
<i>Mr Giraud; Mr Pisoni; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Wischnewski, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli</i> .....	56		
12. Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea:			
Debate on a motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Concas on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee:			
<i>Mr Concas; Mr Brewis; Mr Wischnewski, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities</i> .....	59		
		13. Commission Memorandum on measures relating to point 16 of the Hague Communiqué: Debate on a report by Mr Seefeld on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth:	
		<i>Mr Seefeld, rapporteur</i> .....	61
		<i>Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Christian Democratic Group; Mr Terrenoire, draftsman of the opinion for the Budgets Committee; Mr Walkhoff, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr John Hill, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Yeats, on behalf of the Group of Progressive European Democrats; Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli; Mr Deschamps; Mr Pisoni; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Seefeld; Mr Yeats</i> .....	65
		Consideration of proposed recommendations .....	78
		Amendments to proposed recommendation No II .....	78
		Amendments No 1 and No 6 to Article 1 A:	
		<i>Mr Laban; Mr Klepsch; Mr Yeats; Mr John Hill; Mr Broeksz</i> .....	78
		Rejection of Amendment No 1 .....	80
		Adoption of Amendment No 6 .....	80
		Amendment No 9 to Article 2 A:	
		<i>Mr Yeats; Mr Seefeld; Mr John Hill; Mr Laban; Mr Thornley; Mr Yeats; Miss Lulling; Mr Klepsch; Mr Walkhoff</i> .....	80
		Rejection of Amendment No 9 .....	82
		Amendments No 2 and No 10 to Article 3:	
		<i>Mr Laban; Mr Yeats; Mr Klepsch; Mr Terrenoire; Mr Walkhoff; Mr Klepsch; Mr Thornley; Miss Lulling; Mr Seefeld</i> .....	82
		Rejection of Amendment No 2 (corr.)	85
		Rejection of Amendment No 10 .....	85
		Amendments No 3, No 7 and No 8 to Article 3 .....	85
		Withdrawal of Amendment No 3:	
		<i>Mr Laban; Mr John Hill; Mr Laban</i> ..	86
		Adoption of Amendment No 7 .....	86
		Adoption of Amendment No 8 .....	86

<i>Amendment No 4 to Article 3:</i>		<i>Rejection of the procedural motion ..</i>	88
<i>Mr Laban; Mr Seefeld; Mr Broeks;</i>		<i>Adoption of the motion .....</i>	88
<i>Mr John Hill .....</i>	86		
<i>Adoption of Amendment No 4 .....</i>	87	14. <i>Importation of educational, scientific</i>	
<i>Amendment No 5/rev. to Article 4 ..</i>	87	<i>and cultural materials:</i>	
<i>Withdrawal of Amendment No 5/rev.:</i>		<i>Decision to postpone consideration of</i>	
<i>Mr Laban .....</i>	87	<i>a report:</i>	
<i>Procedural motion:</i>		<i>Mr Lange; Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli;</i>	
<i>Mr Yeats; Mr Broeks; Mr Walkhoff..</i>	87	<i>Mr Lange; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr</i>	
		<i>Lange; Mr Bermani .....</i>	88
		15. <i>Agenda for next sitting .....</i>	89

## IN THE CHAIR : MR BERKHOUWER

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 11.05 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

### 1. *Approval of minutes*

Before I present the minutes of proceedings of the previous sitting for your approval I draw your attention to the fact that the following sentence should be inserted in front of paragraph 12 on page 13:

'After Mr Scott-Hopkins had spoken, the President announced that the enlarged Bureau would examine at one of its next meetings the question of the quorum in committee meetings.'

This sentence will also be included in the final version of the minutes.

Are there any objections?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

### 2. *Statement by the President*

**President.** — May I remind the members of the enlarged Bureau that we are expecting a delegation from the European Movement at 2.50 p.m. in Europe House to present a petition with approximately 10,000 signatures.

I should like to ask the members of the enlarged Bureau to meet in the large hall a little before this time so that they can form up around the President to receive this petition.

### 3. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received the following documents:

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

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation on certain measures to be taken in agriculture for Italy as a result of the fixing of a new representative rate for the Italian lira (Doc. 133/74);

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

b) from Parliamentary committees the following report:

— report by Mr Lucien Martens on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the financing of publicity in respect of nursery products (Doc. 134/74).

### 4. *Forwarding of a document — Statement by the President-in-Office of the Council*

**President.** — I have just received the following documents from Mr Wischniewski, President-in-Office of the Council:

"Joint guidelines established by the Council of the European Communities on the strengthening of the budgetary powers of the European Parliament:

**President**

- I. Draft amendments to Article 203, 204, 205a, 206 and 209 of the EEC Treaty and to those articles of the other Treaties which relate to budgetary procedure;
- II. A draft text, to be inserted in the Treaties, which aims at establishing a European Communities Court of Auditors;
- III. A draft joint declaration of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on the setting up of a conciliation procedure.”  
(Doc. 135/74)

This document will be referred to the Committee on Budgets.

I should like to extend a warm welcome to Mr Wischniewski. I gather that he would like to give a word or two of explanation on this document and I thus call on him to speak.

**Mr Wischniewski**, *President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities*. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. I am extremely happy to be speaking to this House—I was previously privileged to be a member of it and I see many old friends and colleagues present here today—in my capacity as President-in-Office of the Council. I have a statement to make to you, Mr President, which the Council considers to be of particular importance.

At its meeting of 4 June 1974 the Council drafted joint guidelines for the strengthening of the budgetary powers of the European Parliament. As you know, Commission proposals and resolutions adopted by this House have been submitted to the Council. The Council has considered these proposals and resolutions very thoroughly and has had long and extremely serious discussions on this subject.

The Council realizes how important it is for the development of the Community and the increasingly democratic operation of its institutions, that the European Parliament should have a greater say in the procedure for approval of the budget and acknowledges that our two Institutions must cooperate more and more closely in the drafting of legal instruments with financial repercussions which, by reason of their nature, have a direct effect on budgetary decisions. The Council has based its guidelines on these considerations and I am convinced that these new rules, once applied, will very soon prove to have a beneficial effect on our Community's administration, its progress and the pace of its advance.

The joint guidelines set by the Council cover the following points:

- a draft revision of those articles in the Treaties concerned with budgetary procedure, particularly Articles 203, 204, 205a, 206 and 209 of the EEC Treaty and related articles of the other Treaties;
- a draft text, to be inserted in the Treaties, which aims at establishing a European Communities Court of Auditors, equipped to exercise fully effective and independent surveillance of the Community's financial activities;
- a draft joint declaration of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on the setting up of a conciliation procedure for legal instruments of general scope, which have considerable financial consequences and which are not approved and binding on the basis of existing legal instruments.

I have pleasure, Mr President, in giving you this text this morning, and we have taken the necessary measures to ensure that it is distributed immediately to all Members of the European Parliament. I thus do not think it necessary to outline the contents of this text in detail, as you will be able to read it for yourselves shortly. The Council now awaits any comments the European Parliament may have on the texts which will be used to amend the Treaties.

The Council would then have to consult and set the requisite procedures in motion. The European Parliament must also announce whether or not it supports the draft joint declaration which has to be approved and, I hope, will be approved by our three Institutions.

Mr President, I should like in conclusion to express my deep conviction that the Community, primarily by frank and fruitful cooperation among all our Institutions, will be able to make progress towards achievement of the common goals we have set ourselves and that it will steadily develop into a factor of decisive importance for the wellbeing of our people and for stability and peace in the world.

(Applause)

**President**. — Thank you Mr Wischniewski.

I call Mr Spénale, chairman of the Committee on Budgets.

**Mr Spénale**. — (F) Mr President, I think we should express our thanks to the President-in-Office of the Council for the statement he has just made which has outlined for us the latest developments as regards the revision, now under way, of Parliament's budgetary powers.

I should like, very quickly, to voice a number of regrets regarding the past and, nevertheless,



## Spénale

thanks for the present, but also a number of questions as regards the future. My regrets concern the delays to which this procedure has been subjected. These are due essentially to the Commission, which is considered as a permanent institution and which has not fulfilled in time the commitments it undertook in April 1970 to make proposals at the appropriate time to ensure that the Parliament's new budgetary powers would be in force when it came to examining the 1975 budget.

It is clear today that since conciliation procedures are still to be set up between the Council and the Parliament, even if one Member State had a reservation regarding possible amendments to the Treaty, the procedures for ratification by the national parliaments could not be completed before 1 January 1975, in addition to which the harmonized basis for assessment of VAT, with all the problems it entails regarding land systems, special systems, zero rating or exemptions has no chance either of being introduced before 1 January 1975, so that great precision is needed in preparing the substitute system whereby the budgetary resources needed by the Communities can be guaranteed between now and 1 January 1975, by payments proportional to the gross national products of the various Member States.

To sum up, by 1 January 1975 we shall not be where we ought to be, either as regards the real resources originally envisaged, or as regards institutional law on budgetary matters. Consequently you will understand that the European Parliament feels somewhat bitter about this and is still reserving its final judgement.

So much, then, for the past, and we must express our appreciation, as regards the present, of the initiatives taken in the Council of Ministers by the German Presidency.

It is clear that without the diplomacy, drive and persistence of the German Presidency in constantly keeping this question, which is of prime importance to us, on the Council agenda, we should not have achieved the breakthroughs we have today. As a result, we wish to express our thanks and our hopes that throughout the German Presidency and afterwards, when a French President takes over, the Council's position will be marked by the same spirit of determination. These words of thanks are specifically for the enthusiasm and activity of the German Presidency; they do not amount to approbation of the actual substance of the proposals, since such approbation could only be given by the European Parliament itself. As regards the substance, I do not think we are in a position to pronounce today. The documents

which we have only just received deal with a subject which is complicated in substance, and difficult to analyse so that they ought first to be examined.

My first reaction is to say that there are a great number of omissions. Not a word is said about creating new resources, and the conciliation procedure closely resembles the one proposed by the Commission and which failed to satisfy Parliament; the budgetary procedure itself comprises important points on which we are not satisfied.

But I do not propose to begin a debate on the substance here. I should like instead to ask the Council for a few details. In paragraph 26b of its resolution of 5 October 1973, Parliament asked the Council not to adopt its proposals without prior consultation with Parliament.

It appears from the statement made just now by the President-in-Office of the Council, that the Council was concerned to respect this request. He spoke of guidance and said that the matter would have to be discussed once Parliament had stated its position. It thus appears that the question is still open. On the other hand, as regards the form this conciliation is to take, the Council perhaps does not have quite the same point of view as Parliament. It is now awaiting any comments this House may make on the text it proposes to use to amend the Treaties. After this it will consider them. This would seem to indicate that the Council expects us to decide something before it holds any discussions.

Parliament's thinking was different. Parliament wished to see conciliation on these matters which would not only deal with the way in which new expenditure was pledged, on an important and recurring basis, but would also deal with budgetary procedure, the establishment of a Court of Auditors and the adoption of financial regulations. We want conciliation to cover all this, and this, we feel, should be discussed in a clear and detailed dialogue between the two Institutions rather than by sending a document which the Council would debate once again on its own.

Broadly speaking, we should like this conciliation to start by defining what the conciliation itself is meant to be and to define the budgetary powers by agreement between the Institutions.

I should like to know whether the Council is aware of this aspect of the matter, whether it is willing to have conciliation of this kind and if it is able, in this connection, to suggest a date or dates.

At the crossroads we have now reached, only positive answers to these questions will enable progress to be made without further ado on this

**Spénale**

matter which we, like yourself, Mr President-in-Office, consider to be of major importance as regards our interinstitutional equilibrium and cooperation which we consider to be vital. And in this respect, you can rest assured of our greatest possible willingness to work towards the building of Europe.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Giraud.

**Mr Giraud**, *Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee.* — (I) Mr President, I too should like to speak, first to thank the President-in-Office of the Council for his statements to this House and secondly to support the comments made just now by the chairman of the Committee on Budgets.

I should also like to stress the institutional aspect of the question of the Parliament's budgetary powers which thus brings it within the competence of the Political Affairs Committee. We are not trying to start an argument here—we have never done this in the past—as to whether the Political Affairs Committee or the Committee on Budgets is more important. As regards technical aspects, we concede that the Committee on Budgets has precedence. Nevertheless, we consider it necessary to stress the importance of the political aspect and the institutional aspects involved in this question of budgetary powers and I think Parliament will wish to authorize the Political Affairs Committee to express a well-considered opinion on these proposals by the Council.

I, too, have no wish to discuss at this stage the merits of the proposals outlined. I consider it will be the duty of the Political Affairs Committee, in conjunction with the Committee on Budgets, to examine the proposals and submit an assessment and a conclusion on them to Parliament, so that Parliament can take its decisions. Indeed, I cannot but stress the importance, for the institutional growth of the Community, of any progress which is possible in respect of the European Parliament's powers and particularly its budgetary and supervisory powers. I hope, as Chairman Spénale also hoped in his concluding words—that the Council will in fact agree not only to hear Parliament's opinion, but will agree to begin conciliation in the discussion of these proposals, so that Parliament can see that from now on it has a real chance to have a say in Council decisions on the Community budget and can see from now on that it has the opportunity to help define these powers in a logical and democratic fashion, as a living and decisive part of the reality of the European Community.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Aigner.

**Mr Aigner.** — (D) Mr President, since we are not able to embark on any detailed debate today, I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council a question regarding his proposals. It is, I must say, a rather basic question, but I hope we shall be able to talk about it.

My question is this: is the Council prepared to conduct the procedure of dialogue between Parliament and Council in the manner envisaged in the joint declaration on the conciliation procedure, i.e. in the manner you proposed?

Mr President, what I don't want is the situation where we again take decisions, appear before the Council with a delegation, the Council dismisses us with friendly assurances, shuts its doors, and carries on deciding in the way it alone thinks fit.

My question then is as follows: will the conciliation procedure, when these proposals are discussed, in fact be applied in the way the Council itself suggests?

**President.** — I would remind Members that we must confine ourselves here to 20 minutes speaking time; five minutes for the chairman of the Committee in question and a total of fifteen minutes for Members of the House.

Subsequently the President-in-Office of the Council may, if he wishes, comment briefly on the remarks which have been made.

I call Mr Pounder.

**Mr Pounder.** — Mr President, I shall, of course, observe your request for brevity.

This is a very important document. Obviously one cannot reach a definitive judgment on the basis of a quick and first reading.

May I just say this to the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers? The first impressions of the European Conservative Group are undoubtedly favourable to these proposals and obviously we shall give them great and careful study. However, I should like to put one question to the President-in-Office. Can he give an assurance that, once the relevant committees, and indeed this Parliament as a whole, have had an opportunity to study and discuss these very important proposals, a joint meeting will be arranged between the Council of Ministers and representatives of this Parliament so that we can have a dialogue on the outcome of the deliberations which the committees, and so on, will hold. Can the President-in-Office give this assurance that we shall have a meaningful talk with the Council of Ministers at an appropriate time?

**President.** — I call Mr Wischnewski.

**Mr Wischnewski.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. I should like to make just five points.

Firstly, I have every sympathy as regards the annoyance at the delays which have occurred, as I too have experienced them in this House.

Secondly, I am glad that Parliament too speaks of a step in the right direction. I must point out that it was, of course, not exactly easy to arrive at this compromise.

Thirdly, I appreciate that Parliament must first read through the documents carefully.

Fourthly, there is absolutely no impediment to dialogue among the Community Institutions with regard to this question.

Fifthly, we should be glad if no further delays occur. I should be grateful if that could be borne in mind. As regards Mr Aigner's question on how the matter will be handled further: I shall recommend that the Council proceeds in the manner proposed here.

(Applause)

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Wischnewski.

This item is now closed.

##### 5. Question Time

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is Question Time (Doc. 122/74).

We shall begin with questions to the Council of the European Communities.

I call Oral Question No 1 by Lord O'Hagan on the budgetary powers of the European Parliament:

'What progress has the Council made towards agreeing to increase the budgetary powers of the European Parliament?'

I call Mr Wischnewski to answer this question.

**Mr Wischnewski, President-in-Office of the European Communities.** — (D) Mr President, I feel that the statement I made to your assembly regarding the line which the Council intends to follow concerning the strengthening of budgetary powers of the European Parliament answers Lord O'Hagan's question about the progress made by the Council in this respect.

**President.** — I call Lord O'Hagan to put a supplementary question.

**Lord O'Hagan.** — Can the President-in-Office say what obstacles now remain in the way of putting into effect without delay those of the proposals he has outlined which do not involve amendments to the Treaties?

**President.** — I call Mr Wischnewski.

**Mr Wischnewski.** — (D) Mr President, from the Council's point of view there are no obstacles. We now have to await the outcome of the dialogue on this important matter which is now under way.

As far as the Council is concerned, there are no other problems.

**President.** — We now move on to questions put to the Commission of the European Communities. I call Oral Question No 2 by Lord Chelwood on the concern of the New Zealand Government over present and future exports of dairy and sheep meat products to the Community:

'What anxieties have been expressed by the New Zealand Government about their 1973 dairy exports to the Community and future prospects in the light of Protocol 18 of the Treaty of Accession, Council Regulation 226/73,<sup>1</sup> and Commission Regulation 713/74,<sup>2</sup> and about sheep meat exports?'

I call Sir Christopher Soames to answer this question.

**Sir Christopher Soames (Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities).** — In 1973 the quantity of butter exported by New Zealand under Protocol 18 of the Treaty of Accession was 131,000 metric tons, that is, some 35,000 tons less than the full amount authorized in the Protocol. For cheese, the total was 46,000 tons, which is 23,000 tons less than the full amount authorized.

The New Zealand authorities have conveyed to the Commission their concern about the prices they are receiving under Protocol 18 and about the possible future trend of these prices.

The Commission has studied various aspects of this problem in its report to the Council on the operation of the Protocol during 1973. It is now making a thorough examination of the implementation of the Protocol and will make proposals to the Council if necessary.

On sheep-meat, we have made it clear that we shall take into account the position of New Zealand as an important supplier of the Community.

<sup>1</sup> O.J. No L 27, 1 February 1973, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> O.J. No L 88, 1 April 1974, p. 17.

**President.** — I call Lord Chelwood to put a supplementary question.

**Lord Chelwood.** — In thanking Sir Christopher Soames for his helpful reply, which clearly confirms that this problem can be dealt with through normal Community machinery, may I ask him to go a little further and to confirm that New Zealand has sound reasons for seeking a better return for her dairy exports to the United Kingdom, taking into account such factors as, for instance, the doubling of production costs, the steep increase in freight rates and higher world prices, all of which have happened since June 1971?

At the same time, can he confirm that a reasonable increase in the return for the New Zealand producer need not put up costs for the British consumer, nor need it prejudice in any way the marketing in the United Kingdom of butter and cheese from other Community countries?

**President.** — I call Sir Christopher Soames.

**Sir Christopher Soames.** — In answer to the last part of the supplementary question, I can confirm to Lord Chelwood that an increase in the price of butter and cheese to New Zealand need not have the effect of putting up the price to the consumer. As to the increase of freight costs and costs of production, plainly there have been some increases. I take Lord Chelwood's point.

He would not, I know, wish me to prejudge the examination which I said we are in the course of making at this moment by indicating what effect exactly these costs have had and what effect they should therefore have on our attitude towards any change of prices under the Protocol.

The New Zealand Government have very kindly invited me to visit them. I hope to take advantage of this invitation and to go there in September. I hope that I shall then be able to have detailed discussions with them on the future course and pattern of our trade between New Zealand and the Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to put a supplementary question.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I hope that Sir Christopher Soames, after his visit to New Zealand in the autumn, will make firm proposals to the Council of Ministers regarding sheep-meat, which he mentioned in reply to the initial question. How is that likely to affect the New Zealand producers and the consumers in the Community—not only in the United Kingdom?

**President.** — I call Sir Christopher Soames.

**Sir Christopher Soames.** — My colleague, Mr Lardinois, will be responsible for bringing forward a sheep-meat regulation. I know that he intends to do so. I also know that there are anxieties of various kinds on the meat market. Happily, lamb is not causing anxiety at the moment. Therefore, I do not think that a sheep-meat regulation is at the top of my colleague's priority list at the moment. However, I take note of what the honourable Member has said for when the moment comes.

**President.** — I call Oral Question No 3 by Lord St. Oswald on trade relations between the Community and New Zealand:

'Will the Commissioner summarize the Commission's annual review of trade relations with New Zealand?'

I call Sir Christopher Soames to answer this question.

**Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — As I mentioned in reply to the last question, the Commission makes an annual report on the operation of Protocol 18. There is no annual review of our trade relations as such, but this is a subject on which we are in regular contact with the New Zealand authorities and which I discussed with their Minister of Overseas Trade on his recent visit to Europe.

In the Commission's view, the Community's exports to New Zealand are developing in a satisfactory manner. Last year they amounted to 549 million units of account, which is 79% higher than in 1968.

New Zealand's exports to the Community, which are principally agricultural products, were worth 949 million units of account in 1973, representing an increase of 57% over the same period.

**President.** — I call Lord St. Oswald to put a supplementary question.

**Lord St. Oswald.** — I am naturally most grateful for that reply by the Commissioner. I should like to add that what purported to be a report from the Commission to the Council appeared in the British press about two months ago. I think that it would help the kind of dialogue between the Commission and this Parliament of which we both approve if some résumé or condensed version of any report—I understand that it was not a formal report—were published in order that we could discuss it among ourselves and at a later time with the Commission.

**President.** — I call Sir Christopher Soames.

**Sir Christopher Soames.** — Any formal report that the Commission makes to the Council of Ministers will come before this Parliament. The report to which the honourable Member refers was in the nature of a summary of the situation under Protocol 18 during 1973. Basically, it consists of the figures which I gave in the previous answer to my noble Friend, coupled with a statement of fact on the difficulties with freight, price, and the like, which have changed since then. It was not a long report. I shall be delighted to let the honourable Member and this Parliament see it.

**President.** — I call Oral Question No 4 by Mr Hougardy on State aid to students:

'The Member States follow different procedures for awarding grants to their students, contrary to Article 118 of the EEC Treaty, which provides for close cooperation between Member States, particularly in matters relating to vocational training. Does the Commission therefore intend to submit proposals to harmonize these systems of State aid to students?'

I call Mr Cheysson to answer this question.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) The question put by the honourable gentleman can be interpreted in two ways. On the one hand, Article 118 of the EEC Treaty does, it is true, state that the Commission must promote close cooperation between Member States in the social field, particularly in matters relating to basic and advanced vocational training.

However, the fact that Member States have different procedures for awarding grants to students following basic or advanced vocational training does not constitute an infringement of Article 118.

All the same, the Commission wants to progress towards the kind of harmonization of the criteria for awarding grants which the honourable Member wishes to see, and it is currently gathering the information it requires as a basis for assessment. For example, it has nearly completed a detailed study on the possibility, in each Member State, of obtaining paid leave to attend courses.

On the other hand, the term "students" in the question may refer to another field outside that defined in Article 118 of the Treaty, that is, to education.

If this is so, the question should be approached from the point of view of cooperation in educational matters.

The way to this kind of cooperation was opened up in a resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers of Education on 6 June 1974, in Luxembourg.

The Commission is now planning to initiate talks on student mobility. The problem of the financial assistance existing in each Member State for these students, that is, those attending universities or following postgraduate studies, will be examined.

The Commission will keep Parliament informed of its activities in this sphere.

**President.** — I call Mr Hougardy to put a supplementary question.

**Mr Hougardy.** — (F) Mr President, I should just like to thank Mr Cheysson for that reply.

Allow me to point out that I asked this question because it is clear from figures I have in my possession that the scholarships and grants awarded by the Member States of the Community for public higher education vary considerably from country to country, and in some cases are twice as much in one country as in another, with approximately the same population.

This, Mr President, was why I felt it was still necessary to draw attention to these anomalies, especially as we have gained little real encouragement from the meetings of national Ministers of Education. Indeed, these have often had to be postponed, and the meeting which was, I am glad say, held recently in Luxembourg did not manage to reach any solution on the equivalence of university qualifications, which is an extremely important matter, as there will be no possibility of exchanges or freedom of movement until the equivalence of professional qualifications is recognized.

Please forgive me, Mr President, for having departed briefly from the subject of my question.

**President.** — As Mr Bousch is not present, his Oral Question No 5 on the free movement of persons and goods will be answered in writing. I call Oral Question No 6 by Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker, on the sending of an observer from the Government of the United States:

'The Commission is asked what proposals there are for an observer from the Government of the United States of America to meet regularly with the Commission?'

I call Sir Christopher Soames to answer this question.

**Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — I take it that what Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker is concerned to ensure is that we have the fullest and frankest exchange of views with our chief trading partners and notably the United States. The House knows of the Commission's regular high-level consultations with the US administration. To take one example, last Thursday and Friday President Nixon's Special Trade Representative, Mr Eberle, and I jointly presided over such consultations in Brussels covering such diverse subjects as international trade, energy, investment, industrial policy, relations with developing countries, supplies of scarce food and raw materials and most major items of purely bilateral economic and commercial interest between the Community and the United States. Accordingly, on our side, my colleagues Mr Simonet, Mr Dahrendorf, Mr Lardinois, Mr Gundelach and Mr Cheysson all took part in these discussions.

As on other occasions, both sides found this a most useful way of keeping in touch. These meetings are, of course, supplemented by frequent exchanges of visits between individual Commissioners and senior American officials or Ministers, and are underpinned by daily contact and consultations through diplomatic channels, both through the Commission's Delegation in Washington and through the United States Mission in Brussels, to whose work I should like to pay a special tribute. If Sir Douglas wants to see an observer of the United States Government who is in constant touch with us, he need look no further.

**President.** — I call Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker to put a supplementary question.

**Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker.** — Mr President, may I thank the Commissioner for that reply and congratulate the Commission on the considerable progress in Community-United States relations which has taken place since I put this question down and for which the President of the United States has paid tribute to Sir Christopher Soames?

Although I believe that in practice such co-operation is good, may I ask the Commissioner whether for the future he will consider some way of institutionalizing or formalizing more regular contacts, in an effort to avoid some of the public misunderstandings which have taken place in the last six months?

**President.** — I call Sir Christopher Soames.

**Sir Christopher Soames.** — I think that matters affecting the Community are well institu-

tionalized. Indeed, the meetings to which I referred take place at regular intervals—about every six months—and I do not think that either the United States or the Community feel that there is not an adequate dialogue on matters that are of Community responsibility.

However, there are of course other matters which are outside the Community's responsibility and which fall into the general category of political co-operation. Here it is my impression—though this, of course, is outside any responsibility of mine—that both sides feel that there is a good deal to be desired and that the sooner a pattern of dialogue as effective under the heading of political co-operation can be brought into being, as exists under the Community hat, the better it will be for all. This does not refer by any means only to the United States of America.

**President.** — Lord Mansfield has intimated that in view of his other commitments he would prefer to have his Oral Question No 7, on opium production in Turkey, postponed until the next part-session.

I call Oral Question No 8 by Mr Brewis, for whom Mr Scott-Hopkins is deputizing, on food prices:

'The Commission is asked if they are satisfied that the lower prices at present ruling for beef animals are being adequately passed on to the benefit of the consumer?'

I call Sir Christopher Soames to answer this question.

**Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — During the latter part of 1973 the reduction in prices for beef animals was not accompanied by a drop in beef prices to consumers in most Member States. However, since the beginning of this year there has been a more satisfactory trend. As an indication, I can inform the honourable Member that during the period from January to April, when average producer prices in the Community increased by 1.7 per cent, there was a decrease in consumer prices of 0.5 per cent in Britain, 1.5 per cent in Germany, and 2 per cent in the Netherlands. On the other hand, there was an increase of 2 per cent in France, 1 per cent in Belgium, and between 0.25 per cent and 0.5 per cent in Italy.

The Commission considers it essential that consumers should enjoy the full benefit of price reductions at a time when supplies of meat are plentiful. In order to promote a better knowledge of the market we intend to organize an information campaign both for producers and consumers.

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins, to put a supplementary question.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Would not the Commissioner agree that an information service or an information exercise will not be sufficient in this case and that drastic action should be taken by the Commission if we are to encourage the housewife—the consumer—to buy more beef throughout the Community, which is obviously most important? Will the Commissioner put forward some measures which will safeguard at the same time the income to producers, who are at this moment going through a very difficult period?

**President.** — I call Sir Christopher Soames.

**Sir Christopher Soames.** — Yes, Sir. What we must have are returns for producers which will give them adequate encouragement to develop their production and also ensure that the produce of their efforts reaches the consumer at a reasonable price.

As to what the Commission can do, I have said that we are thinking of going in for an information campaign. The main burden of responsibility here must rest with member governments, because there are all sorts of things involved, such as patterns of distribution and mark-ups, over which the Commission has, and should have, no control. This is not for us.

The patterns are very different in different Member States, and it is for us to ensure that there is a sort of general understanding in the Community and it is for the Commission to do its job. My right honourable friend Mr Lardinois is, I know, much preoccupied with this. But I think that the main burden of responsibility must be put fairly and squarely where it is, which is on the member governments.

**President.** — I call Oral Question No 9 by Mr Blumenfeld on meeting the cost of training Palestinian refugees.

‘What precautions has the Commission taken, or what precautions does it intend to take, to ensure that the Community funds (6.55 million u.a.) which, in accordance with its proposal, are to be paid to UNRWA for the training of Palestinian refugees are in fact used for the intended purpose and not to finance other Palestinian activities?’

I call Mr Cheysson to answer this question.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, on several occasions the Commission has spoken in this House of the problems raised by the 2 1/2 million Palestinian refugees. As you know,

approximately half of these refugees are now in the territories administered by Israel, while the other half are in East Jordan, Syria and the Lebanon. 1,700,000 of them are in the care of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, which has afforded them a means of survival and of maintaining some kind of existence.

Mr President, two years ago the Council decided to set up a major scheme for food aid; the Parliament was informed of this and approved it. The aid is distributed through the United Nations Agency for Palestine Refugees.

In the 1974 budget, which you approved at the time, 11 1/2 million u.a. were allocated to this food aid programme. As the honourable Member has pointed out, we have now proposed a unique, once-only move to stop the closure of schools in 1974, or the closure, to be precise, of preparatory courses for secondary and technical education, affecting some 70,000 children of refugees. I should like to point out, Mr President, that this move was most warmly supported by the four Governments concerned, three Arab Governments and the Israeli Government, who are extremely concerned to avoid any further cause for disquiet among the Palestine refugees, as you can easily imagine what political consequences this might have.

This is an exceptional move intended to help the Agency overcome great financial difficulties; it will, if it is approved by the Council, take the form of an agreement which will not, in this case, be made with the United Nations Agency, but whereby the Commissioner-General of the Agency will give us full guarantees as to the uses to which it is put.

This agreement will be similar to another one already signed by us on food aid, and I had an opportunity some weeks ago, on 24 April to be precise, in a reply to Sir Tufton Beamish, to point out that the implementation of food aid agreements has so far been most satisfactory. So I think we can rely on the United Nations Agency, its Commissioner-General and its officials, to ensure that our agreement is administered correctly.

Finally, I should like to draw the House's attention to the fact that in all the 25 years of operation of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, there has never yet to my knowledge been any criticism of the way aid was distributed, and this is worth remembering. I do not think there is any reason for us to start speculating about their work now.

**President.** — I call Mr Blumenfeld to put a supplementary question.

**Mr Blumenfeld.** — (D) Mr President, I shall try to be brief. I hope the Commissioner will not take it amiss if, in thanking him for his reply, I say straight away that I am not satisfied with it. I should like to go on to ask him this:

Why is it that, now that the whole problem has taken on a new perspective and a new dimension as a result of successful political moves by the American Secretary of State, the Commission intends to entrust this training programme to the UNRWA, an organization which has been in financial difficulties for more than twenty years? And I should also like to ask whether the Commission has considered how much the Arab oil states are prepared to pay to the UNRWA for a programme which will be of direct benefit to their fellow Muslims and their own people.

I think that these questions ought to be studied much more closely by the Commission, before we can accept that this aid is really well-advised.

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, Community aid to the budget of the United Nations Agency for Palestine Refugees is not a new thing, as I said a moment ago—our practice of granting food aid is now in its third year.

The teaching programmes of the United Nations Agency for Palestine Refugees go back to its very beginnings, or in other words, almost 25 years, and affect several hundred thousand children who are attending the Agency's schools in the territories administered by Israel, as well as territories under the Arab authorities in Syria, Jordan and the Lebanon. There is nothing new about this. The very fact that there are now prospects for a peace settlement, thanks to the achievements to which the honourable Member referred, is yet another reason to avoid any further cause for disquiet among the Palestine refugees, which as I said just now might have serious political consequences.

It was for this reason that three Arab Governments and the Israeli Government pressed us, and others, to take action to prevent the Agency from experiencing even greater difficulties this year than it has done in the past.

All the same, the honourable Member is quite right to point out that the contribution of the Arab countries to the well-being of their Palestinian brothers could be greater. This was one of the fundamental points of our reply, and it is for this reason that I said just now that the Commission's proposal to contribute to the

United Nations Agency's teaching activities was an exceptional move which would not under any circumstances be carried beyond 1974.

The Commissioner-General of the United Nations Agency, Sir John Rennie, is fully informed on this matter and expects that by the end of the year he will obtain more assistance from the Arab countries and from the American Government, the relative value of whose contribution has dropped slightly in recent months.

**President.** — I call Lord Chelwood to put a supplementary question.

**Lord Chelwood.** — May I put to Mr Cheysson a point of view different from that of my good friend Mr Blumenfeld? Is it not a fact that the Palestinian refugees would have been not only hopeless but also helpless but for the admirable international aid given to them through UNRWA, which is very seriously short of funds? Is it not essential that the European Community as such should be seen to be playing a generous role in training young Palestinians in the civilian skills which they need now and will need after there is a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, for which we all pray?

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) Mr President, I fully endorse that statement on the achievements of the United Nations Agency. I hope that I also made it clear, in my earlier speech, how much we value the Agency's achievements.

What will happen once there has been a settlement is, however, a different problem: it is uncertain, and perhaps even highly improbable, that these matters will be dealt with through a United Nations Agency once a settlement has been achieved.

We therefore propose that this exceptional assistance be given to the teaching programme in 1974. We have made it clear that this type of assistance administered by the Agency, will not be extended beyond 1974. This does not exclude the possibility that the Community may, in the future, have to fulfil other commitments towards these persons, and others in that region, as part, indeed, of a de facto settlement.

**President.** — I call Mr Giraud to put a supplementary question.

**Mr Giraud.** — (F) Mr President, I wanted to ask whether the Commission gives any attention to the spirit underlying education in certain refugee camps; I am thinking particularly of



**Giraud**

the events in Kyriath-Shmoneh and Maalot. I should like someone to confirm that the teaching is based on peaceful principles.

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) Mr President, the Commission is not proposing that the Community launch its own teaching programme, but for the very reasons given by the honourable Member who spoke before, it is simply proposing that the United Nations Agency's teaching programme for some 70,000 children should not be interrupted this year. This was why it made a recommendation to the Council to give this extra financial support.

If certain governments have doubts about the activities of the United Nations Agency, I should like to make it clear that the Commission does not share these doubts.

Furthermore, this is not the place to express these doubts. Such comments should be directed to the bodies supervising United Nations activities for Palestine refugees.

**President.** — I call Oral Question No 10 by Mr Noè on Community participation in the development of the Amazon Basin:

Does the Commission not consider that it would be desirable for the Community to play a part, by taking technological and financial action, in the development of the Amazon Basin which is being carried out by Brazil with the participation of the United States and Japan?

I call Sir Christopher Soames to answer this question.

**Sir Christopher Soames,** *Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.* — This is not a question that has ever figured in the exchanges of views between the Community and Brazil.

**President.** — I call Oral Question No 11 by Mr Terrenoire, replaced by Mr de la Malène, on relations with certain Mediterranean countries:

'Can the Commission say what measures it plans to take in order to come to terms with the obvious impossibility of observing the deadlines agreed with Morocco and Tunisia to clear up the confusion resulting from the unilateral measures applied by certain new Member States vis-à-vis certain Mediterranean countries?'

I call Mr Cheysson to answer the question.

**Mr Cheysson,** *Member of the Commission of the European Communities.* — (F) Mr President, in spring 1973 the Commission made proposals to the Council on the guidelines for negotiation or

renegotiation of agreements to be made for preferential arrangements with five Mediterranean countries.

In June 1973, the Council gave us a negotiating mandate and negotiations were held from July to October. In October we asked the Council for a supplementary mandate to continue this work. We were hoping to complete negotiations with the Mediterranean countries by the deadline of 31 December 1973, imposed on us by the terms of several international agreements.

It will be obvious to the House that on 11 June 1974, we have considerably over-stepped the deadline of 1 January.

This has led to a great deal of confusion, as the honourable Member points out, and I leave you to judge where the responsibility lies.

At the last meeting of the Council of Ministers, my colleague Sir Christopher Soames once again drew the Council's attention to the problems arising for Tunisia and Morocco.

The agreements with these countries will expire, as the honourable Member has pointed out, on 31 August 1974.

What are we going to do then?

If we are not given a negotiating brief in the next few weeks, we shall be faced, in the Commission's view, with a disastrous situation. It will have disastrous effects on our relations with the three Maghreb countries. And it will have disastrous effects at a more general level, as people who are inclined to doubt the seriousness of the Community's intentions and of the nine European states' intentions in their attempts to open up a dialogue between Europe and the Arab world, will have their doubts confirmed.

If, on the other hand, the Commission can be given a brief to resume negotiations at the next meeting of the Council of Ministers, we believe that it will still be possible to save the situation. But there is no doubt that there will have to be a transitional period after the expiry of existing agreements with Tunisia and Morocco, before the new agreement to be negotiated under this brief can be implemented.

More generally, too, going beyond Tunisia and Morocco, and as the honourable Member has so rightly pointed out, the unilateral measures applied by certain Community Member States—indeed, by certain new Member States vis-à-vis certain Mediterranean countries—have resulted in confusion and irregularities.

Initially, this was due to the Community's inability to maintain its commitments vis-à-vis Spain and Israel, which should have obtained new agreements by 1 January 1974.

**Cheysson**

But the situation was aggravated by unilateral action on the part of certain Member States, the very action to which the honourable Member has referred.

The Commission deplores the fact that all efforts to find at least some pragmatic and temporary solutions have failed to show results so far.

But it hopes that the main problem will be borne in mind, which is to bring the current negotiations to a close and to call a halt to this intolerable situation where for several months we have had to turn away our negotiating partners every week.

**President.** — I call Mr de la Malène to put a supplementary question.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (*F*) Mr President, I should like to thank the Commission for the information it has given in this reply. I was glad to hear about the background to the problem, and its opinion on the present situation.

I am in complete agreement with the Commission's point of view. In 1973 we had great hopes but unfortunately these were dashed, one by one, as the year went by.

The Mediterranean was one of the areas where we had hoped we might see the first approaches to a common foreign policy on the part of the Community, and we had spoken of an overall policy, a joint approach...

**President.** — Mr de la Malène, I called you to put a brief question.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (*F*) Mr President, I am always brief and would never misuse my speaking time. Besides, I am quite familiar with the Rules of Procedure.

In response to your request, I shall just ask a simple question. We did have these hopes, then, and we should like to ask whether the Community intends to ask the Council, not just for a negotiating mandate to settle the problems of the agreement ending on 31 August, but if it intends to relate the question to this plan for a common, overall policy which we had hoped to apply in the Mediterranean and which, thanks to the attitude adopted by certain new Member States of the Community, is crumbling away as the months pass.

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (*F*) Our reply is categorically 'yes'. The Commission sets all its activities, and

hence all its recommendations in this respect, in the context of its overall approach to the Mediterranean. I would also call Parliament's attention to the fact that this overall approach to the Mediterranean has taken on an even greater importance since a European-Arab dialogue has been proposed by the Community of the Nine, and this was officially confirmed yesterday by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the nine Member States meeting in Bonn. In essence this incorporates the overall approach mentioned by the honourable Member.

**President.** — I call Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker to put a supplementary question.

**Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker.** — Will the Commissioner confirm that the delay in reaching this agreement also holds up agreements with a further four countries—Malta, Cyprus, Egypt and the Lebanon?

Will he point out to the Council of Ministers that, although it is difficult enough to stop the clock in Brussels, it is a long time since anybody got the sun to stand still in the Mediterranean?

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (*F*) Mr President, the Mediterranean has not seen much sun for several months and a particularly deep gloom has settled on our agreement.

In the question put by the honourable Member, I would distinguish between two groups of countries. On the one hand there are the three countries, Spain, Israel and Malta, whose negotiations are linked with those concerning the Maghreb countries and on the other hand there are two more countries who recently presented us with proposals to resume negotiations with a view to extending our agreements. Those countries are Egypt and the Lebanon. I put these two countries in a separate category because agreements with them already existed and because their governments only forwarded a proposal to renegotiate them a few weeks ago.

**President.** — As Mr McDonald is not present, Oral Question No 12 on monetary compensatory amounts will be answered in writing.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

Question Time is closed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Annex: Oral Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers.

6. *Welcome to a Delegation from the Turkish Parliament*

**President.** — Before we continue our proceedings, I should like to welcome the delegation from the Great National Assembly of Turkey, which forms part of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the EEC-Turkey Association.

(*Applause*)

This visit will benefit the existing parliamentary cooperation for the development of Turkey's association with the Community.

I feel sure that the work of the Joint Parliamentary Committee cannot fail to give a new impetus to the association between Turkey and the enlarged Community and will encourage increasingly active participation by Turkey in the creation of Europe.

7. *Oral question with debate: Political rights of migrant workers*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the Oral Question with debate by Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli, Mr Marras, Mrs Iotti and Mr Fabbrini and Mr Sandri, to the Council of the European Communities, on the political rights of migrant workers (Doc 14/74 rev.). The question reads as follows:

At a colloquy on the political rights of migrant workers held in Brussels during the weekend of 23/24 February 1974 by the 'Santi Institute', Mr Ernest Glinne, the Belgian Employment Minister, delivered a long and interesting speech on this problem.

Mr Glinne informed the participants that at the Paris summit Belgium had supported the idea of granting migrant workers the right to vote at municipal level in all the Member States after five years of residence.

1. Is it true that the Italian Minister did not support the proposal made at the February 1973 Council meeting by the Belgian representative that the migrant workers of the Community be granted the right to vote in municipalities?
2. What is the position of the Federal Republic of Germany on this important matter, that State being the principal host country for the migrant workers of the Community?
3. Would the Council be prepared to recommend that the Member States try for themselves the—successful—Belgian experiment of setting up advisory committees of immigrants attached to the municipal councils and elected by universal suffrage?
4. Would the Council welcome a Commission proposal on these lines?

I would remind you that on Monday Parliament decided to limit the speaking time for questions as follows:

— 10 minutes for the questioner

— 5 minutes for other speakers.

Otherwise, the provisions of Rule 47 remain in force. I call Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli to speak to the question.

**Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the problem raised with this question by a group of members is, I think, extremely important, both as regards the status of migrant workers and also—even more significantly, when we see the matter in its true perspective—as regards the integration and creation of Europe, and the democratic future of its institutions, especially our own European Parliament.

First of all we should like to express our sincere gratitude to our colleague Mr Glinne, for raising this problem on so many occasions in his various capacities: as mayor, Member of Parliament, and minister, and for carrying out these experiments in his municipality with what at that time could almost be called a pioneering spirit. Mr Glinne has made an extremely important point which gives us food for thought. He has pointed out that in his country, Belgium, the number of migrant workers is taken into account when determining how many seats should be held by each province in the two Houses of Parliament, but that these same workers, who are counted for determining the number of seats, are denied the right to vote.

We think this point strikes home at the political crux of the matter, which has several different stages. The most remote is the problem of voting in national parliamentary elections, and we would be the first to acknowledge the difficulties this involves. But there is another stage which presents far less difficulty. I mean the possibility of voting in elections for the European Parliament. Indeed it would be quite unthinkable to deny Community citizens the right to this vote simply because they do not live in their country of origin, when it comes to electing a parliament which was set up precisely—by very definition—to transcend national boundaries. This too is a matter which is more relevant to the future, as we have not yet reached the stage of direct elections for the European Parliament. All the same, it is necessary to have a clear idea of intentions.

The third stage is even more immediate and concerns votes in local elections. We are persuaded that the time has now come to tackle this problem. Experiments have been carried out, mainly in Belgium, which have a particular bearing on committee elections. They have shown that these workers, both from Com-

**Carettoni Romagnoli**

munity and third countries not only take an active part in voting, (it had been suggested that they might not go to the poll) but that they do vote and are in no doubt at all for whom to vote. After the experiments in co-optation they successfully changed over, by way of the advisory committees, to a system of direct voting. This success encouraged Belgian MPs to put two bills before parliament: Mr Glinne's bill and Mr Leviaux's bill, and it is the re-submission of Mr Glinne's bill that we are supporting here today.

Far less progress has been made in the Federal Republic of Germany. Altogether one might say that the dialogue has only just started. However, both these limited experiments and the more advanced ones have convinced us that it is high time the Community organizations took a clear and positive stand.

We do not think we can rely simply on the good-will shown in any quarter, but we think (and this is why we submitted the question) that this is one of the fields where one would expect the Community organizations, rather than individual governments, to take the initiative and start the ball rolling. This was why we put the queries in points 3 and 4 of our question to the Council, feeling that these points would be in keeping with the aims set out in the 1973 Social Action Programme. But we included another question because we believe it is very important to know the German Federal Republic's position on this, because, as we all know, there are three and a half million migrant workers in that country. We believe that the whole of this topic should be considered in relation to the political momentum provided by the Paris Summit talks on European citizenship.

Less than a month ago, my colleague Mr Andreotti reminded Parliament of the reference made to this topic in the Communiqué from the Paris Summit. We want to raise this point again and think it essential to study the full implications of the problem and to arrive at some solution. I should like to say beforehand that we would take an extremely grave view of any signs of coolness or refusal—and I hope it will be confirmed that my Government changed its position at more recent Council meetings—not simply for human, social and democratic reasons, but because any coolness or failure to respond to this problem would reveal little or no realization that Europe is, in fact, being created by the combined efforts of this work force, which is paying a high price, and making great sacrifices, to shape this new kind of European citizen who will only emerge from exchanges of opinion, from the free movement of labour, but certainly not from any treaty.

**President.** — I call Mr Wischnewski.

**Mr Wischnewski,** *President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities.* — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. The Council would like to point out that it cannot make public, confirm or deny the position taken by any member at meetings, which have to remain confidential. I hope you will appreciate why this has to be so.

As for the problem of migrant workers, the Council, in its Resolution of 21 January 1974 on the Social Action Programme, laid down a number of guide lines for the establishment of an action programme for these workers and members of their families. The Commission must now submit to the Council the proposals necessary for it to adopt this programme.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Wischnewski. I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we all know that certain political rights are normally granted to migrant workers by the Member States of the European Community, with a view to forming associations for providing cultural and social interests or for the purpose of "peaceful and unarmed demonstration", to quote the Belgian Constitution. But it is quite a different matter when it comes to political rights at the highest level—the right to elect and to be elected.

We feel, Mr President, that this matter must be tackled positively, bearing in mind the highly significant fact that the European Community now has a kind of nation within a nation, made up of migrant workers from both Community and non-Community countries, and so numerous that today they might almost be called the tenth unofficial Community state.

We believe that they must be integrated, that we must encourage new types of political participation, at various levels, to their own advantage, taking their membership or non-membership of the Community as the criterion for determining and assessing the type of political participation involved.

It was in this spirit, that, as you are aware, certain proposals were made at the European Summit in Paris in October 1972. On this occasion the Belgian Prime Minister, Mr Eyskens, and Mr Andreotti, the President of the Council of the Italian Republic, suggested that certain voting rights in local elections be granted to all nationals of Community Member States, regardless of their place of residence. These government proposals were, in a sense, an amplification

**Glinne**

of certain suggestions made by Mr Mansholt when President of the Commission of the European Communities.

Truth is no slander, and my position as a Member of this Parliament permits me to speak out without fear or favour. I want to make it quite clear that in 1973 the Belgian Government confirmed the stand taken in Paris by Prime Minister Eyskens at every single meeting of the Council of Ministers on the subject of social affairs.

The Belgian Government also made a number of specific suggestions which to say the least were greeted very coldly and gained no real supporters.

On the political level, Mr President, I am happy to say that so far two bills have been put before national parliaments, sponsored by Socialist groups: in Italy, the bill submitted by Messrs Minocci, Corona and others, and in Belgium, the bill which I had the honour of re-introducing on 22 May last on behalf of my party.

This bill would grant EEC nationals the right to vote after 5 years of residence, and the right to be elected after 10 years of residence. The Socialist Group of the European Parliament believes we must progress gradually, but with vision, to give a political voice to these nationals of Community Member States.

At this level, our concern is to work towards a political Europe and the concept of European citizenship mentioned a moment ago. We must recognize that migrant workers from Community countries are so to speak cousins in their host countries.

In the same way, when it comes to elections for the European Parliament by universal suffrage, it is clear that EEC nationals must be included in the national electorate, and a tripartite bill recently put before the Belgian Parliament lays down that if, in two years' time, the Belgian delegation to the European Parliament is elected by direct universal suffrage, the electors will include both Belgian citizens and any EEC nationals living in Belgium.

I think that this factor will be all the more important in the political consolidation of Europe, after the crisis it has gone through and the delays which have occurred in work towards political union.

Mr President, I should like to add that as regards the political rights of Community workers in their own country of origin, national parliaments must make it easier for those living abroad to participate in their own country's political life, with full voting rights and facilities for postal votes.

As regards the whole body of migrant workers, both Community and non-Community nationals, my Group considers it important to encourage the experiments now under way, in Belgium, the Netherlands and the Federal German Republic using a system of local advisory committees for non-nationals. We also feel that the Council and the Commission of the European Communities should encourage efforts to compare, coordinate and eventually harmonize the migration policies now practised in isolation by each of the Member States in their relations with third countries.

This work should be inspired primarily by a wish to rationalize cooperation and to encourage development on the intercontinental scale, rather than seeing migration simply as a means of satisfying purely economic requirements.

Mr President, we feel that in any case, having drawn a distinction between Community and non-Community migrants, an effort should be made to examine the vast problems they involve for European society, ridding ourselves of any narrow nationalistic concepts, especially when we are discussing the problems of migrant workers from the Community. These men should not be treated merely as a labour force conveniently shunted to and fro in accordance with the vagaries of the economic situation; they must be treated as compatriots. However, I fear that the proposals made so far to further their interests are extremely meagre, and singularly lacking in substance.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR BURGBACHER  
*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Bersani.

**Mr Bersani.** — *(I)* Mr President, on behalf of the other Italian members of my group, I should like to state that we agree with the questioner and his definition of the problems raised and the basic aims involved.

I should also like to pay tribute to Mr Glinne who, together with other members of his family, has been a true pioneer in this field, and has concerned himself with these problems for many years. We would like to thank him for the work he has done in the past, and is still doing, to translate his aims into legislation.

Having said this, I would add that today we can only discuss one aspect of the problem. Tomorrow we will be discussing some requests on which Mr Wieldraaijer has prepared a report and we shall then be able to tackle the problem in more general terms.

**Bersani**

But to keep to the subject of the political rights of migrant workers, I should like to stress that we approve wholeheartedly of the plans for these workers to participate—through certain advisory bodies today and a fuller, more rational system in the future—in elections for local councils and national parliaments and—when the time comes—in elections for the European Parliament by universal suffrage.

We believe that, especially in this area of moral and civil rights and matters affecting the political status of migrant workers in the European Community, a great deal of progress must be made if we want to achieve a true Community in every sense of the word. With a total number of migrant workers close on 11 million, the problem is hardly a marginal one. This is a fundamental problem, one of the problems against which the Community will have to measure its ability to create conditions of true humanity and equality, with effective participation for all.

To come now to the specific point made in the question, I think we should at least be able to hope for some action by the Commission in the very near future. From what has just been said I gather that the Council representative has given the green light to this. Any action of this kind should consist primarily of recommendations to Member States on measures for setting up advisory committees elected by universal suffrage, of the kind set up in many Belgian municipalities.

I have been following recent events with much interest and should like to say that I wholeheartedly support this action. I do not think that the experiment created any practical problems or difficulties for the Belgian authorities and, as Mrs Caretoni said, there was a massive and eager response from the immigrant electors. We are therefore asking the Commission to take some action, and to give it priority. We have been talking about these problems for several years now. This is the first step along the right road, but we still have a very long haul and must act with a great deal more decision and responsibility. If it takes us so long to take such a limited step it does not say much for our ability to tackle the major and decisive problems of creating a Community of men who are free citizens, participating equally in determining a common destiny.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Alfred Bertrand.

**Mr Alfred Bertrand**, chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on

Social Affairs and Employment I should like to say that we are of course completely in agreement with the action taken by our colleagues to give political rights to migrant workers, and to start some form of participation in the political life of the countries where they live and work. But I should like to point out that at this moment we must be wary of spreading our initiatives over too wide an area, in case the Charter which migrant workers deserve to have in the Community is postponed indefinitely as a result.

The Community now has some ten million migrant workers, who can be divided into four categories. First of all, we have the category of workers entitled to take part in the free movement of labour among Community member states. Incidentally, I think it is wrong to call this group 'migrant workers'; they are Community nationals with the same rights in social and trade union affairs, and in safety and social security, and in these spheres they should not be subject to any kind of discrimination in the countries where they have settled. Under the Paris and Rome Treaties the Commission would appear to have a number of legal possibilities to ensure that the workers who are able to move freely throughout the Community do not in practice experience any kind of discrimination. The second category consists of Turkish workers. Because of the Association Agreement with the EEC they can also claim a different legal status from other workers who are not Community nationals. At present we are in a transitional stage of the Association Agreement with Turkey which specifies that after a transitional period of 12 years, free movement of Turkish workers within the Community should be made possible. Under Articles 36 and 39 of the Association Agreement, the Association Council has already been able to make certain recommendations on behalf of Turkish workers and investigate a number of questions relating to social security, medical care, old-age pensions, family allowances and so on. We can now help by tackling these questions as emphasized in particular by Article 39 of the Association Agreement.

The third category consists of workers from third countries. These are now present in the Community in very large numbers as a result of bilateral agreements with Member States over which neither the Commission nor the Council are able to exercise any legal control whatever. These bilateral agreements vary from country to country. Some countries give one-year working contracts, while others give them two years. In some cases the employee can, after two years, change to a different sector from that for which he was recruited in the first instance.

**Bertrand**

Reciprocal agreements on social security and so on do not always exist. In a word the arrangements for workers from third countries are chaotic. The fourth category consists of foreign workers who are living in the Community illegally. They also number tens of thousands and the problems they encounter are vast.

If we now try to solve all these problems in one go I fear we shall be involved in lengthy and complex discussion for many years to come without ever finding a real solution.

This is the reason for my concern as Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, and why, for workers free to remain in the Community, I should like to seek solutions to the problems of being reunited with their families, educating their children, reception arrangements, learning the language of the country where they are staying, obtaining accommodation and transferring their savings, and problems relating to working conditions, medical assistance, taxation, dismissal, the rights of organized labour, and returning to their own country. These are problems to which we must give the highest priority on behalf of these workers in the Community. On the other hand, we must give serious consideration to problems of political, cultural and other forms of integration into the society of the host country.

I should also like to point out that there are certain countries who do not want their own nationals who emigrate to other countries to be integrated into the life of the country where they are working, but who insist that migrant workers return home after a certain time. This is another important aspect we shall have to study in depth. We must try to find the best approach to this problem.

Finally, I should like to point out that migrant labour is also an important economic factor, as some countries make fairly extensive use of it as a means of evening out their balance of payments. This is why certain host countries give far more attention to the economic aspects of migrant labour, rather than the human aspects, sometimes forgetting that these workers are merely forced by circumstances to earn their keep in foreign countries. We must therefore give serious attention to all these problems. I would prefer a gradual approach to be taken by both the Parliament and the Commission, depending on the various categories of workers. I hope the Commission will submit the necessary proposals as part of the Social Action Programme which has now been approved, and which also included a scheme for the employment of disabled persons.

Therefore we look forward to appropriate proposals from the Commission.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Della Briotta.

**Mr Della Briotta.** — *(I)* The matter we are debating today and tomorrow is a counterpart to a discussion held by the international trade union movement in Geneva only a few weeks ago, and will be significant, always provided we do not waste all our time on verbal declarations, statements of principle and protestations of solidarity with migrant workers, and do not get caught up in a maze of details at the end of which we shall probably still be faced with the same problem. I do not think it is of any use to make humanitarian speeches, even though the humanitarian thread has run through workers' movements in the last century and we would be the last to deny its value and significance. But here we feel a need and a duty to define precise aims which can be realised step by step.

When we discuss the problem of migrant workers in the European scene we should not forget we are dealing with some ten million players (or should I say sufferers). In other words, it involves almost 10% of the Community's working population. The figures speak for themselves. Strange as it may seem, we might say that in numbers alone they constitute the sixth largest state of the Community, with a population higher than that of Belgium, Denmark, Ireland or Luxembourg: ten million citizens who have left their home countries, either for good or for a shorter or longer period, to work in a country which may well grant them a certain number of rights—although these are usually in the economic sphere, concerning their incomes, social security and health insurance—but virtually debar them from political rights.

The Europe of the Nine has made coal and steel into a European concern, it has encouraged the emergence of a European labour market, with free movement of labour, but in reality the well-known restrictions imposed on it have the effect of cancelling it out (one need only think of the effect of not renewing contracts); in this way it has failed to meet the challenge of building a Europe which is integrated socially and economically.

Giving a meaning to the life of these citizens, many of whom live under conditions which are far from favourable, is more than a way of easing our consciences—it is in the immediate interest of Europe and the countries where the migrant workers live. The migrant workers' real trouble is that even if they have acceptable living conditions (or in fact far better conditions

**Della Briotta**

than in their country of origin), they are essentially rootless. This explains why these workers live in a state of extreme tension in the 'displacement' period when they have been uprooted from their old environment and have not yet settled into their new one, and it explains all these events we hear about, these outbursts of rage which are so bewildering for the migrants' host countries, like the events in France last year, and others in the Federal Republic and Northern Italy, which has in turn experienced massive emigration. In 1969-70 we saw the consequences of this phenomenon which was rather more than a matter of temporary concern; today it is a reality which is being repeated in every part of the globe. If we want to help millions of uprooted citizens to adapt to their host country we must help them to discover their new identity; we must further this process, which must needs be slow, laborious and painful, with or without the support of public opinion, political parties or trade unions. But if we have the courage to do this, if we can stop talking about the lack of legal bases in the Treaties, if we prove our intentions by following the example of our colleague Mr Glinne, who deserves all my thanks and those of the Italian Socialists and the Italian workers who are so much involved in emigration within the Community—I would go so far as to say, if only the various international organizations can stop passing the buck from one to the other, we shall certainly find the solution, which is really very simple—to stop ten million citizens in Europe remaining outsiders in a country which is not their own.

The question mentions the statement made by Mr Glinne in a colloquy on political rights held in Brussels by the 'Santi Institute' which is close to our political party. I should like to remind Members of the action taken by a group of members of my Party which Mr Glinne has mentioned once already. They presented a proposal to the Upper House of the Italian Republic to grant voting rights in local elections to citizens of Community countries resident in Italy for a certain number of years, and I would remind you of a similar step taken by Mr Glinne which is a repetition of an earlier move in 1971; I would add that this is a matter of extreme importance, and an official announcement was made by the Swedish Prime Minister a few weeks ago, saying that as from 1976 the right to vote in elections for municipal and general councils will be granted to immigrants resident in Sweden for at least two years. This measure will affect 270,000 people in Sweden. On a practical level, too, various kinds of experiments have taken place in Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands, setting up committees whose task

is to inform local authorities of the problems of migrant workers and to encourage immigration. The Council of Europe also took action in this field in 1972, nor should we forget the initiative taken by the Council of European Municipalities which, at a meeting in July 1973, supported the right of migrant workers to participate in elections, inviting the municipalities who were members of that organization to take action along these lines to prepare the way for more formal moves. Allowing migrant workers to participate, by granting them the right to vote in local elections is, I think, a necessity, and it also fulfils the criterion of gradual, judicious progress which we must of course bear in mind. We now know what problems arise in connection with the participation of workers in political elections, beginning at the local level—and it is this level, after all, at which the most vital and pressing problems of migrants and their families have to be solved.

*(Applause)*

#### 8. *Change in the agenda*

**President.** — I call Mr Memmel on a point of order.

**Mr Memmel.** — *(D)* Mr President, had we realized that this oral question was going to bring down such an avalanche of speeches, it might have been better to leave it until after I had moved my oral question, which is without debate, and can be disposed of in five minutes. I am informed that several more Members have asked to speak. I do not think we can expect the President of the Council to stay on here this afternoon just for the sake of a single oral question, especially one without debate, and in any case I also have to leave. I would therefore ask that oral question Doc. 34/74 be put on the Agenda for the next part-session.

**President.** — I thus have a proposal from Mr Memmel to have the Oral Question without debate to the Council on relations with the countries of the Mediterranean basin (Doc. 34/74) postponed until the next part-session.

What is the opinion of the President-in-Office of the Council?

**Mr Wischniewski.** — *(D)* The President of the Council agrees to the proposal, but I am of course at Mr Memmel's disposal at any time, Mr President.

**President.** — I thank the President-in-Office of the Council.



**President**

Are there any objections to the postponement? Mr Memmel's oral question is therefore postponed to the next part-session.

9. *Oral Question with debate: Political rights of migrant workers (resumption)*

**President.** — We shall now continue with the debate on the Oral Question on the political rights of migrant workers (Doc. 14/74 rev.) I call Sir John Peel.

**Sir John Peel.** — This question is not only very important but much more complicated than would appear on the surface. Our colleague, Mr Bertrand, put his finger on the very considerable problems that arise under it. For example, the first part of the question, on granting migrant workers the right to vote at municipal level, seems to me to cover not only one group of migrant workers—those from within the Community—but those from third countries as well; and in my own country there are Commonwealth immigrants who have a right to vote as British subjects as soon as they register. The Irish, too, have the right to vote when they come into Britain.

In those circumstances it seems to me that the Oral Question with Debate which is down as No 79 on Thursday on the harmonization of nationality laws is very relevant to this particular point. For instance, does the giving of the vote at municipal level after five years of residence mean in fact that those people will have become citizens of the country in which they live? If not, do they retain a vote in the country from which they came as well as acquiring a vote in the country in which they are now residing? These are questions which will certainly require an answer.

Item 3 of this Question, which concerns the Belgian experiment of setting up advisory committees, is a very different matter, because the election of migrants to advisory committees is much less complex, as the capacity is only advisory.

It seems to me, therefore, that we need to clarify some of these things very much more than is done in the form in which they appear in the Question. My country fully supports the view that migrant workers should receive treatment equal to that applying to nationals, and all people allowed into the United Kingdom enjoy the same social rights and benefits as the natives; but we are now talking of political rights, which is rather different. Freedom of movement inside the Community countries at the moment applies only to Community

nationals, and I suggest that an extension of this freedom to nationals of third countries would not be immediately acceptable either to my own country or to a number of other Community countries.

So, Mr President, this rather easily simplified question which has been put hides some very complex problems. They need a great deal more consideration and study before we can come to any conclusions. I think that we should hear much more about this side of things from the Commission when we get the answer in the debate on Thursday under Item No 79 on the harmonization of nationality laws.

**President.** — I have five more requests to speak.

I assume the House will have no objections if we now suspend our proceedings until 3.00 p.m.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1.00 p.m. and resumed at 3.10 p.m.)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR BERSANI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

I would remind Members of the House that the meeting of the Political Affairs Committee organized under the Davignon procedure will be held this evening at 7.30 p.m.

10. *Election of a Vice-President.*

**President.** — I have received the nomination from the Christian-Democratic Group of Mr Lucien Martens as a Vice-President of the European Parliament, to fill the seat left vacant by Mr Maurice Dewulf.

Since there is only one nomination for this seat I should like to ask Parliament, in accordance with Rule 7 of its Rules of Procedure, to elect Mr Martens by acclamation, unless there are any objections.

*(Applause)*

I thus declare Mr Martens duly elected as a Vice-President of the European Parliament, in the same order of precedence as his predecessor. I should like to extend my hearty congratulations to Mr Martens on his election and say once again, whilst Mr Maurice Dewulf is still with us, how deeply his departure will be regretted and how warmly we hope he will be able to rejoin us at different times and complete the work he has done so far and which has been so warmly and widely appreciated.

*(Applause)*

11. *Oral Question with debate: Political rights of migrant workers (resumption)*

**President.** — We now resume discussion of the question put by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Marras, Mrs Iotti and Mr Fabbrini and Mr Sandri to the Council of the European Communities regarding the political rights of migrant workers.

I call Mr Giraud.

**Mr Giraud.** — (*F*) Mr President, now that the federalist cause has been so ably advocated in this House, and we are resuming debate of an important problem which affects so many who live in our Community, I should first like to add my thanks to those expressed by many of our colleagues to Mr Glinne for the steps he has taken at varying levels of responsibility to protect the political rights of migrant workers.

He has shown that this theory works, which is certainly the best form of proof.

But—and to my own shame I say it—the country I represent has not yet followed suit.

There is much talk at present of granting migrant workers a charter of their rights. This is an extremely broad objective and may thus be hard to achieve, which does not mean we should stop trying. But there are so many considerations involved that any quick solution seems unlikely.

Consequently, and here I am addressing myself to the Commission in particular, I think that in such a specific field as that touched on by our Italian colleague, the Commission should draw on the ideas of Mr Glinne and his colleagues and try to make a conspectus of the problems involved in our various countries with a view to granting equivalent rights to all migrant workers under similar conditions and bearing in mind the ways in which our various constitutions differ.

It is a matter which affects local and regional politics, and also the way in which the European Parliament is elected.

A lot is said nowadays about a "European identity", a slogan which is often bandied about rather unpleasantly. Perhaps, if we set our own house to rights, we could proclaim this European identity we are all seeking by granting the rights of European citizens to migrant workers, who by chance have elected to live outside their own home country. Then they would at least have a European identity.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Pisoni.

**Mr Pisoni.** — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be very brief, not because the problem is unimportant but because we consider that all aspects of this subject can be covered in the debate on the migrant workers' Charter which is scheduled for tomorrow and this will enable us to deal with these matters in greater detail. Even so, the question at issue is of paramount importance to us and we have discussed it on many occasions, both in associations in Italy itself and in emigrant worker associations in the various Community countries. And then there are such special problems as citizenship and, in a number of cases, dual citizenship or the question of being able to have a say in the political decisions taken in the host country.

Although we often talk about "participation" the workers are not really able to participate. We must therefore try to let the workers take part in the civil, administrative and political life of the country to which they have moved either of their own free will or because of the need to continue in their profession. We are glad to see Italian workers joining trade unions. There are not many who have done so: in positions of responsibility about 1,000 to 1,500 Italian workers are engaged in trade union activities in their countries of employment, and here they participate directly in elections. These citizens, who live in municipalities or urban areas of varying size, have to pay taxes, lead their everyday lives and must therefore be able to use local services. We thus consider it logical and self-evident not to debar these workers from taking part, if not actually in political life, at least in the organization of civil and administrative life in the countries where they work.

And the best form of participation is, in fact, the ability to take part in administrative decisions as this involves no great difficulties. Even a short period of residence, say a couple of years, should be enough to ensure an uninterrupted domicile or at any rate to entitle them to have some say in the administration of public funds to which they contribute. This is a fundamental right. We could act in one of two ways: we could try to get all municipalities (as has been done in Belgium) to establish direct contacts with them either by enrolling them in special parallel councils or, even better, by enrolling them in the ordinary municipal councils. So much for political decisions relating to the organization of services and day-to-day life, of direct concern to the migrant worker.

No one is saying that these citizens, who have a say in the political decisions taken in their

**Pisoni**

own countries, should have the same right in their host country, at least not until we have a Europe in which the citizen can express himself as a European: still, his ability to take part in decisions which affect him directly should be generally acknowledged as his right.

From this point of view, it would appear that the Commission, and the Council too, could help bring about this desired state of affairs by doing something more than simply making a recommendation. I am not sure which Community instrument would be best, perhaps a directive, to help us achieve results which, at some future date, will concern not only citizens of the nine Member States of the Community, but all workers working within its borders.

We thus propose to recommend that the Council and Commission take action along these lines, in deference to the wishes of our migrant workers resident in the various European Member States.

**President.** — I call Lord O'Hagan.

**Lord O'Hagan.** — This morning the President-in-Office of the Council intervened briefly in the debate, but he said very little, which did not surprise me, because one has been accustomed to a certain lack of progress at the level of the Council of Ministers resulting either from a lack of will or from a lack of ability to grapple with the problems associated with migrant workers.

However, it did not surprise me for a more generous reason, that the problems connected with migrant workers are, as many other speakers in the debate have said, very complex, some of them perhaps almost intractable, offering a whole variety of difficulties which need to be resolved, and all of which have an influence one on the other.

It may well be that this particular aspect—the political rights of migrant workers—is one of the most difficult problems of all for the Community in its present state to tackle in a meaningful way.

I second the general approach of Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli and Mr Glinne, but I say, as other speakers have said, that political rights cannot be isolated from more general considerations. I would underline that all the difficulties connected with migrant workers represent a European problem which needs a series of European solutions.

It is the success of the Community that has created the jobs which these migrant workers have come to our countries to undertake,

whether they come from another Community country or from outside the Community. Not only have they participated in the prosperity of the Community but they have in part created that prosperity.

If the Community is to go through difficult economic times, we must accept the fact that those migrant workers who are in our countries are a European responsibility. It is a European responsibility to attempt to offer solutions to their difficulties, whether they come from inside the Community or not.

While accepting that the political rights of migrant workers may be one of the more knotty problems in this whole panoply of problems, I ask the Council today whether they cannot propose something a little more positive and a little more practical to show that they are aware and active in this regard.

If the President-in-Office cannot say much more—we would all like him to say more—about the resolution of the difficulties concerning these workers' rights, could he not at least give us a direct report on what the Council of Social Ministers decided yesterday when they were dealing with the extension of the Social Fund to migrant workers? The extension of the Social Fund to migrant workers may not be strictly relevant within the terms of the debate as initiated by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, but it is only by attempting to make progress in considering on various fronts simultaneously the variety of difficulties and problems connected with migrant workers that the European Community will be able to face up to what is, in the ultimate, a European responsibility—a responsibility for the future welfare and development of the migrant workers who have made the Community an economic success.

**President.** — I call Mr Wischniewski.

**Mr Wischniewski, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to comply with this request and can tell you that the Council, in which Ministers for Social and Labour Affairs met yesterday, took important decisions which represent a first series of practical steps to implement the resolution of 21 January 1974 regarding the Social Action Programme.

The Council decided that the Social Fund should contribute to measures designed to assist migrant workers under Article 4 of the Decision to reform the Fund. The main item of this decision are integrated programmes, welfare measures and measures to assist the training and

**Wischniewski**

further training of social workers and teachers responsible for special courses for migrant workers and their children.

The Council largely approved the content of the Commission's proposal which it forwarded to the European Parliament for consultation and which, I believe, is familiar to you. The Council has also introduced a new subsidy to cover the special expenditure required for the specialized education of children of migrant workers.

In addition the Council has set out the views of the Community regarding implementation of Article 39 of the additional protocol to the Ankara agreement on social security for Turkish workers employed in the Member States. As a result of the Council's consultations, the living conditions of these workers and their families can be improved. So much, Mr President, for yesterday's decisions.

I should like to add a few remarks of my own on the political problem. It will be obvious that the freedom of migrant workers to participate in political life in their host countries is of great importance. The three basic factors are:

First: the particular tasks which will face us if, as we hope, we are soon in a position to elect a European Parliament.

Secondly: there is at present considerable variety in the rights of migrant workers to vote in national elections in their own countries.

Thirdly: the opportunities of influencing local politics at the workers' current places of residence.

Many questions have been asked regarding the situation in Germany on this matter, and I should like to make a comment on behalf of my government. As regards the social sector, foreign workers in Germany are fully integrated. This is particularly true as regards voting in works' council elections where they not only vote but also stand for election and are in fact elected to the works' councils of the firms employing them. The same applies to the elections on social matters held a few days ago for retirement pensions and health insurance, where foreign workers are also fully integrated.

The situation is different with regard to local elections. Migrant workers are not entitled to vote in these in Germany, or not yet. But a considerable amount of experience has been gathered. In a variety of towns and municipalities with a particularly high proportion of foreign workers, committees have been set up which advise the competent local authorities on questions affecting these workers. I realize that this is by no means satisfactory, but we in

Germany are currently trying to make improvements.

Mr President, the Council is aware of the particular significance of this problem. We have noted a whole series of important points raised in today's Parliamentary debate, and we are confident that the Commission will be able to submit proposals to us in the foreseeable future.

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (1) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to state that the Commission is fully aware of the importance of the problem under discussion and that it proposes to seek a solution to it under the Social Action Programme for which, as we know, the Commission is to put forward proposals by the end of the year.

The Commission also considers that one aspect of this question can be examined in the debate to be held in this House tomorrow on the question of a European Workers' Charter.

The Commission is of the opinion that action can be taken in these two ways, and speaking for myself I can confirm the positive nature of its thinking, which does not attempt to conceal the legal difficulties arising out of the general terms of the Treaty, which so far has only aggravated problems which were already extremely complex, politically speaking, having regard to the attitude of the individual Member States.

At any rate, the Commission's positive attitude should very soon lead to clear-cut proposals on this particular aspect of the question.

**President.** — I call Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli.

**Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli.** — (1) Mr President, I also speak for my other colleagues who put their names to this question when I voice my warm appreciation of the many expressions of support it has received in this House. Probably it was precisely this support which helped to guide the Council in formulating its reply. The Council had in fact previously given a most disappointing reply; the second Council statement, however, even if it does not provide assurances, nonetheless shows that the Council are to some extent aware of the importance of this problem. I would also say that the Commission's stance is important, even if it is not final. I therefore think that our interventions, if they have done nothing else, may have helped to draw attention to the problem, and I hope this will jog memories in both the Commission

**Carettoni Romagnoli**

and Council and that they will include it in their programme.

Of course we quite understand how complex these problems are, but we don't want to be told, whenever a difficult problem arises, that it's too involved to deal with. Of course the difficulties exist, but it's no good burying our heads in the sand and refusing to take note of the situation, or asking for an adjournment or evading the issue on the grounds of its complexity.

The issue—as all my colleagues have stressed with reference to the statistics—is close to being solved. This is shown, for example, by the experience gained in Belgium. And if we already have a body of experience which augurs well for the future, we should tackle the problem with all the more determination.

In addition, Mr President, and as always in this House, we thought it wise to mention the need for caution. The history of this Parliament is one of caution, but I should like to point out to Mr Bertrand (who has in fact examined the position with considerable insight), who urges us to be patient and not make occasional, isolated moves, that this is exactly what Mr Glinne did in his own municipality; and if he had not done so we should certainly not be able to quote this example and the matter would not have progressed to the extent it has done. Empirical thinking can sometimes be useful too; but clearly, this is not everything, and this is why we are seeking a precise commitment from the Council and the Commission.

In my statement I stressed—rather forcefully, I think, and perhaps not too tactfully—that we cannot rely on measures by individuals or isolated municipalities, nor on the governments of the Member States; on the contrary, what we need is a campaign, an enthusiastic drive by the various Community bodies, because responsibility lies with the bodies which govern our Community. And another reason is that, when an issue is raised at summit level (true, this is not a time to derive much comfort from references to summits), it will have the authority of those who first raised it at the Paris Summit.

I believe that the Council of Ministers and the Commission should think this matter over, and I should therefore like to end by asking the Community Institutions—after thanking the Council and Commission representatives for their statements—to give very serious consideration to this subject which gives a broad definition of the problem of European nationality.

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

The debate is closed.

12. *Third United Nations Conference  
on the Law of the Sea*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Concas on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 130/74).

I call Mr Concas to present his motion for a resolution.

**Mr Concas.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. At its meeting of 7 June the Legal Affairs Committee unanimously adopted the motion for a resolution which I now have pleasure in presenting, and agreed to submit it for consideration and voting on by Parliament.

The Legal Affairs Committee attaches great importance to the questions under discussion at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea soon to be held at Caracas. The work of the Conference covers the proposed law of the sea with all related questions on the use and enjoyment of the sea, the resources of the sea and the sea bed, the limits of territorial waters, definition of the so-called adjacent zones, freedom of navigation, fishing, pollution control and prevention, protection of the environment, conservation and so on.

These are problems of which every State is already fully aware, and many international law standards will be considered with reference to guidelines and opinions already recorded. Many of these standards are likely to give rise to heated debate, involved polemics, interesting meetings and a good deal of up-dating, changes and revisions.

Clearly, the new law of the sea will have to take into account every reality and necessity, not just the interests of Member States and the international Community.

Everyone realises that the subjects and issues are extremely important. And so there is no justification for non-attendance or lack of interest, and even less for outdated or—even worse—nationalistic attitudes, seeing that greater interests are at stake which are of concern to the entire international Community. Thus it is clearly in the European Community's interest not only to take part in this conference but to make its voice heard and join the new international convention when the time comes.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is clear that not all the subject matter on the agenda for the Caracas conference comes within the specific competence of the Community, which

**Concas**

is faced—as previously—with the twofold problem of Community participation as such on matters which concern the Member States jointly, and the question of individual participation by each Community member as regards the text as a whole, but based on standardized, uniform positions.

We were delighted to hear that the Community will be taking part in the Conference, that it will keep the European Parliament informed of its work and its findings and that, at this international forum, the Community will be speaking with a single voice and even that the Member States of the Community—after contact and discussions among themselves—have agreed to harmonize their positions so as to offer a united front.

This in itself is a good result, but although it may satisfy us today, it obliges us to continue on the same road. The invitation, which is being sent to the Council and governments of the Member States of the Community to enable them to take this opportunity of transferring greater national powers to the Community Institutions as regards the law of the sea, is not being ignored but seen as a further contribution to the creation of European unity.

Since it is clear that the Community Treaties do not permit the Community to legislate in all sectors covered by the general context of the law of the sea, but—as we all know—since laws naturally follow on facts, we must have both the courage and the political will, to be ahead of the times, to act pragmatically, eschewing any discussion of academic points of law, in order to achieve results which reflect primarily the requests, demands and legitimate interests of the Community populations.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if it is true that the cause of European unity can only be achieved gradually and laboriously via constructive attitudes and specific successes, no one can fail to recognize the importance of the united front to be shown by the Community and Member States at this Conference, and the impassioned appeal sent to the governments of Member States, calling on them to persuade the Community, in the near future, to assume an increasing part of the role that now devolves on them.

It is in this spirit and with such good omens that I call on Parliament to vote in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee. I have deliberately kept my comments brief because any further word would be superfluous and contrary to the common, Community thinking which is its main-spring.

**President.** — I call Mr Brewis.

**Mr Brewis.** — On behalf of the European Conservative Group I should like to congratulate Mr Concas on tabling this motion. This is an urgent matter because the conference begins this month. However, we cannot be as pleased with the Council and with the sense of urgency that they have so far shown in reaching a common negotiating position.

The traditional law of the sea is undoubtedly in need of revision because there have been many sensational discoveries recently. I instance the oil fields of great extent discovered under the North Sea. In addition, there are the new methods of exploiting these resources, such as the greater use of submarines and the enormous drilling platforms which are comparable in size with the Eiffel Tower in Paris. It seems clear that the Continental Shelf Convention of 1958, which restricted the exploitation of territorial waters to a depth of 200 metres, is completely out of date owing to these new methods.

I must also mention the perhaps less sensational improvements in methods of catching fish, which mean that measures to conserve fish stocks are in need of rationalization.

At the conference in Caracas there will be many interesting items to be discussed. However, it will be difficult to reach agreement when there are nearly 150 participants in the conference. Therefore, the first and very important point is that all members taking part must be prepared to compromise—to give a little, to take a little—in order to get a valid agreement on the law of the sea.

For example, it seems fairly certain that territorial waters will have to be extended, perhaps to 12 miles. If that proposal is accepted, it will mean that certain countries—for example, Iceland and Brazil—will have to reduce their territorial limits. If territorial waters are extended, we must consider preserving navigation rights through narrow waters and straits and also established fishing rights in waters of other countries.

I have already said that the preservation of fish stocks is important. I think that this could be best left to regional bodies in the various regions where fish are caught.

After the conference has taken place, it would be right for the Commission to review the common fishery policy of the Community, because there is evidence of a decline in fish stocks in the North Sea. Undoubtedly we need to consider conservation measures.

**Brewis**

I should also like to mention the dangerous dispute which has arisen in the Aegean between Greece and Turkey. This seems to be a matter of importance to the Community, because both states are Associated members and also members of NATO. Mediation in this difficult dispute will undoubtedly have to take place, and it may be urgent.

Beyond territorial waters there will be an adjacent zone in which minerals can be exploited by the country which has the sea coast adjacent to that zone. It has been suggested that this zone should extend to 200 miles. Again, it will not be a limit which can be easily agreed. Already certain states have extended to the continental margin, which is beyond 200 miles in certain cases; but we must be sure to set a limit. A limit is essential because the high seas are international property and their exploitation should be for the benefit of mankind, including the inhabitants of countries which are landlocked.

The proposal that there should be an international agency to exploit the resources of the high seas is, therefore, one which I feel we must commend. At the same time, there will obviously be great difficulties in deciding what is required in regard to the terms of reference for such an international organization. We must also be sure that there is freedom for scientific research in the high seas, and as a condition of this being granted we must insist upon publication of research results.

Finally, there is the question of pollution—a very wide subject. Already we have conventions on pollution originating from the land and from ships, but I do not think anything has been done about pollution originating from the sea itself and caused by the mining and exploitation of resources on the seabed. This is another subject which will have to be taken up at the conference. I am very glad that certain steps have been taken to reach a concerted position by the Community at this conference, and on behalf of my group I hope that it has a successful outcome.

**President.** — I call Mr Wischniewski.

**Mr Wischniewski, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities.** — (D) Mr President, Mr Brewis's words in particular have revealed the complexity of the questions at issue. I am sure you will understand if at this point I merely say that the Council has taken note of the motion for a resolution. I shall report to the Council on it.

I am sure you will understand that I cannot express any definite views on the motion at this

sitting. The Council has decided, in accordance with Parliament's wishes, to answer the question put by Mr Broeks on the same subject during the second part-session in June, to be held from 26-28 June 1974. The reply will now be drafted in accordance with the usual procedure, and I shall be glad to provide you with the relevant information at the next part-session.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Wischniewski.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The motion is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

## IN THE CHAIR: MR COUSTÉ

*Vice-President*13. *Commission Memorandum on measures relating to point 16 of the Hague Communiqué*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the debate on the report by Mr Seefeld drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth on the Memorandum from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on measures to be adopted in implementation of point 16 of the Hague Communiqué:

— Recommendation for a decision setting up a "Committee for Youth Questions".

— Recommendation for a decision setting up a "Youth Advisory Committee".  
(Doc. 41/74).

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

**Mr Seefeld, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. There can be no doubt that the youth of today desires more independence and has a greater sense of responsibility than in the past. It rebels against tutelage and seeks to participate in the broadest sense in important decision-making in some way or other; at least, it does not want to be overlooked.

These general remarks apply equally well to our own efforts to integrate Europe. Naturally, the younger generation could not and cannot be

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**Seefeld**

in the seat of power, responsible, for example, for building up the European Community. But our young citizens would at least like to understand how the Community is being developed. This is a legitimate interest since in the long run it is mainly they who will profit or suffer from the decisions made now.

The Heads of State or Government of our Member States have recognized this fact. They decided to include the youth sphere in Point 16 of the Communiqué issued at their Summit Conference in The Hague in December 1969. Some years have passed since then. The declaration of intent to associate the young in the integration of Europe has so far been an empty promise. Progress is now to be made. Youth is asking when this will happen, and this question—I would add—is being asked by others as well as myself.

The whole procedure of dealing with our report is revealing, as are the results of discussions in committee meetings. The problem begins, as is so often the case, with definitions: what is youth, how old is youth, who are its spokesmen, is youth only organized youth? Question upon question, to which we would certainly not all give the same, or generally binding answers.

Then there is the question of the concept of youth policy. In the attempt to define this concept, three basic ideas were recently advanced in my country. Firstly, there must be more discussion with the younger generation than before. Secondly, we must think about the rights of young people to codetermination and cooperation.

Thirdly, social assistance must be given to those who will become the adult citizens of tomorrow. Mr President, I think that these ideas could be applied to European youth policy as well, and I hope you will agree with me when I say that we should try and incorporate ideas like these into our conception.

Before I present the report on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth, I should like to make some introductory comments on chronology.

The Summit Conference at The Hague in December 1969 resulted in a declaration of intent in which the Community institutions were called upon to associate the young in the building of Europe, and awaken their interest in this, to a greater extent than before. This is what I just mentioned. Another Summit Conference took place in December 1972, this time in Paris. Unfortunately, the communiqué released did not contain a single declaration relating to youth policy. In view of the great hopes awakened by the Hague Summit Conference, one might

have expected to hear that the new prospects for European youth had been extended, or at least reemphasized, at a subsequent conference. Those cherishing such fond hopes were due for a bitter disappointment; not a single word was said about youth policy.

The report we are concerned with also has a long history, in my view, far too long. The Hague Summit Conference took place on 1 and 2 December 1969. It recommended a decision setting up, and I quote, a "Committee for Youth Questions" as well as a "Youth Advisory Committee".

It is to my great regret as rapporteur that this preparatory phase of promoting youth policy has taken so much time. The reasons, in brief, are undoubtedly as follows. The Memorandum from the Commission to the Council of 28 January 1972 referred to a previous Memorandum of 14 April 1970, and contained proposals for the implementation of the task. On behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, Mr Hougardy then submitted in February 1972 a report on Youth and Educational Policy in the European Community. In this report, paragraph 25 of his motion for a resolution on the institutional development of youth and educational policy contained the following passage:

The European Parliament ... calls for the necessary institutional structure for Community policy on youth and education to be set up without delay, viz.:

- regular meetings of the Ministers responsible for youth and educational questions in the Council of the European Communities;
- a Directorate-General for youth and educational questions, or at least a Directorate for each of these two spheres, in the Commission of the European Communities;
- a Standing Committee for youth questions and for educational questions, composed of senior officials and experts from the Member States in the Commission of the European Communities;

And this motion, which we adopted, also says:

'a Youth Advisory Committee should be set up for the youth of the Community, represented in accordance with a key to be determined at a later date by the youth organizations, which has the right to be consulted on all questions of direct and special concern to Youth.'

The last two proposals are contained in the Commission's Memorandum, and can finally—three



## Seefeld

and a half years after the Hague Conference—be discussed in this House.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Commission Memorandum on this complex of subjects was submitted to the Political Affairs Committee, which was responsible for youth questions in our Parliament at the time, on 10 March 1972. Unfortunately, and it is with great regret that I say this, there was at first no action on the part of the Political Affairs Committee of this House.

The Commission's document was then forwarded to the Parliamentary Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth which was newly constituted in March 1973. After nominating me as the new rapporteur in May last year, this Committee took up work immediately. In the meantime, the Commission revised its first Memorandum to the extent that it included the new Member States Denmark, the United Kingdom and Ireland.

Ladies and gentlemen, eight committee meetings and several meetings of a Working Party specially set up for the purpose, one hearing with representatives of the leading European youth organizations and particularly of their two umbrella associations—this hearing turned out to be necessary when the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth examined the Memorandum, since the Commission took no action itself although it considered such a proceeding advisable—and other bilateral negotiations between the rapporteur and various youth representatives were held in an attempt to produce a document which takes the interests of the European youth organizations and the political groups of this Parliament into account as far as possible. The attempt was only partially successful. The representatives of the Socialist Group in the Committee for Cultural Affairs and Youth have not agreed to the report I am presenting today. I must confess that I am also not in full agreement with it. However, ladies and gentlemen, I assure you that in my capacity as Committee rapporteur, I am objectively and fairly presenting the majority opinion which is not my own.

I must also mention, just for the sake of good form, that the two large European umbrella organizations, that is the Co-ordination Bureau and CENYC, have declared to me that they are not in agreement with the report, particularly as regards the composition and method of working of the Youth Forum.

This means—and I feel bound to point this out as well—that the legitimate representatives of organized youth in Europe are not likely to be very happy with the efforts and decisions of the

European Parliament if this report is adopted. Even the original ideas of the Commission were not very popular with the European youth organizations—rightly so in my opinion.

At the plenary session of the European Youth Council CENYC, the President then in office, Mr Weber, expressed this quite clearly when he said: "We should also firmly oppose similar trends such as those apparent in the development of youth policy in the European Community. The proposals for the establishment of a Youth Advisory Committee made so far, which take no account whatsoever of the international youth organizations, contain no right of initiative and also ensure strong Government influence on the nomination of youth representatives, are absolutely out of the question."

The CENYC President also stated that he favoured "equal representation" of the national committees incorporated in CENYC and the international youth organizations united in the "Co-ordination Bureau".

In a resolution adopted by this 8th CENYC plenary meeting held in Ireland on 28 April 1973, one of the important prerequisites for cooperation with the Institutions of the European Community is stated as follows: "Youth representatives must be elected by the youth organizations themselves. We categorically reject any type of intervention by other organizations". The old Commission document could only appear to the youth organizations like a red rag to a bull; for example, it proposed that members be nominated by the Governments.

The CENYC resolution also contains this passage: "Youth's right to codetermination must not be restricted to youth questions. The right of initiative is a condition of the establishment of a Youth Advisory Committee".

This same conference also commented on the Commission's views of the age groups to be considered. The resolution puts it as follows: "The definition of the word youth as the age group from 15 to 25 is artificial. It takes into account neither the valuable work carried out by youth organizations for young people under 15, nor existing practice and agreements which set an upper age limit of 30 to 35". These opinions from the representatives of the national associations of European youth organizations on the Commission's original proposals can only be described as critical. It is not an exaggeration to say that organized youth rejects the Commission's views.

I should like to state two facts emphasizing that this Parliament too was dissatisfied with the Commission's youth policy.

**Seefeld**

Firstly: during the debate on the 7th General Report on the Activities of the Community, the Committee for Cultural Affairs and Youth deplored that the subject of youth was missing yet again.

It also stressed that "a Community youth policy must be based from the start on consultation and co-operation with representatives of the youth organizations".

However, I am tempted to point out that this same Committee, which stated its views just quoted so clearly, would not follow the opinions expressed by the youth organizations in the hearing as regards the creation of a Youth Forum.

Secondly: at an early stage in its deliberations, the Committee found the Commission's proposal on the establishment of a Youth Advisory Committee unusable, and decided to return it. At the request of the Member of the Commission responsible, and particularly to speed up the dilatory Commission and Parliament action on the declaration of intent issued at the Summit Conference in The Hague, a settlement was reached which then entailed the Committee's revocation of its decision to return the document.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza was good enough not only to send his permanent staff to the meetings of a small Working Party formed by the Committee, but also to assure the Committee that the Commission would examine the numerous radical amendments to its Memorandum with all speed. He promised to meet the desiderata of the Committee and this Parliament as far as possible.

You will notice that I have so far dealt almost exclusively with the Recommendation for a decision setting up a Youth Advisory Committee; incidentally, our committee was unanimously of the opinion that it should be called a Youth Forum, not a committee.

Since, however, both the Commission Memorandum and this report refer to the setting-up of a "Committee for Youth Questions", I must at least mention that this part of the text caused no problems and agreement was reached within a short time. The minor amendments to some of the Articles met with Commission approval in committee meetings. The Committee for Youth Questions, which is to be composed of senior officials and experts from the Member States, would be, as the Commission proposes, a group for planning, stimulus and general orientation, whose initial function would be to analyze proposals in order to determine new measures to be taken. We proposed no basic

amendments, and there was complete agreement on this point.

Our efforts were thus concentrated on seeking the best form in which organized European youth could participate in the "Youth Forum".

On the substance of this matter I should like to add that our debate and decisions are mainly concerned with the organizational form for future progress and not yet with specific subjects. Nor does this report deal with the latter. And yet the problem remains to be solved: what can and must be done by the Community for youth? The Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government in The Hague already mentioned repeatedly was not the first occasion on which the idea of associating youth in the integration of Europe was advanced.

This idea was put forward at the Conference of Messina, and more especially led to the inclusion of three provisions in the Rome Treaties. These are Article 9(2) of the Euratom Treaty concerning the establishment of a European University, Article 50 of the EEC Treaty on the exchange of young workers and Article 57 of the EEC Treaty on the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications. Since the declaration of The Hague, however, we have the clear task of putting individual projects in the context of a Community policy on education and youth. For me, the question of what can actually be done for youth gives rise to three initial questions.

Firstly:

What concrete proposals can be discussed which best do justice to the expectations and requirements of Europe's youth?

Secondly:

On what legal basis can concrete action be founded?

Thirdly:

What funds must be made available?

Mr President, I wanted to make these comments in this House today to point out that there are enough subjects for the Youth Forum, regardless of its composition and the manner in which it may one day take up work. Europe's youth—and this does not incidentally, consist only of academic youth, as suggested by previous declarations on the subject of universities and diplomas—has a right to expect adequate consideration of its interests in the development of our Community. I consider it a good sign that today's younger generation is critical, sometimes uncomfortably so, of those in positions of res-

**Seefeld**

possibility. If the critical attitude could result in sitting down together for joint discussion—and joint discussions with the Commission as well as with the Council and Parliament are possible within the framework of the Youth Forum—I consider it would be a hopeful beginning.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank all my colleagues in the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth and the representatives of the European youth organizations for their co-operation over the last year. If this report, which is associated with my name, although it does not meet with my full agreement, can provide a new stimulus to cooperation in good faith between the youth representatives in our Community and those responsible for policy, it will be a step forward no matter how opinions on it may differ.

I should thus also like to appeal from this platform to all those who will be concerned with the work of the Youth Forum: help us by your initiative and experience of youth problems to work for and help the people really involved, the young citizens of our Community!

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Klepsch.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking our rapporteur who has gone to such trouble to present the report bearing his name so quickly and who has always secured the cooperation of all the Groups of this Assembly. I should also like to express my especial thanks to Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, acting on the Commission's behalf, for his readiness to bring unorthodox means to bear so that we can wind up this subject in Parliament with the least possible delay.

The decision we have to make is important, and we are discussing no ordinary matter, but a Youth Forum, as the Committee unanimously decided to call the Youth Advisory Committee, an institution, therefore, which has no parallel in other comparable fields. We consider it a matter of urgency to associate European youth suitably in the development of Europe, and to do so to the fullest possible extent. We are well aware of one difficulty, that we can only institutionalize organized youth. All attempts to associate non-organized youth would be defeated by the problems of time, space and numbers.

Now that we must concentrate on finding our way towards a dialogue with European youth, my Group—and I am pleased to say that the

Conservative and Liberal Groups have also concentrated on this aspect—has come to the conclusion that the broadest possible range of opinions should be represented in the Youth Forum and that we should take trouble to ensure a genuine dialogue of youth and between youth and the various political and other movements of this Parliament. This, I think, was also the keynote of our discussions and our voting.

Having the Seefeld report in my hands, I must confess that I too signed three amendments. I should like to say from the outset that these amendments change nothing of the sense and content of the report, but are concerned with the financial side only. Our aim was to dissipate the doubts of the Committee on Budgets. These doubts arose from the fact that the original estimate of funds for the first two-year period was raised considerably on the basis of particular conclusions we arrived at, but also at the Commission's own suggestion. The amendments which I signed together with Mr Hill for the Conservative Group and with colleagues from the Liberal Group are only intended to keep the amount of money which must be spent on meetings for the first two years within controllable limits.

Allow me now a few words on the central questions involved. In our opinion, we must first experiment. After two years, a report is to be drawn up on the result of the Forum's work; this Assembly and all those participating will then be in a position to appreciate the defects and difficulties better, as well as the advantages, in order to organize matters better in the future.

Secondly, our aim was to safeguard this broad range of opinion by putting youth representation on as authentic a basis as possible. Allow me to make one comment on the amendment by the Socialist Group. The Committee has already considered the question. In our opinion, having half the members of the Forum drawn from CENYC and the other half from the Co-ordination Bureau would create a completely unsuitable organization to filter opinions and establish contact with the Community.

Our initial aim is to ensure that the international youth organizations send their representatives to the Forum directly on their own responsibility, and not in accordance with the majority decisions of a Co-ordination Bureau or some other umbrella organization.

I freely admit that these umbrella organizations, which claim 50%, cannot meet with our agreement as matters stand—one reason is that CENYC is an organization on the level of the Council of Europe, and this raises numerous problems—such as nomination of representa-

**Klepsch**

tives—owing to the States represented, whereas we consider the Coordination Bureau—I am speaking for my Group of course—an umbrella organization which is somewhat one-sided in its political views. One has only to read the preamble to the Statutes, which, by majority decision, professes the cause of a socialist Europe. Naturally, every organization is entitled to take such majority decisions, but as far as my Group is concerned, we wish to see a Youth Forum which covers as broad a spread of opinion as possible.

I should like to add that we attempted to cater for the minorities in our report. This is why we expressly made provision for an opinion which is held by 25% of those represented to be studied by the Commission and the pertinent committees in the same way as a majority decision. And we also made provision for every opinion to be recorded so that it would be available to all interested parties.

But we were also concerned with giving youth the right of initiative in the subjects to be chosen and the expression of opinions. We thus formulated the report so that those represented in the Forum would be guaranteed this right of initiative as far as the law allowed.

It would obviously be impossible to try and guarantee participation for every interested party from the outset; this could only result in shattering the framework of the Forum. So we laid down a series of criteria which in our opinion guarantee a broad range of opinion but keep the scope of the Forum within workable limits.

I should like to conclude by saying that my Group welcomes this occasion, when we can talk about the opportunity Europe's youth is to be given of expressing its opinion on European unity as part of the overall opinion-forming process, and the permanent place it is to be given in the exchange of opinions with the Commission, this Parliament and amongst its own members.

We are aware that others may assess this matter differently, as will certainly emerge in future debate. But one principle should stand firm—and I emphasize this on behalf of my Group—such an institution will only be fully effective if its majority is not preplanned and manipulated, if it expresses the broad range of opinion held by European youth, and if a lively and keen dialogue is guaranteed.

With these thoughts in mind, my Group is in favour of adopting Mr Seefeld's report and thanks him for his work.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Terrenoire, draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Budgets, who should normally have spoken immediately after the rapporteur.

**Mr Terrenoire, draftsman of the opinion.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Budgets was naturally very favourably disposed towards the intentions expressed at The Hague Conference to associate the young with the construction of Europe. But it was mainly concerned with the financial aspects, since these were what it had to decide upon. The Committee needed a lot of patience and had to wait a long time to know exactly the budgetary assessments and reassessments which had to be made after the rise in prices, and it was not until 31 May 1974 that the Committee on Budgets learned the precise position of the Commission on the financial planning, which could either be based on the Commission's initial proposals or on the amended proposals presented by Mr Seefeld as rapporteur for the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth.

For this reason, the Committee on Budgets, whose views I present, has certain reservations, since we have ultimately not had the time to examine thoroughly all the budgetary consequences of the Commission's proposals on the creation of the committees in question.

And these reservations also are reflected in our anxiety that a somewhat bureaucratic organization will be formed too rapidly before these committees, or this Forum as the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth now says, have been set up.

We must ensure that the youth representatives who will sit on these committees or in this Forum are given the means to carry out their work, but are also given the necessary encouragement from the start, though without too great expenditure on the part of the Community.

The Committee on Budgets would also like to see a gradual and pragmatic implementation of this task, with due regard to the first results to emerge. The Committee on Budgets has above all endeavoured to find out—but has received no reply on the subject—the opinion of the Commission on the amendments proposed by Mr Seefeld on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth.

If these amendments were accepted by the Commission and submitted to the Council, the financial conditions would be different from those for the initial proposals.

We would like the Commission to give us its views today, as explicitly as possible.

### Terrenoire

The Committee on Budgets would very much like to be involved in the planning of the expenditure permissible for setting up these committees, so that this can be subjected to the necessary scrutiny—one of the rights of our Assembly.

That, Mr President, is our committee's point of view, briefly expressed in accordance with your wishes.

The Committee on Budgets has given no opinion on the substance of the proposals, as it considered this the concern of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth.

Its opinion contains some reservation, but also, as I readily admit, a firm hope that the institutions enabling the Community to associate European youth in the construction of Europe will be set up with all speed.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Walkhoff.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Socialist Group I should like first of all to thank the Commission for its recommendations on setting up a Committee for Youth Questions and a Youth Advisory Committee. I intend, however, to restrict my remarks to the Youth Advisory Committee as the former Committee entails hardly any problems.

With the aid of this report from the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth, and particularly with the aid of some of the amendments it contains, the same game is to be played with Europe's youth that consumers have been accustomed to for a long time, consumer protection being dangled in front of them in the guise of numerous directives, whereas in reality the Community of trade and industry functions superbly on profit-making lines. And now as a parallel, a Potemkin village is to be set up for youth to give the impression that it is associated with the new construction of Europe.

It is clever to allow youth to take part in building up the cardboard scenery in accordance with well thought-out rules, and thus tie down committed forces.

It must, however, be clearly stated, to prevent a false impression from being created, that the negative aspect of the plan was due to the proposals of the Christian-Democratic and Conservative Groups which found a majority in the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth. Mr Seefeld, the rapporteur, bears none of the blame.

It may help to clarify the political intentions of these two Groups if I not only consider the amendments which gained a majority in the Committee, but also briefly deal with the original demands of the Christian-Democrats and the Conservatives which were submitted to the Committee on 20 December 1973. This is particularly called for because Mr Klepsch had little to say on the background of the Group's paper.

One of the demands made in the catalogue of Christian-Democratic amendments is that the Youth Forum only be given the right of initiative when a decision is carried by 75% of the votes; if the majority is smaller, decisions cannot be regarded as the expression of youth's opinion.

Allow me to address my next remarks to the German members of the Christian-Democratic party: you should make demands like these at home. In this way you could unequivocally give substance to your demand for more democracy and argue *ad absurdum* at the same time. Your ideas on democracy as you have presented them in this point remind me of a kindergarten where the children are allowed to romp as they like within the accepted standards of behaviour, but the rules, the objectives and the result of the sandpit game are determined by the kindergarten supervisors.

But then the devil had his claws cut for his appearance in the official committee report, showed benevolence and only demanded that minority opinions carrying at least 25% of the votes also be submitted for study by the Community institutions.

Point 5 of the Christian-Democratic proposals, included in the report to prohibit the youth umbrella organizations from nominating their own representatives in the Forum, is typical of the democratic thinking prevalent in that Group. Point 5 says—if the President will permit me to quote—"Youth organizations cannot pretend to represent all youth". Don't the German members among you remember how they fought the non-parliamentary opposition by arguing that everyone had a chance of exerting influence if he organized himself on political lines? They considered parliamentary democracy endangered by the activities of those not represented by political parties. I personally do not have a blind faith in the magic powers of parliamentary democracy, but I do see it as the only possibility of ensuring self-determination under state pilotage. But you change your standpoint when your political interests make it opportune to do so. Now that a large number of the young have organized themselves on at least with regard to youth questions, following the democratic rules, the majority situation

**Walkhoff**

doesn't suit you any more and so you throw your principles overboard for tactical reasons.

True, in the course of Committee discussions the Christian-Democrats backed down on the Commission's proposal they had always supported, i.e. that the national governments should propose the members of the Youth Forum. But their compromise, which gained a majority in the Committee and made provision for every youth organization recognized by the Commission to have one vote in the Forum, is based on the same negative aims as the original Commission proposal, and goes against the principles of democratic representation in exactly the same way by equating the Organization of Young European Poultry Farmers and numerous other associations of similar size and importance with the political and trade union youth organizations which are few in number but have a large membership.

When one considers that the Christian-Democratic Group also attempts to split the Forum by dividing it up into several compartments, it is not difficult to see the method behind the whole approach.

As my time is nearly up, I can only devote one example to the Conservative Group. This Group explained its model—with its, as I think, governess-like ideas—by denying the necessity of genuine institutional representation for youth and saying that a Committee for Youth Questions composed of officials and under Commission supervision was sufficient and proper for solving the political problems of youth.

Unlike these opinions, which were unfortunately given much attention in the Committee's report, the proposals of the Socialist Group to set up a European Youth Forum are based on the principle that youth must be given the right of cooperation in solving the European problems directly concerning it, freely, without tutelage and without manipulation.

We thus consider it absolutely essential for the establishment of a Youth Forum that the representatives of youth be nominated free of the influence of national governments. This I say for the benefit of the Commission!

Representation on democratic principles can only be guaranteed by the Socialist proposal to permit the two umbrella organizations, which all national associations are free to join, to nominate the representatives of the Youth Forum. This I say for the benefit of the other Groups!

The Socialist Group is in agreement on all basic points with these two umbrella organizations

and the majority of the national youth organizations.

Allow me a final personal comment: if the Socialist Group's viewpoint given in the amendments does not get a majority, we must give up the whole idea of a Youth Forum until further notice in my opinion, because the discrimination of youth in offering them a place in the sandpit cannot be justified politically.

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

**Mr John Hill.** — After the long march through committee and sub-committee to this debate, I should like to begin by echoing the thanks paid to the Commissioner, his staff and particularly to Mr Seefeld, our indefatigable rapporteur. By his stamina, patience and good humour, especially when the majority was against him, I believe he has set a very remarkable example.

The European Conservative Group recognized from our very entry into the European Communities that the Community institutions had a duty to take action to implement the outstanding obligation of the Hague Communiqué to provide an effective opportunity for youth to be associated with the building of Europe.

Like other groups, we had no difficulty in accepting the establishment of the Committee for Youth Questions composed of the national experts on youth policy. I am glad that the budgetary provisions seem to be comparatively modest and that there is not to be a large, heavy secretariat. I hope that some of the travelling expenses will be saved as a result of good co-ordination of the meetings since these gentlemen will periodically find themselves meeting in connection with other matters.

As to the Youth Advisory Committee, we were not enamoured of the proposals since we first saw them merely mathematically enlarged to take account of the Nine in the Community.

Our attitude was set out at an early stage in our letter of 20 September last, which is summarized in this comprehensive report. I wish to quote two paragraphs from pages 28 and 29. We said: 'Our discussions led us, however, to doubt the need for youth to be institutionalized in the Committee's institutions to the extent envisaged in the Commission's proposals, and we thought that if the latter were implemented, they could in fact set a dangerous precedent for claims for similar status by other categories of Community citizens.'

And on page 29: 'We believe a less rigid approach would be more likely to get results both in meeting the desires of organized youth

## Hill

to express its opinions and be listened to, and in attracting the interests of the many young people who are not members of any youth movement but whose support the Community must seek to enlist.'

Consequently, we supported with some enthusiasm the idea that the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth should be charged with seeing how far it could achieve a consensus on new and, as I would say, more up-to-date proposals.

We in our group believe that youth arrangements are all part—and, indeed, a very important part—of an overall information programme. Perhaps that is some answer to the criticisms made by Mr Walkhoff. We believe that the object is to enable youth to be well-informed about developments in the Community, to appreciate some of the difficulties under which we who are charged with the responsibility have to labour and to inform the institutions about the needs and wishes of youth.

The report defines youth as from 15 to 25 whereas some of the members of the youth organizations, particularly the international organizations, would like this to be extended to 30 or 35 since it takes a long time to get to the top in international youth circles. However, if it is difficult to define youth in years, it is even more difficult to identify any single youth view except on comparatively rare occasions. This is hardly surprising, because on most topics the views of the younger generation are as diverse as those of any other. It would be odd if this were not so.

We therefore saw the need to provide a flexible and open machinery for a continuous dialogue between the younger generations and the Community institutions, including ourselves. The device of the youth forum meeting every six months, with provision for the expression of minority views, is essential to our purpose. Indeed, it has achieved a welcome consensus.

My group was also impressed by the evidence produced by the youth organizations, at the committee hearing on 8 October, of the sheer difficulty that most youth organizations have in communicating among themselves or with Community institutions on an international basis. Many are short of funds and facilities—the smaller, the shorter probably. They often work through voluntary part-time members and interests. Yet it is precisely those who are not in full-time youth activities who have much to contribute, particularly by way of their opinions.

Therefore, we ask: what can be done here? It is very much a matter of resources, and we know that they are short. I have in mind what

Mr Terrenoire said today on behalf of the Committee on Budgets and on earlier occasions.

The question of providing the organizations with some means of expressing themselves and being in communication—preferably by some modest presence in Brussels—deserves urgent consideration as soon as decisions are taken on the establishment of the forum and its procedures.

I turn now to some of the arguments on the detailed suggestions. It is the detail that now matters. The essence of this debate concerns the motion for a resolution—that is, as set out in the right-hand columns of pages 7 to 15 of the report—plus what I call the rival groups of amendments—those tabled by the Socialists, on the one hand, seeking to reassert a position that they did not carry in the committee, and, on the other hand, those tabled in the names of my group and of the Christian-Democrats, with Liberal support, mainly designed, on further thinking and in the light of further information, to improve flexibility and to make economies, particularly after receiving the budgetary estimates, which we had from the Commission only last month, and the opinion of the Committee on Budgets, which I saw in written form only last night.

Perhaps I should mention that the British do not have a Minister for Youth Affairs as such. Therefore, we may need a little reorganization of responsibilities.

The detailed proposals, which will be covered again in later amendments, are made against the background of a review and report to be made in the first two years of the forum's work. That is covered in Article 5, which is a most important provision.

We are most unlikely to get the machinery right the first time. It is bound to be somewhat experimental. Therefore, while providing for the review, I think that we should encourage the widest participation and activity.

I do not propose to touch on matters which might be suitable for amendment on further thought, with one exception. I question whether it is necessary and desirable, for example, to appoint the chairman for a full two years straight off. It may be that he should be appointed annually and allowed one further term.

I believe that we should get as much turnover as possible of young people occupying offices, being members and having their say. They will then move on to their careers having had a useful European experience, both political and cultural, in passing through the institutions of the forum.

**Hill**

We think that the forum would operate better if the organizations forming part of it were subdivided into separate interest groups for part of their work. Otherwise, there is the danger of a swamping effect with the immediate political issue of the day taking up all the time, whereas the Commissioner, his officials and the Committee for Youth Questions may want some fairly detailed opinions on rather dull topics — for example, the finer points on matters of employment or vocational training. Therefore, we should divide the forum into a political section—I think we could say a party political section because all groups might say they are political—which reflects the activities of this Parliament or, at any rate, its Political Affairs Committee, a social and trade union group, and, finally, an educational and cultural group, including, I hope, some sporting organizations.

We thought we could make economies by having these separate meetings actually attached to the forum main meetings when the people concerned are all together and—although we greatly appreciated the Commissioner's suggestion—by giving up, as an economy, separate sectional meetings between the meetings of the plenary forum since interpretation alone is apt to be very costly.

It is very important that the forum should have the right of initiative to raise topics within the Treaty and its future development. The question of who should attend the forum will be considered when the amendments are discussed, but whatever we do, all this is subject to review in two years.

In conclusion, I urge that it is vital for the health and growth of the Community that we enlist and hold the interest and support of the younger generation. There is a good deal of evidence of frustration and disappointment at the slow progress in what is admittedly a difficult period. Perhaps the generation gap appears to have widened. If so, there is all the more reason to discuss the difficulties and to hear suggestions from those who will—certainly some of them will—bear all the responsibility in the not very distant future, after we have retired. The proposals therefore could provide a means for effective communication between youth—giving, I hope, some encouragement to unorganized youth to join in—and all the institutions of the Community, including ourselves.

There is a choice between two different expressions on the face of this institution. We can accept the Socialist group of amendments, which I consider to be a rather too professional, somewhat narrow, bureaucratized and centralized expression; or we can accept the rather looser, freer, more flexible expression if the Conserva-

tive and Christian-Democrat amendments are supported. These latter are more in consonance with paragraph 8 of the motion for a resolution. I have not the time to quote it, but I hope honourable Members will read it because it is important. And I hope that the European Parliament will accept the amendments which go in that direction.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Yeats** — I should like to open, as others have opened, by thanking Mr Seefeld for his most excellent report and for the clarity, detail and candour with which he has presented it. I think that we are all agreed on the importance of this subject. We are all agreed that we must end a situation in which young people in all countries have in recent years tended more and more to feel cut off from the thoughts and the decisions of their elders.

Young people have ideals and ambitions that must find expression in an organized and practicable form, and to the extent that the proposals in this report do meet this growing need, they are certainly to be welcomed. As the committee states in paragraph 8 of its motion for a resolution, it is essential to rouse in young people 'feelings of unity and mutual understanding, and to make them fully aware of their worth and their rights and obligations in a united, democratic and peace-loving Europe.'

There may be many different views as to how best this process of harnessing the ideals and ambitions of youth can be achieved, but I think that we can all agree on one thing at least, namely, that this report, embodying, as it does, all the thought and discussion that have taken place over a long period, will be completely wasted unless we can obtain the agreement to our proposals of the young people themselves. We cannot tell them what to do. We can only seek to gain their agreement to the structure and powers of the new committee and provide them with the money and facilities that may be necessary.

In view of this obvious need for general agreement, one can only regret that initially the Commission should have produced its proposals without consultation with the youth organizations. Presumably, if there had been such consultation, the Commission would have realized in time that it was quite unacceptable that the initial choice of youth representatives should be made by governments. So-called representatives



**Yeats**

of youth, chosen in this way, would at once lose all support amongst the young people of their countries. This kind of paternalism is no longer possible today.

The Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth did not repeat this mistake of the Commission, and on 8 October last a hearing was held in Brussels at which the views were received of the representatives of international youth organizations. Unfortunately, whether due to misunderstandings or perhaps to lack of time, or to some lack of clarity in the viewpoints expressed on behalf of the youth organizations, it seems that the report of the committee does not now represent the wishes of the international youth organizations. This matter was referred to by the rapporteur in his introductory speech.

Last month at the European Youth Centre here in Strasbourg a five-day seminar was held between the two umbrella bodies of youth organizations in Europe—that is, the Council of European National Youth Committees and the European Coordination Bureau of International Non-Governmental Youth Organizations. Both these organizations joined in condemning the proposals which are now before us. They considered, apparently, 'that the initial consultative meeting with the Members of the European Parliament was unsatisfactory.' They felt—I am not saying necessarily that they were justified in this—that the hearing did not discuss the proposals and counter-proposals of the youth organizations in sufficient detail and also that, in their view, 'little consideration appears to be given in the final text to the views expressed by the youth organizations.'

For these reasons, these international youth organizations have suggested that 'Parliament... might refer this document back to the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth'. I think that this request is one that Parliament ought to consider very seriously.

In order to enable Members to decide whether they wish to comply with this request, which was made on behalf of the international youth organizations in the statement they issued after their seminar, I am formally proposing under Rule 26(2) that the report should be referred back to the committee.

After the joint seminar held from 4 to 8 May 1974, an agreed statement was issued on the youth policies of the European Communities. The statement began as follows: 'In discussing the youth policies of the European Communities the youth organizations are not willing to consider the details of the various proposals coming from the European Parliament and its political groupings. In our opinion the youth organiza-

tions must first be consulted before any proposal is put forward by the European Communities.' The statement goes on to list in some detail the objections that the youth organizations have to the document that is now before us.

It will be obvious that this formal statement on behalf of the international youth organizations sets out a number of fundamental objections to the proposals in the report. These specific objections have been raised on behalf of the international youth organizations, but I should mention also that there has been strong condemnation of the proposals both of the Commission and of the committee in its report by the National Youth Council of Ireland.

With regard, for example, to the new Article 1A proposed in the report, the National Youth Council of Ireland describes this as 'a reactionary and unworkable proposal'. It points out that all organizations are to an extent political and all will have views on social and cultural issues. It points out that, from an Irish point of view, there would in effect have been no participation in the first two committees as none of the major political parties or the trade unions in Ireland has recognized youth wings.

The National Youth Council of Ireland goes on to say that, from an Irish point of view, the proposals in the new Article 3 for setting up the forum are, as it puts it, 'disastrous'. It points out that the requirement for the international organizations to have membership in five of the nine Member States could mean that the vast majority of organizations recognized under Article 3(1) will have no links with Irish youth organizations.

Again, from an Irish point of view, the Irish youth organizations have condemned the proposed allocation of votes in the forum as 'entirely unacceptable'.

I understand very well the long discussions that have led to the appearance of this report. I can appreciate that Members may be unwilling to postpone a decision on this matter any further. But I urge that we should bear in mind that the international youth organizations spent five days last month considering this matter. They have given us their views, and it would surely both be unwise and discourteous to ignore altogether the representations that they have made to us. I am not suggesting for a moment that this whole matter should be reopened but merely that it would be well worth while for the committee to meet even once more to give consideration to the representations that have been made.

Yeats

If Members cannot agree to ask the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth to consider these representations, we should at the very least accept the amendments that have been tabled in an effort to meet the wish of these various youth organizations. Thank you, Mr President.  
(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR BERSANI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli.

**Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli.** — (1) Mr President, I too should like to express my thanks to the rapporteur for his diligence and patience; this patience was required not only during the long discussions in committee, but also by the very nature of this extremely complex and delicate subject.

Relations with youth are not easy. It would be wrong not to start from this assumption, just as it would be wrong not to start from the assumption—and this has not been emphasized sufficiently in this debate—that the world of youth is probably not identical with that represented by the organizations with which we have come into contact. In my opinion, this is in fact the great limitation of youth policy; we cannot by any means assume that the organizations with which we have come into contact reflect the real world of youth.

As the rapporteur pointed out, this report is a first attempt to deal with the large amount of material stemming from the Hougardy report. I feel, however, that this result is rather modest in relation to the problems involved, and even in relation to the concept which the European Parliament propounded in the debate on this report. Our uneasiness is thus based not only on the modest significance of what we are about to decide, but also on the fact that what we have proposed—and I realize that we may not have been able to propose more—follows the usual scheme of bureaucratic activity which is typical of our Community. This is our main anxiety.

Of course, we also have another fear—that there will be no place in these new bodies for the opinions of the large youth organizations of the Left, such as the Italian and French Communist organizations, which unite large numbers of young industrial and agricultural workers and students who carry great weight in their own countries.

Do not misunderstand me—I do not simply want the rapporteur or the Commissioner to reply

that this was not possible. I realize that it was not possible within this framework, because there are no organizations of this type at European level. What I am saying is not so much a criticism as a statement of the fact that forces of great importance are not represented. We shall not, however, be making any formal request in this context—just as we did not, and could not do, at the committee stage.

Having said this, we must make some comments of a general nature on the problem as a whole. In all our relations with youth, we must bear in mind that, nowadays, not only do the young want to count, but also that they already count a lot. We need only look at the effect of giving the vote at 18 in various countries; we need only look at some election results—among them that of the referendum in Italy, in which the vote of the young played a major role.

Not only this, but the young are nowadays accustomed to having frequent contacts with their counterparts in different countries, and they have a view of problems which I have no hesitation in describing as universal, simply because today—in contrast to the position in our youth—the problems and viewpoints are identical even in far-distant countries. To someone of my age it is very impressive to see this agreement in feeling, opinion and attitude between, say, a young person from the Far East and one from a European country. This is a new and extremely important feature.

Furthermore, the young everywhere show extreme intolerance of bureaucratic structures, and a genuine longing for liberty and democracy. Let us all remember that the protest of youth in countries where there is no democracy—Greece, for instance—has recently assumed great importance. The young have a longing for self-determination, for forms of democracy which are as direct as possible, and they want to be able to choose their future themselves.

If, as we feel, this is true, we must show as much goodwill as possible—that is not intended as a criticism of you, Mr Seefeld—by setting up, at European level, a structure which by some means reflects this way of looking at the problem. I feel that our very way of regarding problems is one of the reasons why the young are generally neither very enamoured nor very conscious of Europe. Not only are we incapable of proposing an ideal model to which youth can aspire—as one of the previous speakers has said—but the Europe of today is a collection of interests bearing no relation to the interests of the mass of young people. Moreover, we are today going through a deep crisis and experiencing the collapse of some things—customs union, monetary policy etc.—which seemed to be accomplished facts and which we can no

**Romagnoli**

longer use as a letter of introduction to the great mass of youth. Not only this, but in general the Community—as we have often said—by its very origins, its very history, has been marked right from the start by an inability to take independent and collective decisions.

We have seen that the nine countries, far from showing an ability to reach independent and collective decisions, have produced the direct opposite—something which is in conflict with youth's own ideas. I therefore feel that our problem and our difficulties derive from the fact that we are not on the same wavelength as youth in the dialogue.

With this motion for a resolution, we are giving an initial answer which not only fails to do enough, but also does not do the right things. What we are in fact doing is creating yet another two bodies which are more or less identical to those which we have already set up and are still setting up in this Community, in which—as we all know—there is never a shortage of committees, in which there is never a shortage of ready-made schemes which some young people—not by chance—have described as paternalistic. These schemes offer nothing concrete to the aspirations of youth, which cannot honestly see how they will function, nor what guarantees there are that they will function at all. And, what is more, even the most fervent supporters of these solutions say: let's try it; it's an attempt, an experiment.

Having made these criticisms, I must, however, add that the text of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth, on which we are voting today, is infinitely better than the text with which we started off. We must take care not to make this text any worse by approving amendments which make it even more restricted. There are some important points which I cannot but emphasize, although I still look at them somewhat from outside, for the reasons I mentioned before. There is no doubt that the right of initiative accorded to the young people in the new text from the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth is important; the fact, for instance, that the minority interests in the Forum will not disappear, but will be in a sufficiently privileged position, the return to the subject of guaranteed independence—all these are changes for the good made by the Committee. For the reasons given above, however, we are afraid that all the aspirations mentioned in paragraph 8 may easily be in vain. In any case, the very phrasing of this paragraph smacks of paternalism, since—in the Italian version at least—it appears to see young people as the receiving party, rather than the deciding party. It speaks of rousing young people, and of making

them aware of their worth and their rights and obligations—but this is an attitude which makes no impression at all on youth nowadays.

In concluding, I should again like to say that we very much appreciated the work of the rapporteur and the patient labours of the Committee. However, we cannot help seeing in the proposal to set up new bodies—although these may be justified and even useful from a certain point of view—a feature of this European machinery which has lately often been running and producing in neutral, and which does not succeed in achieving anything, while all around us the problems are becoming worse, so much so that our very development may be at stake. We cannot but notice this discrepancy between proposals aimed at setting up bureaucratic bodies and the hard facts with which we have been struggling for some time now and from which—at least for the present—we can see no way out.

**President.** — I call Mr Deschamps.

**Mr Deschamps.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this is my maiden speech in the European Parliament, and I am particularly glad that it should be on a problem concerning primarily the youth of Europe. We are all aware that the work we are doing here is being done for them, and that the Europe we are building so laboriously is being built for them.

In its principle, therefore, the recommendation in the Hague Communiqué to set up a "Youth Advisory Committee" must command our unanimous approval.

Joining in this debate, which has been going on for two years now, I cannot but notice that there are differences between the groups in this House—not with regard to the objective, but on the way of attaining it. I feel we have reached the point where only a vote can settle the question, and that it is no longer possible, for the time being, to reach a compromise. I feel that this will in any case not be so tragic, since we shall be creating a temporary situation which will have to be reviewed within only two years from now.

This is a short space of time, but I hope it will be sufficient for us to be able to gain the experience with which, in two years time, we can choose the forms which are most effective and which best suit the wishes of youth as a whole.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee which we are discussing is of interest, above all, to young people. It is "their business", and allow me therefore to appeal from here to all those young people organized within the different movements which will be working

**Deschamps**

together to put the stamp of youth on Europe and give it the impulse and lead which they so desire.

I would ask these young people to appreciate the difficulties with which we are faced and to understand certain differences which still exist between us and on which—as is customary in democracy—we shall have to decide by means of a free vote. What I ask of these young people is that they should not become polarized over these procedural or technical problems in the name of some ideology or other. I would ask them to react as young people, and not according to attitudes deriving more from hidebound principles than from an effective pragmatism. I would ask them not to refuse to take part in an experiment which has been undertaken for them, which has taken far too long to achieve and which, within a short time, will enable us to arrive at machinery based to an appreciable extent on what they themselves wish.

These young people, it is true, have already had an opportunity to express their opinion through their organizations, and we are bound to note that they, too, have differing—and sometimes opposing—views on the best way of achieving our objective. This is perfectly normal, but the vote which we are about to take will give all these youth organizations an opportunity to cooperate.

The temporary situation which we are about to create may well appear something short of perfect to them, since it is going to be a political choice. However, we are at least offering them the chance to do something themselves. For this reason, whatever the result of the voting—and of course I hope it will be in favour of the views of the Christian-Democratic Group, since I feel that they are the best, that they will permit the expression of the most currents of thought—I would ask young people to accept the result and to contribute with enthusiasm to the launching of this Youth Advisory Committee which is being set up for them, and which we want to achieve together with and—to a great extent—through them. I implore these young people not to perpetuate old and out-dated quarrels nor to let themselves be split by pointless tendentious struggles copied from their elders! It is five years since the Hague Communiqué prompted us to set up this Committee, and delaying it any longer under the pretence of improving it would be a defeat for youth as a whole. What matters now, after this long period spent in deliberation and exchanging views, is to proceed apace with implementing the provisional proposals which are our end result. Whatever provisional arrangements are decided upon—but more particularly in the case of those proposed

by the Christian-Democratic Group—the members of the youth organizations will have a chance to become closely involved in the work of the Committee. They will have their part to play in defining the final structure—as far as anything is ever “final”—and it is their opinions, based on the experience gained during these two years, which will enable these arrangements to conform as closely as possible to the intentions expressed five years ago at The Hague.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at this stage in the construction of Europe, it is my profound belief that all convinced Europeans must stop talking about what has divided them up till now, and establish the political, economic, social and cultural structures which will enable Europe and its peoples to overcome the difficult times ahead of us.

All through my political career, I have tried to be a unifier rather than a divider! I know that youth, as a whole, shares this attitude. I would ask all here—though voting in accordance with their convictions, to accept the outcome whatever it may be, with the firm intention of co-operating in the institutions resulting from it.

We Christian Democrats will certainly do so, and I hope that our Socialist colleagues will not stick to the excessively unbending—and, for me, inexplicable—attitude which was sometimes taken by their speaker. I also ask the young people for this understanding and this participation, and I fervently hope that they will show comprehension.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Pisoni.

**Mr Pisoni.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall try to keep my speech as short as possible. I should like to bring the debate back to general topics, without going into the merits of measures which are empirical and pragmatic, and hence capable of being adapted gradually to future situations. What is important is the spirit behind these measures, and the speaker before me has appealed to the young to behave in a particular way.

I should like to do the opposite—I should like to draw attention to some points which the Commission, the Council and Parliament must bear in mind if the young people who are called upon to participate are to have the ability and possibility of participating and of making a definite contribution.

What we are about to vote on is an offer of participation, and we should like it really to be this. If we call upon young people to act, we

**Pisoni**

must give them room and means to act. We cannot call for participation and contributions if all ideas subsequently become pointless, if aspirations are repressed or if, sometimes, certain fears are forestalled so that they can be sealed up and rendered inoperative.

We want—and shall always want—voices which are authentic, young, organized—but not manipulated; not only carefully-orchestrated or rhetorical opinions, but new and authentic ones, although we realize that the young people will present us with a concept of Europe which is not ours, but theirs. If we are able to accept these proposals of theirs, we shall have achieved something; if, on the other hand, we do nothing but put forward our ideas without accepting theirs, I think our efforts will have been in vain. We shall then remain at the stage of someone who tries to catch votes with visions—and I do not know how attractive these are to those whom we are asking to work together with us in building Europe.

Many people before us have tried to be spokesmen for youth, but I do not know how well qualified they were to do this; they were not really passing on the opinions of youth, but rather superimposing their own opinions on those of the young people. Let us try to avoid making the same mistake; we do not want to be spokesmen, we want to hear genuine and definite opinions. We must avoid mistakes—particularly the paternalism of which our systems and institutions are guilty; we must also avoid the “juvenilism”, which is the opposite of paternalism but which is just as dangerous and mistaken.

It is very difficult to find a way between these two extremes, but we must try to do so in order to allow the young people to range over all possible subjects; there are no subjects which are exclusive to youth, just as there is no precise age limit to youth. It is true that youth is a matter of date of birth, but it is also, above all, a way of seeing things.

It is thus clear that the young people must be able to deal with all the subjects concerning the model for society which they envisage, even if this model conflicts with the model we have offered or may wish to offer them.

It is essential that this instrument should not be interpreted purely as a means of attracting young people so that we can share responsibility with them. We must make a difficult—an extremely difficult—choice, since we must be prepared to accept their contribution without sharing their mistakes. We must rather try to keep them clear of any possibility of making mistakes, because it may be that the young

are not today in a position to tell us what they want, what kind of society they wish to have. Above all, we must accept their criticism, since this will tell us what they do not want, and it is up to us to change matters or to improve them.

As I said before, it is a difficult position—the position of someone who must realize that, having made an offer of participation, he must accept it as a whole, with all the attendant risks and consequences. Only if we act in this way, if we do not try to set up this Committee with the intention of nullifying aspirations, of forestalling pressures or of repressing impulses, shall we have achieved anything positive. This is also the only way in which we can carry young people with us, or use to the full the beneficial effects of youth's energy.

Otherwise, we shall merely have set up an instrument capable of appealing only to those who are youthful in years but have lost their youthful force through being too accustomed, by now, to the machinery of institutions, to the intriguing of inferior politics. These are not the ones who have the genuine spirit of change, that spirit which is so indispensable for any progress. Ours is a difficult task. I wanted to bring these points to the attention of the Commission, the Council and Parliament, since I realize this is what awaits us if we want our work to be of benefit. Otherwise, we shall merely have produced another “hearse”, another body which will run alongside us, which will hold various meetings, but which will not produce anything new or help us to progress along the important road to European unity.

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I was very impressed by today's discussion, and I should like to thank Mr Seefeld and the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth, under the chairmanship of Mr Broeks, for the diligence they have shown.

The results of their work are the subject of study in Parliament, which will shortly be taking a decision on it by vote. I feel, however, that I must stress the importance of today's debate, which marks the end of a very long passage, even if each of us here fully realizes that we have reached a stage which is certainly not final, and in the course of which some changes will be necessary.

In presenting his report and the conclusions of the Committee, Mr Seefeld was right to trace the historical background to the situation. I must

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

add that, several times and on various occasions, the European Parliament has shown a deep interest in the problems of youth, even though its deliberations did not then produce concrete results because of the familiar difficulties and objections.

I must, however, remind you that the decision today derives from a debate in the European Parliament on the occasion of the establishment of the European Youth Office. I might also recall all the subsequent debates and also the discouragement of those who, passionately dedicated to the causes of youth, thought that the decisions taken at the Hague Summit might open up, for young people, a wider path towards Europe, whereas, in fact, the following summit meeting in Paris did nothing but repeat the ideas put forward at the Hague.

As far as the past is concerned, I would recall that, although it is true that the Commission has presented its proposals without having had any really official or definitive meeting with the youth organizations, it is also true that, at various times, the Commission, through my person, has had occasion to point out that it was much more useful to proceed with the work and then refer to concrete proposals from the European Parliament, rather than withdraw proposals already introduced to revise them. This would have wasted time, and we would certainly not have got as far as the present discussion. I therefore wish to repeat my thanks to the parliamentary committee and the working party which, at a moment of difficulty, accepted the advice and suggestions I had proffered with a view to speeding up progress and arriving at concrete proposals.

Obviously, opinions may differ in tackling the problem of youth, particularly when it is a question of offering young people an opportunity to become deeply involved in European problems. As you know, there are two proposals before us today: one to set up a committee of officials with, in a certain sense, the task of administering the national youth policies in a European framework, the other to set up a Youth Advisory Committee, which must be the first step towards enabling young people themselves to manage the policy which they feel to be most suitable for working out in their meetings.

I do not share the pessimism of Mr Walkhoff who maintains in substance that we are creating something which is not genuine, that we are lowering a curtain behind which there is nothing, that we are doing the same for the young as we have done for the consumers, while Europe still remains the Europe of business and businessmen.

I do not think the intention is to draw a curtain or a veil before the eyes of the young. On the contrary, it is a serious attempt to develop, in the years to come, a genuine policy for youth, just as we are trying to apply a valid consumer policy. It is true—as has been pointed out by several speakers, particularly Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli—that it is no simple matter, nowadays, to penetrate the world of youth, and there are some recognized organizations which are linked to political parties or trade unions; on the other hand, there are large numbers of other organizations, especially private and non-political ones based on particular interests and particular aims, which escape the net and which obviously cannot be incorporated—at least for the time being—in developments at European level.

All this is true, but if we do not start doing something positive, such as is contained in the general policy lines of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth, I do not think we shall ever again have an opportunity to tackle these problems—problems not only of information on the European Community, but also problems of training. And I would add—in agreement with Mr Pisoni—that they are problems of having contacts with young people, so as to find out their impressions of Europe, to be in touch with their lines of thought and their assessments, so that this Europe which has been—and is still being—constructed with so much effort may in future become the Europe of those who will have to govern it, of those who, in all our countries, will tomorrow be taking over the responsibilities incumbent on every citizen.

This appears to me to be the spirit in which we must act, and although Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli has expressed disquiet about the fact that some of these organizations, some of these representative bodies, may not be included at present in the Youth Advisory Committee, I feel that, in future, this disquiet will prove to be unfounded when one considers that the presence of similar organizations in five of the nine Member States of the Community (as indicated by the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth) is sufficient for admission to advisory committees and for participation in their work.

In this context, Mr Terrenoire raised a precise question to which I should like to reply. As regards the costs, the Commission had made estimates at the time it presented its proposals. For a long time, these estimates lay on the tables of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth and the Committee on Budgets, and precise figures were not asked for until about the end of May. These were supplied to the Committee on Budgets within less than a week.

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

From these figures, it can be seen that the initial expenditure of six million six hundred and fifty thousand Belgian francs has been increased to eight million two hundred and fifty thousand Belgian francs, in view of the rate of inflation and the higher operating costs. As a result of the proposals made by the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth, this figure of eight million two hundred and fifty thousand Belgian francs has been further increased to nine million seven hundred thousand Belgian francs, which, the Commission feels, effectively represents the sum required for the proper functioning of the services.

Another feature is that provision is made for a permanent secretariat, and I should like to point out, in this respect, that more than a year ago, when the youth organizations explained to me the problem of their work and the need to have, in Brussels, an office, secretariat staff and a meeting room with interpreting facilities, so that they could carry on their work, I replied that I felt this request to be justified, insofar as the Commission also bore these costs for other organizations. In the light of the figures from the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth, as given in the text approved by the Committee itself, I therefore feel that the sum of nine million seven hundred thousand Belgian francs is realistic.

Naturally, the decisions taken by Parliament this evening may to some extent modify the budget as it has been submitted.

Having said this, I shall refrain from stating my views on the various amendments and on the various articles, while recalling that, in the case of some of them, I have already expressed reservations at committee meetings, and if they were to be maintained in the text submitted, my reservations would also be maintained. In the case of the others, I left it to the parliamentary committee, for the reason stated—that I would, as far as possible, give due consideration to the decisions of Parliament rather than withdraw a proposal which I felt to be useful. I hope that a decision can now be reached on the texts submitted so that, within the shortest possible time, the Commission can adopt its definitive position and present the relevant proposals to the Council.

I also hope—and I feel this is the task which the Commission and Parliament must undertake—that this initial experiment can be used as a basis for opening a concrete and effective dialogue with young people—a dialogue which will make it possible to widen the circle of those whom we wish to keep informed of our policy lines, to listen to their reactions and also to take

note of their aspirations, so that this instrument—which may at present appear bureaucratic and unfinished, and which may not yet be up-to-date enough—may become increasingly a focal point for the young generations and for the hopes of the future citizens of Europe.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I should like to thank Mr Scarascia Mugnozza for his ardent and factual speech. I do so recalling the time when, in this Parliament, he provided a stimulus and a personal contribution towards the development of this policy, which concerns such an important field.

I call Mr Seefeld.

**Mr Seefeld, rapporteur.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. My task at the end of this debate is very simple. The discussion was marked by a high degree of objectivity, and I should like to thank all those who spoke either on behalf of their political groups or in a personal capacity.

After long weeks and a large number of meetings, we have come to the end of the road. I can, of course, add nothing to what you have said. You have expressed the opinions reflecting your points of view.

I should like to comment on one point—Mr Terrenoire's statement on behalf of the Committee on Budgets—simply because I want to stress that the subject of financing was not disregarded in the deliberations of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth. I might point out that, on various occasions, we had talks with the Commission on how certain proposals on which we had to decide would affect the budget.

I was very pleased to find that Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, the member of the Commission responsible, gave us encouragement and induced us to act as we have decided. I feel sure that, in the process, he realized that the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth did not want to set up any bureaucratic organizations either.

Allow me to make three final remarks. Firstly: I feel that the demands we have made can be achieved, no matter what type of Youth Forum the Parliament decides upon today. Some of the demands made by the political groups, ladies and gentlemen, went much further. May I point out, for instance, that Article 10 of the motion for a resolution proposes that we should subsequently—not today, but impartially and unhurriedly—investigate whether it might be desirable to set up something like a European Youth Centre. We have postponed this indefinitely and instructed the Commission to study the matter.

**Seefeld**

Secondly: money spent on the youth of Europe, ladies and gentlemen, is money well spent, if we can cooperate in finding a suitable form for the work with which these young people can, in future, play their part in building Europe in the way intended by the Heads of State or Government.

Thirdly: If we state that we wish to involve youth in the construction of Europe, we must realize that this decision implies financial commitments. I am therefore very grateful to the Committee on Budgets that, in spite of its critical comments, it has nevertheless come out in favour of rapid achievement of the aims of the Hague Communiqué. I am also grateful to it for having pointed out that Parliament should receive regular and detailed information, particularly as regards budgetary considerations, on the action taken on these proposals and deliberations.

Mr President, I should like to conclude by saying that I, too, have set myself a goal. In two years time, we should again consider impartially and unhurriedly whether what we decided upon here was the right form. I feel sure that the experience gained by then can be put into practice.

I should like to thank you all for having followed this debate with such patience and for having given us the opportunity of making a start on a purposeful European youth policy. I regard it as a purposeful start if we are able to listen to the youth of Europe in the Youth Forum and if we are prepared to make use of their arguments in our work.

Ladies and gentlemen, all our decisions will affect chiefly those who have a longer life expectancy than many of us here.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak? The general debate is closed.

Before going on to consideration of the proposed recommendations, I wish to ask Mr Yeats if he intends to request formally that the matter be referred back to the committee.

I call Mr Yeats.

**Mr Yeats.** — Mr President, with your permission I will for the moment withdraw my request whilst reserving the right, if it seems necessary, to reintroduce it at a later stage.

**President.** — Thank you for being so cooperative, Mr Yeats.

We shall now proceed to consideration of the proposed recommendations, Mr Yeats' request having been temporarily withdrawn.

I have no amendments for proposed recommendation No I.

We may thus proceed immediately to proposed recommendation No II.

I have two amendments to Article 1 which may be the subject of a joint debate:

— Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Laban and Mr Walkhoff, which reads as follows:

'Article 1A

Delete the second and third paragraphs of this Article.'

— Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, Mr John Hill on behalf of the European Conservative Group, Mr Premoli and Mr Baas, and which reads as follows:

'Article 1A, third paragraph

Delete this paragraph.'

I call Mr Laban to move Amendment No 1.

**Mr Laban.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to explain Amendment No 1 to Article 1A tabled by the Socialist Group. There can be no doubt that we shall need the help of today's younger generation in building the European Community, which, if we are realistic, will take a long time to achieve. Mr Scarascia Mugnozza also rightly mentioned this in his answer. For this reason we must associate the socially aware members of the younger generation as much as possible in the activities of the European institutions, and take their opinions into account. In principle, as Mr Walkhoff has made clear, we heartily support the proposal to set up a Youth Forum.

If we want to associate young people in our work, and win them over to the European idea, this must be done in a conscientious and democratic fashion. Therefore, as stated on page 47 of Mr Hougardy's report, the channels through which young people can make their opinions known must not take the form of rigid structures imposed on them from above. This would, however, indeed be the result of a compulsory division of the forum into three sections. The reactions reaching us indicate that the international organizations involved, and many of the national organizations too, have serious objections to this. The Parliamentary Committee conducted a hearing in which youth organizations had an opportunity of airing their views. However, most of the members of the Committee appear to have taken little or no notice of the points the young people made. I should also like to say to Mr John Hill that, in our view, this



**Laban**

runs completely counter to paragraph 8 of the draft resolution which he quoted, and in which mention is made, among other things, of a democratic Europe. I also note that the Commission drew up the text of its proposal after the first hearing, but omitted to consult the young people again to discover what they thought of it.

Mr President, if three independent sections are in fact set up within the Youth Forum we shall run the risk of becoming so bogged down in these specific problems that we shall lose sight of the broader issues. Moreover, the three proposed sections do not correspond to all the existing types of youth organizations. Practically no youth organization limits itself to problems in one particular field. The issues directly affecting youth, and other relevant problems in Europe cannot be put neatly into three pigeon-holes.

It strikes me as ridiculous to say that we value the views of young people and then to impose structures upon them to which, in our opinion, they rightly object. It should be remembered that they did not ask for this type of structure in the first place.

We therefore feel that we must propose, in accordance with the young people's wishes, that the last two sentences of Article 1A be deleted.

I hope Parliament will approve this amendment and will not let itself be led by feelings which, however well intended, will seem paternalistic in practice.

I therefore urge Parliament to adopt the amendment tabled by our group.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch to present Amendment No 6 which I have just read.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. I am speaking on this occasion on behalf of the Christian Democratic Group, the European Conservative Group and the Liberal and Allies Group.

We have proposed that paragraph 3 should be deleted. I have already explained that this is purely for reasons of economy. Of course, the meetings of these sections should be held on the first day of the forum, but not separately, as this would entail enormous additional travelling costs, and we feel that a close watch should be kept on the budget during the two years' trial period.

As regards the central point of the Socialist Group's proposal presented by Messrs. Laban and Walkhoff, I may say on behalf of our Group that we reject it. We discussed this in great

detail in the Committee, and I should like to stress that we set great store by informed and qualified opinions, and feel that the general problems must indeed be discussed in the forum as a whole, leaving specific problems to be dealt with by those youth organizations which have themselves decided to accept responsibility for them. They make up their own minds as to what specific subject they should decide upon. Thus we believe that there is plenty of room for democratic freedom of choice, and that Mr Laban's proposal throws everything into the melting pot and would hinder the making of objective judgements.

For this reason we urge Parliament to reject Messrs Laban and Walkhoff's proposal concerning paragraph 2. On the other hand, we are in complete agreement with them as regards paragraph 3.

**President.** — I call Mr Yeats.

**Mr Yeats.** — I support the amendment. There are several reasons why these paragraphs of Article 1A are unsatisfactory.

We simply cannot divide people into watertight compartments in this way. The representatives of political organizations will surely be interested in social and trade union and in educational and cultural matters. Equally, the representatives of social or trade union organizations will be interested in politics and in educational and cultural matters. We cannot separate them in this way.

In setting up this forum there is an even more fundamental point to be considered. Why should we tell this new forum how to conduct its business? If it wishes to set up sub-committees, it should be allowed to do so. I cannot see why we should instruct the forum to form three sub-committees of the kind to which reference has been made. If it wishes to do so, surely that must be its own affair. I think that we are overreaching ourselves and adopting a somewhat paternalistic attitude, which would be resented.

For those reasons, I submit that the amendment should be adopted.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr John Hill.

**Mr John Hill.** — I support the retention of paragraph 2 because it is fundamental to the Conservative, Christian-Democrat and Liberal approach. We were saying earlier that there is a danger that the specialist and minority interests will be swamped, and there

**Hill**

is some evidence of that from the history of the colloquium organized in Brussels in June 1970, when it was hoped that young representatives of all kinds of international organizations would cover a wide range of subjects, many of them detailed. They did not get a look in because the big political issues swamped everything.

The international youth organizations are not to be exclusively divided and segregated. It is provided that every organization could have a member attending in the different sections but it has to decide in which section it places its vote.

It may be that experience in operation will show that some modification is desirable, but I do not think it likely that we can rely upon the forum deciding at an early stage that it is desirable to have this division. We ourselves go into committee and discuss important subjects in very much greater detail than this Chamber could tolerate. I hope, therefore, that Parliament will see the sense of trying to get all subjects adequately covered, because very often the Commission will need the detailed, almost technical response of the youth organizations concerned, or perhaps one or two of them. I agree that we cannot put them entirely into watertight compartments but we can ensure that different specialist interests are represented in the appropriate departments.

**President.** — I call Mr Broeksz.

**Mr Broeksz.** — (NL) Mr President, I think all the members of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth will understand that I found myself in a somewhat difficult position as chairman of this committee. I was one of those who abstained.

If one considers these amendments one will see that both groups agree that the third sentence of Article 1A should be deleted. I must admit that this would indeed save a great deal of money. On the other hand, I must point out that the Commission was prepared to provide this money, since Mr Scarascia Mugnozza felt sure that preliminary discussions of this kind would help the forum to function effectively.

If the Commission feels that it can provide money for this purpose, the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth can give it its support.

It would of course be better to save this money. Thus I feel that the members of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth and, I hope, Parliament, will have no objections to supporting Mr Klepsch's proposal.

As for the other proposal, I must defend the attitude of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth. We have discussed this at great length both in the Committee and in the Working Party. We were fully aware of the fact that the international youth organizations felt no need for this. If people think they can get round this problem by all becoming members of the political group, as suggested by the Irish national organization, little can be done to prevent it; whether or not it works will emerge in the course of the two years' trial period.

As Chairman of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth I feel that this point should be retained, although I personally shall abstain.

**President.** — In accordance with Rule 29 paragraph 4 of the Rules of Procedure I first put to the vote Amendment No 1 since this is the one which departs furthest from the text of the Parliamentary committee.

I would remind you that if Amendment No 1 is adopted Amendment No 6 will become superfluous.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 6 to the vote.

Amendment No 6 is adopted. On Article 2A I have Amendment No 9 tabled by Mr Yeats, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, and which reads as follows:

'Article 2A, second paragraph

Replace

'Any minority viewpoint that obtains 25% or more of the votes cast shall be attached to the opinion and submitted to the institutions for consideration.'

by

'Any minority viewpoint shall be recorded in the minutes, attached to the opinion and submitted to the institutions for consideration.'

I call Mr Yeats to move this amendment.

**Mr Yeats.** — Mr President, this amendment endeavours to ensure that smaller minority interests than the 25% mentioned in Article 2A should be recognized, for 25% in European terms is a very large figure. If no minority viewpoint receiving less than 25% of the votes cast is to be recognized, sizeable sections of European youth opinion will remain unrepresented.

This applies particularly to smaller countries such as Ireland, but it could also apply to minority interests spread over several countries.

I cannot see any difficulty being created by the adoption of the amendment. There is no advan-

**Yeats**

tage to be gained by steamrolling opinion to the extent of insisting that there must be a very large number of people involved before the opinion can be submitted to the institutions. If the amendment is adopted, it will give all concerned a much better chance of expressing their viewpoint. I therefore urge Parliament to adopt the amendment. Thank you, Mr President.

**President.** — I call Mr Seefeld.

**Mr Seefeld, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, as rapporteur I would like to say that this question was also considered in the Committee. However, the Committee decided by a majority that this 25% restriction clause should be retained. It would eliminate any opinions which from the outset only corresponded to the views of a small minority, and it would ensure that work would not be hindered by everyone in the forum thinking he could make proposals which the Commission—or even, as suggested in Mr Yeats' proposed amendment, the Community institutions—would be obliged to consider, even if they had no hope of success.

We wanted to ensure right from the outset that the Youth Forum would be as informed and responsible a body as possible and that at least the attempt would be made to find a small group, all of whom subscribed to one specific opinion. We felt therefore that 25% was sufficient, and I feel it my duty as rapporteur to make this known. If we had decided upon a lower figure, say 10%, or if we had said—like Mr Yeats in his proposal for an amendment—that all minorities must be given the opportunity of having their views recorded in the minutes and submitted to the Community institutions, we would run the risk of entire meetings being taken up by subjects which were doomed to failure from the start and only intended for the minutes.

I feel it my duty to report exactly what was said in the Committee. This is why the figure of 25% was included.

**President.** — I call Mr John Hill.

**Mr John Hill.** — I wish to confirm what the rapporteur has said.

As to Mr Yeats' amendment, I believe it weakens the position. The opinions of all the very small minorities will be noted in the minutes. Under Article 4 the minutes are to be circulated. That point may not have been noted. Therefore, the opinions of the smallest minorities will go forward although they will not necessarily have to be answered.

**President.** — I call Mr Laban.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, I shall be particularly brief, since I fully support the views put forward by the rapporteur, Mr Seefeld. As Mr John Hill has already said, every minority opinion appears in the minutes, even the opinion of one single group. We shall therefore stand by the text of the recommendation and vote against this amendment.

**President.** — I call Mr Thornley.

**Mr Thornley.** — I wish to explain briefly that I am voting with Mr Yeats for precisely the same reasons as that which he gave. My country on the whole does not possess youth organizations which are affiliated to large international bodies but rather youth organizations of a small, vocational and limited kind.

**President.** — I call Mr Yeats.

**Mr Yeats.** — It must be remembered that at the level of the EEC 25% of the total population is 60 million. That is not 60 million young people. Nonetheless, it is a very large number.

That makes it clear that if we maintain the 25%, only large organizations have any chance of expressing an opinion, having that opinion included in the minutes or having account taken of it. In a Community with 250 million people and a figure of 25%, only the large international organizations will be involved.

The purpose of the amendment is not to ensure that there will be hundreds of these organizations. I am certain there will not be. If there were to be, it would be very easy to change the figure at some future date to 10% or some such figure. The aim of the amendment is to see that smaller organizations, which may not extend over several countries and which do not have large international structures, can be represented.

**President.** — I call Miss Lulling.

**Miss Lulling.** — (F) Mr President, I too would like to support Mr Yeats' amendment which I find much more democratic than the Commission's proposal. The fact of the matter is that any limit regarding minorities is arbitrary. 25% is just as arbitrary as 10% and 5%.

That is why I feel that Mr Yeats' amendment is much more reasonable, not only as regards the percentages, but also, in particular, as regards the wording, since it says that any minority viewpoint should be recorded in the

**Lulling**

minutes, and attached to the opinion submitted to the institutions for consideration. The institutions can do whatever they want with this minority viewpoint. They will not necessarily have to consider it. I feel this is much more realistic and democratic, and I will therefore vote for Mr Yeats' amendment.

**President.**— I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Mr President, I have listened with great pleasure to what Miss Lulling and Mr Thornley of the Socialist Group have to say, since it flatly contradicts all Mr Walkhoff's earlier remarks about peculiarly Christian-Democratic wiles. He said earlier that this figure of 25% was a completely undemocratic arrangement, and he explained in great detail on behalf of the Socialist Group why such a minority vote should not go forward to the Commission as equally worthy of consideration. I now hear a whole series of his colleagues saying that a much lower figure must be set. We felt that 25% was a carefully considered figure; like a narrow majority, which after all may be merely due to chance, a minority of this size deserves attention and consideration. And we ensured—in order to comply with Mr Yeats' wishes—my colleague Mr John Hill has already pointed this out—that the minutes should be submitted to the Commission in their entirety, which means in fact that every viewpoint would be made known. However, it would not be correct to say that every divergent vote, supported by only one individual, bore as much weight as one supported by 25% of the voters. I therefore feel that this distinction is justified.

**President.** — I call Mr Walkhoff.

**Mr Walkhoff.** — (D) Mr Klepsch, may I repeat what I have already said, so that my meaning is perfectly clear. Earlier I criticised your original request that the Youth Forum should only be granted a right of initiative when the initiative, i.e. the decision, is supported by 75%; we must continue to reject this.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 9 to the vote. Amendment No 9 is rejected.

I have two amendments to Article 3, first paragraph of Recommendation No II which may be the subject of a joint debate:

— Amendment No 2 tabled by Messrs Laban and Walkhoff on behalf of the Socialist Group, and which reads as follows:

'Article 3, paragraph 1.

This paragraph should read as follows:

'The Forum shall consist of 50 Members. These Members shall be representatives of the CENYC and the Coordination Bureau on a 50-50 basis, and shall be nominated by these two central organizations on proposals from the individual organizations. In doing so, geographical considerations should be taken into account. The delegations from the two central organizations may also include youth representatives coming from countries which are associated with the European Community or have concluded free trade agreements with it.'

— Amendment No 10 tabled by Mr Yeats on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, and which reads as follows:

'Paragraph 1 should read as follows:

'Every international youth organization, national association or national committee to which the Commission has granted consultative status may send one, two or three representatives to the Youth Advisory Committee, where they shall each have one vote only.'

'This consultative status may be obtained one year after having been requested

— by the national associations and committees;

— by the international organizations which are active in five of the nine Member States to further the cause of European unification and which submit an annual report on their activities to the Commission.'

'The organizations, associations or committees mentioned above and represented on the Advisory Committee shall be entitled to have, if necessary, a representative in each section. They shall have only one vote in the section for which they have themselves expressed a preference.'

I call Mr Laban to move Amendment No 2.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, this amendment partly stems from our objections to Article 1A concerning the three sections, but quite apart from this I am afraid my group cannot agree to these detailed regulations governing the representation of youth organizations either. Let us consider the situation.

There are already two international organizations at the European level. We feel they are representative of all youth movements in the Community and anyone can join them. The proposed regulation on representation would, in our view, only lead to difficulties and red tape whenever agreement had to be reached on which organizations were to be given advisory status. As we see it, the proposals in Article 3 also mean that the representatives of the small, and above all, the new Member States would be excluded.

We feel that this would certainly be the case with Ireland, where there are many worthy youth organizations, not based on political or

**Laban**

religious principles, which have no branches in five of the nine Member States. They do, however, come under CENYC.

In addition, we regard it as essential that as many nationalities as possible should be represented, and for this reason our amendment also takes geographical considerations into account.

The international organizations which to a great extent represent the views and activities of young people in Europe oppose Article 3. If this Article is not amended, we do not think that the members of the youth organizations will feel very inclined to participate in this Forum, and if this is the case we in Parliament can make whatever decisions we want, but the project will never get off the ground. We do not feel that the organizations who appoint representatives necessarily need to appoint young people from countries other than the Nine, but Europe does of course comprise more countries than just the Nine and we all hope that the number of Member States will increase still further. Therefore we feel that we must leave the possibility open for other Europeans involved in these umbrella bodies, such as the Norwegians and the Swedes, to take part perhaps in the work of the forum. I hope that our amendment will be accepted by a majority.

If I may also be permitted to state my opinion concerning Amendment No 10 by Mr Yeats, I feel that this proposal is so greatly at variance with the ideal put forward by our group, that it is clear that we cannot support this amendment.

**President.** — I call Mr Yeats.

**Mr Yeats.** — The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that as wide a range as possible of both national and international organizations are represented on the Youth Advisory Committee or forum.

In my speech on the resolution I said that Ireland had a particular problem. Under the arrangements set out in Article 3, the great majority of Irish youth organizations would be unrepresented. I should stress that I am not speaking in any chauvinistic manner. This is not a question of national pride. It is simply a desire that the youth of the whole Community should feel that they can be directly represented in this new organization. The young people of Ireland and of other smaller countries in the Community which may be affected in a similar way will obviously not have the slightest interest in an organization in which in most cases they will have no direct or indirect representation. Therefore, the amendment seeks to ensure that

both international and national organizations have equal opportunity for representation.

I prefer my Amendment No 10, but the amendment put forward by Mr Laban and Mr Walkoff is at least an advance on the proposals set out in the committee's report. The report, as it stands, would mean that only very large international organizations would be represented and in consequence, a high proportion of young people throughout the Community would not be represented. Therefore, before it has even begun, this new endeavour, this forum, would be stultified and to a large extent made useless.

I urge this Parliament to adopt Amendment No 10, which does not deviate from the essential principles laid down in the report, but, in a democratic way, extends the right to attend this forum to a wider section of the young people of Europe.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Mr President, I should like to state briefly our attitude to these two proposals for amendments on behalf of my group and also on behalf of my Conservative and Liberal friends.

We have in fact already discussed this problem in great detail in the general debate. Therefore I will only deal with two ideas which have recently been put forward. Firstly, it is surely completely inaccurate to say that Ireland could not be represented, since the amendment is only aimed at Article 3, paragraph 1, and those who have spoken on this subject know very well that in accordance with Article 3 paragraph 7 the national umbrella association in each country is entitled to a vote in the forum. This naturally applies in the case of Ireland too. I only say this because a factual error has crept into the discussion which can only have arisen from considering one paragraph in isolation instead of all seven paragraphs of Article 3 together.

I should like to make a second remark. Mr Yeats, too, has also obviously misunderstood the nature of the point at issue. The discussion between the majority of the committee—the group which I represent and the Socialist Group—is exclusively concerned with the basis on which the various organizations will send representatives. We want to avoid socialist-controlled umbrella associations dictating the extent to which the other youth organizations are represented in this forum. That, in a nutshell, is the point of disagreement.

We want all the youth organizations to appoint their own representatives without having to obtain the approval of any of the socialist-

**Klepsch**

controlled umbrella associations. That is the issue on which we are voting here. We have already made this point in the discussion here today.

I have also already characterized the two so-called umbrella associations, and should like to repeat once more on behalf of my group that we feel that it was not possible to find any better arrangement. We feel that the form we have adopted will give us the opportunity of deciding in the two years' trial period whether the conditions and reservations were justified. In any case it is more democratic to allow the youth organizations to send their representatives directly than to make their choice dependent on the majority decisions of some umbrella body.

**President.** — I call Mr Terrenoire.

**Mr Terrenoire.** — (F) Mr President, I should like to speak in a completely personal capacity, and ask my honourable colleagues to take note of the fact that for the moment I am not speaking as draftsman of the opinion.

I was very pleased to hear Mr Klepsch reproaching the Socialists for wishing to influence the Youth Advisory Committee. However, he could have begun by addressing this reproach to himself, since we all know very well that behind all this—let us have the courage to admit it—is the wish of two rival international organizations to influence the future Youth Advisory Committee, ignoring the fact, as Mr Yeats rightly said, that there are some countries in the Nine which would not be fairly and properly represented on this Committee.

Thus if we agree to the proposals made here, regardless of whether they are Christian Democratic or Socialist, we should have a Committee which did not really represent European youth.

We personally are confident that the Commission will ensure that representation on the Youth Advisory Committee is organized in a democratic manner, and that the Council, which will take the final decision, will ensure that all young people of the nine Member States of our Community are properly represented on this Committee.

If this does not happen, we run the risk of a political confrontation between two large organizations which, albeit international, nevertheless represent only a small section of European youth. Believe me, there are many young people apart from those who are members of these organizations, or who share their views.

**President.** — I call Mr Walkhoff.

**Mr Walkhoff.** — (D) Mr President, Mr Klepsch has tried to reply to Mr Yeats' objection by pointing out that each national youth organization can send a representative who is entitled to vote in the plenary sessions. This is certainly true. However, it will not be possible for this member to work within the various sections of the Youth Forum. We all know, however, that it is in these sections that the decisive work will be done. In other words, these representatives will share the fate of the non-attached Members of this Parliament, who do not have the opportunity to work in the committees and thus influence the decisions made in the plenary part-sessions. To this extent I think Mr Yeats' views are justified, even if attempts have been made to rule them out on formal grounds.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Just one sentence, Mr President. It is, of course, perfectly permissible for the persons in question to take part in the sectional meetings, and actively participate in the discussions. Only the right to vote in these sections is restricted. Each organization must decide in which section it wishes to vote. On the other hand, the right to vote is completely unrestricted in the plenary assembly, where the decisions are made. Thus the representatives can take part in the discussion without right to vote, just like all the others who have decided to use their vote in another section. We have already made our decision on this point. In the plenary assembly, of course, these persons will have the complete right to vote on any subject, just like everybody else. All this has received very careful consideration. Granted, Mr Walkhoff, you were not in the sub-committee. But I am sure Mr Seefeld will agree that we made great efforts to find an appropriate solution.

**President.** — I call Mr Thornley.

**Mr Thornley.** — I fully share Mr Yeats' misgivings, but in this case, though I am not speaking for my group I am voting with it, because Mr Laban's amendment meets the difficulty completely.

Obviously, I do not know much about Mr Terrenoire. I am a teacher and I know a great deal about students. But he has put in crystal-clear terms what many of us know about the manner in which student politics are run in Europe. I am not prepared to go along with a situation in which this Community finances an organization which becomes a political football kicked between two enormous organizations.

**Thornley**

I slightly resented the remark by Mr Klepsch that this is all about Ireland. It is not all about Ireland. It is all about those youth organizations which do not choose to affiliate themselves to massive international organizations. It has nothing specifically to do with Ireland.

I regret to say that in this instance I shall vote against Mr Yeats and with Mr Laban because I believe that Mr Laban's amendment has completely met the point. But Mr Yeats' fears are perfectly well expressed. I would hate to sound offensive, but listening to the debate I sometimes wonder how many people know anything at all about young people or education. Certainly Mr Terrenoire, who is not in my group, has put his finger on the point. The only reason I am voting with my group and Mr Laban is that Mr Laban has caught the whole nub of the question in his amendment.

**President.** — I call Miss Lulling.

**Miss Lulling.** — (F) Mr President, I should like to explain my reasons for abstaining from the vote on these amendments.

I feel that only the Commission text will enable a youth committee to be set up quickly, and that what people are trying to do here is the best way of never achieving this goal!

We have experienced difficulties in many other fields, for example in the Joint Committee, in the social field etc., where the inability of organizations to reach agreement has meant that we have never been able to set up committees, or have managed only to set up advisory committees, and even then only after considerable time.

In my opinion, the aim must be to set up a committee which can start work immediately.

To adopt all the proposals which have just been made here would be the best way of nipping this initiative in the bud, and I would not like to see this happen. I hope the Council of Ministers will also be reasonable with regard to Article 3 and adopt the Commission point of view, which I feel to be the only realistic and practicable one.

**President.** — I call Mr Seefeld.

**Mr Seefeld, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, the viewpoints of the individual groups have now been presented. You will have noticed that up to now I have spoken in my capacity as rapporteur and have tried to explain the Committee's opinion in as fair and factual a manner as possible. I should like to continue to do so now

by pointing out that for the sake of factual accuracy, certain remarks made by Mr Klepsch cannot be allowed to go uncorrected.

Mr Klepsch said that his Group would not like Socialist-controlled umbrella associations to have a majority. This may reflect what he personally believes, but it does not fit the facts. It is simply not true to say that the national umbrella associations of the European youth organizations in CENYC are controlled by the Socialists, and I cannot imagine the European Parliament allowing such a statement to pass unchallenged. When electing their representatives the youth organizations sometimes vote for one group and sometimes for another. When we were rather younger, Mr Klepsch and I both experienced this ourselves in the national organizations which we represented. I know this was the case then, that it is still the case today and that presumably in the future too there will be better coordination amongst youth representatives than is evidently possible amongst political groups.

(Applause from the left)

**President.** — In accordance with Rule 29 (4) of the Rules of Procedure I shall first put to the vote Amendment No 2 since this is the one which departs furthest from the text of the Parliamentary committee.

It is understood that if this amendment is adopted, Amendment No 10 by Mr Yeats will become superfluous.

I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is rejected. I put Amendment No 10 to the vote.

Amendment No 10 is rejected.

On Article 3, paragraph 3 I have three amendments which may be the subject of a joint debate.

— Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Laban and Mr Walkhoff on behalf of the Socialist Group, and which reads as follows:

'Article 3, paragraph 3

This paragraph should read as follows:

'The Forum shall elect a Chairman and a Bureau of nine Members for a period of two years. This Bureau shall meet every three months.'

— Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, Mr John Hill on behalf of the European Conservative Group, and Messrs Premoli and Baas, and which reads as follows:

'The first sub-paragraph should read as follows:

'Until this decision is reviewed, the Bureau of

**President**

each section shall be composed of a representative from each of the organizations entitled to vote in it.'

— Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, Mr John Hill on behalf of the European Conservative Group, and Messrs Premoli and Baas, and which reads as follows:

The fourth sub-paragraph should read as follows:

'The Bureau shall meet twice a year outside Forum meetings.'

I call Mr Laban to move Amendment No 3.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, since our amendment to Article 1A has been rejected, this amendment, which concerned the necessary textual modifications, is no longer needed. Thus I can withdraw it.

As regards Amendment No 7 by Mr Klepsch, I need do little more than refer to my explanation of vote on the last amendment.

We are against dividing the forum into sections. In spite of our fear that the Youth Forum, which the majority of this Parliament want to set up in a form which the young people find unacceptable, will never get off the ground, we will not vote against this amendment, since in itself it is a slight improvement on the present text.

**President.** — I call Mr John Hill.

**Mr John Hill.** — Mr President, I wish to move Amendment No 7, which is a result of thoughts based, as I said in my earlier speech, on later information and is in the interests of flexibility and economy.

As Mr Laban has conceded, the three sections are due to elect a Bureau of three members each, and the three sectional Bureaux become the forum Bureau with the chairman. My amendment is designed to avoid elections in what may be a very small series of groups electing three members of six, because it seems that in the first two years it is desirable that every organization in the sections should have a chance of being represented in the Bureau.

There are likely to be only 17 organizations, so it is an argument about the travelling of about eight additional people. No organization will be cut out, and if the national groups referred to by the Irish and the French could only get together with others—because by definition they must be keen on the growth of Europe—they could meet the criteria.

The economic argument is that if, when the Bureau meets, it has representation from every organization in the forum, it will be possible, while they are gathered together, if necessary to draft extra items of agenda concerning perhaps just one of the sections and to have a full meeting of that section by inviting a few more people for a day. That might involve a small extra expense, but it would save the great expense of regular sectional meetings outside the forum. I think that the potential saving is over 2 million Belgian francs. I hope that my colleagues, having accepted earlier amendments, will adopt this one.

**President.** — I call Mr Laban.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Do you mean that I am to give an explanation of vote on Amendment No 8 too, or does this amendment form a separate item on the agenda?

**President.** — You can do it now.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, we feel that in addition to the session it would be a good thing for the members to meet once every three months, to ensure that the Bureau functions as smoothly as possible. We feel that two meetings a year in addition to the session are insufficient to provide continuity. Thus we support the text as adopted by the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth. We will vote against Amendment No 8 by Mr Klepsch and his colleagues.

**President.** — Amendment No 3 having been withdrawn we shall now vote consecutively on Amendments No 7 and 8.

I put Amendment No 7 to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is adopted.

I put Amendment No 8 to the vote.

Amendment No 8 is adopted. On Article 3, paragraph 4 I have Amendment No 4 tabled by Mr Laban and Mr Walkhoff on behalf of the Socialist Group, and which reads as follow:

'Add the following text to this paragraph:

Finally, a Community Youth Fund should be created and placed at the disposal of the various youth organizations for the implementation of their internal training and information programmes.'

I call Mr Laban to move this amendment.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, if we want the youth organizations which are to be represented on the Youth Forum to be in a position to do constructive work, we feel that a



**Laban**

fund should be set up which may be used for other than pre-specified purposes. The money must be available for various projects, particularly the training and information of the members. In setting up the forum Europe is providing money exclusively for the organization itself, but none for the development of the internal structure of the youth organizations in the Member States. In the opinion submitted by the Economic and Social Committee it was stressed that the financial support given to the European youth organizations at the moment is in fact very small, particularly in comparison with the means at the disposal of the governments or certain bilateral organizations.

We would therefore heartily recommend that a Community Youth Fund be set up in consultation with the Commission.

We hope that Parliament will show its approval of this idea by adopting Amendment No 4.

**President.** — I call Mr Seefeld.

**Mr Seefeld, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I only wish to add that I should like to ask even those who up to now have largely rejected my proposals, to adopt this amendment. I think the considerations put forward by Mr Laban are valid, and that we should incorporate them in our programme.

**President.** — I call Mr Broeks.

**Mr Broeks.** — (NL) Mr President, this addition to the report was not discussed in the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth. I feel, however, that this addition would have been generally accepted if it had been discussed in the Committee. I feel therefore that there can be no objections to adopting it.

**President.** — I call Mr John Hill.

**Mr John Hill.** — My group and colleagues will vote for the amendment. We believe that the first priority is to help the international youth organizations to maintain a modest presence in Brussels. I am not sure where the money will come from. Nevertheless, we support the idea of a fund which, we hope, could be used for this purpose.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 4 to the vote. Amendment No 4 is adopted. Mr Laban and Mr Walkhoff have tabled on behalf of the Socialist Group Amendment No 5 rev. to Article 4, paragraph 7, which proposes that paragraph 7 of this Article be deleted. I call Mr Laban to move the amendment.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, I have only just received the revised version. Since our Amendment No 1 to Article 1A has been rejected, as far as I can see at present this amendment has become meaningless. I therefore withdraw it.

**President.** — Amendment No 5 revised is withdrawn.

We must now proceed to the consideration of Mr Yeats' request, which had been temporarily withdrawn.

I call Mr Yeats for a procedural motion.

**Mr Yeats.** — The course of the debate has been such that the requirements and requests of the youth organizations have not been met. Therefore, I renew my request, pursuant to Rule 26(2), that the matter be referred back to the committee for further consideration.

**President.** — I call Mr Broeks.

**Mr Broeks.** — (NL) Mr President, I understand very well the considerations which have led Mr Yeats to make this proposal. He thinks that our Committee has not been informed about the points made by the two international youth organizations, and stressed by the National Youth Council of Ireland. This is a misunderstanding. We were in fact fully aware of the situation and therefore I feel there would be little point in discussing the matter again.

I do not wish to be awkward, and if Parliament considers it necessary to adopt this proposal, the question will certainly be examined again with due care and attention, but I suggest to Mr Yeats that he should withdraw his proposal, since as far as I understand the general attitude of the Committee it can have little or no effect.

**President.** — In accordance with Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure one speaker for and one against this procedural motion may be heard. Mr Broeks has declared himself opposed to the motion.

I call Mr Walkhoff.

**Mr Walkhoff.** — (D) I should like to support Mr Yeats' proposal as one who shares the feeling of the youth organizations that the present motion for a resolution and the report of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth are unacceptable. In such a situation one should try everything possible—even when the chances of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth producing a new version are very slight. I feel that our sense of responsibility should be enough

**Walkhoff**

to encourage us to make one more attempt, since the only alternative for me would be to reject this report and this motion for a resolution.

**President.** — One speaker in favour and one against have spoken on the procedural motion.

I now put to the vote Mr Yeats's motion that the matter be referred back to the Committee.

The motion is rejected.

We may now proceed to consideration of the motion for a resolution proper.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anybody wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution in its entirety to the vote.

The motion is adopted<sup>1</sup>.

14. *Importation of educational, scientific and cultural materials.*

*Decision to postpone consideration of a report*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the report submitted by Mr Lange on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the importation free of Common Customs Tariff duties of educational, scientific and cultural materials (Doc. 72/74).

I call Mr Lange for a procedural motion.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, I should like to propose that this item be postponed until the next part-session in Luxembourg. I do not see how we can discuss this item in the present circumstances, since it is concerned with a rather subtle difference of opinion between the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. I should therefore be grateful if we do not hold the debate on this subject today but rather include it on the agenda for the Luxembourg part-session.

**President.** — I call Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli.

**Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli.** — (I) In my capacity as draftsman of the opinion and amendments on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth, I should like to tell Mr Lange that I do not feel there is such a great difference of opinion between us, since the responsible committee has said that it agrees with our request in principle, and that it regards the text as

sufficiently clear already. Now if it agrees with the request in principle there should be no difficulty in adopting two comparatively minor amendments. I have discussed this with the members of the committee, and the extent to which our opinions differed did not seem to be such that it would be impossible to settle the matter without lengthy discussions. Nevertheless I do not feel in a position to make a proposal.

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, for the reasons already given I urgently request that this item should be postponed until the next sitting. It would be too much to deal with now. We thought the committee asked for its opinion would have been sensible enough to realise that the spirit of the Commission's proposal corresponded to its own wishes. Now the amendments have been tabled and something must be said about them. I don't see how we can do this under the present conditions.

In reality, the disagreement over the words "comparable" and "equivalent" reflects, for example, the question of a greater or lesser degree of liberalisation.

The hearing which is expressly provided for will put all the other comparable committees involved in this matter at somewhat of a disadvantage. I should like to ask therefore that we be given the opportunity to discuss this before a House which is aware of the scope of these questions.

May I therefore repeat my urgent request: to postpone the discussion for today and to include it in the agenda for the Luxembourg part-session at the end of this month.

**President.** — Mr Lange, you have proposed an amendment to the agenda which gives rise to a procedural problem. As you know, according to Rule 12 a proposed amendment to the agenda, not submitted by a political group or by representatives of the Commission or the Council, must receive a majority of two-thirds of the total vote; if it does not receive such a majority in favour, the debate must continue. For this reason, I should like to ask whether anyone else wishes to speak on this question before I put it to the House.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I wish to raise a query with which perhaps you, Sir, or the Secretariat will be able to deal, as to the level of business which is scheduled for the second part-session in June. I understand Mr Lange's argument and

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**Scott-Hopkins**

do not disagree with him, but I have a feeling that the second part-session is already heavily overlaid. I would like to know through you, Sir, the view of the Secretariat on this point.

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) The time factor is not so important. I just feel that this problem should be considered under conditions other than the present ones, since it involves a question of maintaining liberalization, which is of considerable interest to this House too. This aspect is not immediately obvious and deserves some discussion.

I had originally hoped that the committee asked for its opinion would be satisfied with our attitude. Then we would have been able to settle the matter in accordance with the Commission's intentions and without discussion. But now we are faced with the crucial issues of liberalization on the one hand and certain protectionist attitudes on the other. These are bound up with differences which appear purely verbal on the surface and may, for example, arise from different ways of interpreting the German language.

In view of this, therefore, I should be grateful if Parliament would grant my request. Those representatives of the Socialist Group who are present should find no difficulty in supporting this proposal on behalf of their group.

**President.** — I should like to say in reply to Mr Scott-Hopkins' query, that the Secretariat thinks it would probably be possible to find time to discuss this question at the July part-session, should Parliament decide to postpone it.

I call Mr Bermani.

**Mr Bermani.** — (I) I fully agree with Mr Lange's proposal to postpone this debate, and as vice-chairman of the Socialist Group I support it on behalf of this group, particularly in view of what the President has said regarding the possibility of discussing this issue at the next part-session.

**President.** — Mr Bermani's statement on behalf of the Socialist Group on the proposal for postponement alters the situation from the procedural point of view, so that a simple majority is now sufficient.

I put the proposal to postpone this debate to the vote.

The proposal is adopted. This item on the agenda is therefore postponed.

#### 15. Agenda for next sitting

**President.** — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Wednesday 12 June 1974, with the following agenda:

10 a.m. and 3 p.m.:

- Report by Mr Wieldraaijer on requests Nos 1/73 and 1/74
- Report by Mr Broeks on the Commission's 1974-1975 information programme
- Joint debate
  - on the report by Mr Willi Müller on the adaptation to technical progress
  - of directives on the protection of the environment
  - on the report by Mr Jarrot on action by public authorities on environmental matters.
- Joint debate
  - on the report by Mr Jahn on the European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions
  - on the report by Mr Marras on the same subject.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.10 p.m.)

## ANNEX

*Oral questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers*

*Question by Mr McDonald*

*to the Commission of the European Communities*

*Subject: System of monetary compensatory amounts.*

Can the Commission say what it proposes to do to prevent the system of monetary compensatory amounts from distorting trade and competition in agricultural products?

*Answer*

1. The system of monetary compensatory amounts was set up to alleviate distortions of trade in agricultural products and of the operation of intervention machinery which certain monetary movements would have created.
2. However, the Commission has always been aware of the drawbacks; the system of compensatory amounts is not satisfactory. In many cases, its complexity constitutes a positive obstacle to trade, for example by prohibiting exporters from concluding medium and long-term contracts:
  - one of the main reasons for this situation is that events in the monetary sphere do not have the same immediate and longer-term repercussions on trade;
  - another reason is that compensatory amounts must be calculated at standard rates, based on intervention prices, which are not always the same as market prices, using exchange rates established after the event.Finally, the frequency of monetary movements leads to changes in the amounts themselves which prevent traders from taking steps under normal conditions.
3. For this reason, the Commission has endeavoured on a number of occasions to find a way of abolishing this system, though it wishes to emphasize that this goal cannot be attained unless substantial progress is made towards the Economic and Monetary Union.
4. The Commission noted with satisfaction that the Netherlands Government acted on these lines by ceasing to apply the compensatory amounts when the guilder was revalued some months ago.

Similarly, the decisions recently taken by Italy to suspend the payment of compensatory amounts show that the present system must be modified.

Furthermore, the Commission has endeavoured to improve the system of applying monetary compensatory amounts and has taken action as follows:

- in June 1973, the system was amended to simplify application administratively: the "bilateral" aspects of the compensatory amounts were abolished; each Member State now administers the application of the compensatory amount resulting from the fluctuation in its own currency;
- in January 1974, the Commission addressed a proposal to the Council to prevent the application of a compensatory amount to a processed product whose base product would not be subject to any compensatory amount

(an effect not intended by Article 4(2) of Regulation (EEC) No 974/71). Parliament has given its opinion on this proposal but the Council has not yet acted on it;

- the Commission has also taken into consideration the problem of traders who have concluded contracts and then find themselves confronted with an additional charge for import or export as a result of an unforeseeable monetary event.

This problem can be solved in the near future.

*Question by Mr Bousch*

*to the Commission of the European Communities*

*Subject:* Free movement of persons and goods.

Does not the Commission feel that it is going too far when customs officials of a country in which the Secretariat of the European Parliament is situated can turn back a member of the European Parliament who lives near the frontier and is on his way to a sitting, on the pretext that the contents of his petrol tank do not comply with the requirements for entry into that country, and that incidents of this kind impede the free movement of persons and goods?

*Answer*

Article 8, first paragraph of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities states:

'No administrative or other restriction shall be imposed on the free movement of members of the Assembly travelling to or from the place of meeting of the Assembly.'

The incident cited by the honourable Member certainly falls within the scope of this Article, and the action he describes is without doubt a restriction on this freedom of movement. It is thus not in accordance with the obligations imposed on Member States by Article 8, first paragraph, quoted above.

The Commission also shares the opinion of the honourable Member in that—quite aside from the privileges and immunities—the restrictions described constitute obstacles to the free movement of persons in the Community. They are not in accordance with Community law insofar as they hamper the obtaining of supplies by nationals of other Member States and constitute a ban on the export of petrol to other Member States.

According to information received by the Commission, the Luxembourg Government has since abolished this measure.

## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 12 JUNE 1974

### Contents

1. Approval of minutes:		Adoption of Amendment No 1 . . . . .	115
<i>Mr Giraud; Mr Broeks; Mr Giraud;</i>		Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	115
<i>Lord O'Hagan; Mr Bermani; Mr Scott-</i>			
<i>Hopkins; Mr Alfred Bertrand . . . . .</i>	93		
2. Apologies for absence . . . . .	97		
3. Documents received . . . . .	97		
4. Membership of committees . . . . .	97		
5. Receipt of a petition . . . . .	97		
6. Presentation of an opinion on a petition — Forwarding of a document to the Council . . . . .	97	9. 1974/1975 Information Programme of the Commission — Debate on a report drawn up <i>Mr Broeks</i> on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth (Doc. 106/74):	
7. Authorization of reports . . . . .	97	<i>Mr Broeks, rapporteur . . . . .</i>	115
8. Petition No 1/73: International Charter on Migrant Workers' Rights — Petition No 1/74: European Charter for Migrant Workers — Debate of a report drawn up by <i>Mr Wieldraaijer</i> on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment:		<i>Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group . . . . .</i>	118
<i>Mr Wieldraaijer, rapporteur . . . . .</i>	98	10. 1974/1975 Information Programme of the Commission (Doc. 106/74) (resumption):	
<i>Mr Pisoni, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Lady Elles, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Rivierez, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr D'Angelosante, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Alfred Bertrand, chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment; Mr Della Briotta; Mr Lemoine; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities . . . . .</i>	100	<i>Mr Van der Sanden; Mr Seefeld; Mr Helweg Petersen; Lady Elles, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr John Hill; Mr Hunault, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities . . . . .</i>	119
Amendment No 1 to paragraph 7:		Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	132
<i>Mr Rosati; Mr Wieldraaijer; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities . . . . .</i>	114	11. Adaptation to technical progress of directives on protection and improvement of the environment — Recommendation on cost allocations and action by public authorities on environmental matters — Debate on a report drawn up by <i>Mr Willi Müller</i> on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment (Doc. 101/74) and of a report drawn up by <i>Mr Jarrot</i> on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment (Doc. 114/74):	
		<i>Mr Willi Müller, rapporteur . . . . .</i>	132
		<i>Mr Della Briotta, deputy rapporteur . . . . .</i>	133
		<i>Mr Notenboom, draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs; Mr Noè, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic</i>	

<i>Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Bourges, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats ..</i>	134	<i>by Mr Marras on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment (Doc. 94/74):</i>	
<i>Mr Willi Müller, rapporteur .....</i>	138	<i>Mr Jahn, rapporteur .....</i>	141
<i>Mr Noè; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities .....</i>	139	<i>Mr D'Angelosante, deputy rapporteur</i>	144
<i>Adoption of the resolution contained in the report drawn up by Mr Willi Müller .....</i>	141	<i>Mr Van der Gun, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Wiel-draaijer, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Yeats, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities .....</i>	145
<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution contained in the report drawn up by Mr Jarrot: .....</i>	141	<i>Adoption of the resolution contained in the report drawn up by Mr Jahn ..</i>	151
<i>Amendment No 1 to paragraph 3:</i>		<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution contained in the report drawn up by Mr Marras .....</i>	151
<i>Mr Noè .....</i>	141	<i>Amendment No 1 to paragraph 3:</i>	
<i>Adoption of Amendment No 1 .....</i>	141	<i>Mr D'Angelosante, deputy rapporteur</i>	151
<i>Amendment No 2 to paragraph 5 ....</i>	141	<i>Mr Alfred Bertrand; Mr Wioldraaijer; Mr Yeats .....</i>	152
<i>Adoption of Amendment No 2 .....</i>	141	<i>Rejection of Amendment No 1 .....</i>	152
<i>Adoption of the resolution .....</i>	141	<i>Adoption of the resolution .....</i>	152
12. <i>Regulation on the creation of a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions — Debate on a report drawn up by Mr Jahn on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment (Doc. 93/74) and of a report drawn up</i>		13. <i>Agenda for the next sitting .....</i>	152

IN THE CHAIR: MR BERKHOUWER

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 10.05 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Giraud.

**Mr Giraud.** — (I) Mr President, yesterday, following the statements made by the President of the Council on the document concerning the budgetary powers of Parliament, I spoke to stress the reasons for which, in addition to sub-

mitting the Council's proposals to the Committee on Budgets as the committee responsible, it would also be desirable to refer the matter to the Political Affairs Committee for its opinion.

Since no objections were made to my request by yourself or by the Assembly, I consider that it was implicitly approved; but I should like you to put this agreement on record by showing it in the minutes of this morning's sitting.

**President.** — Following Mr Giraud's remarks I should like to say the following. In life in general the rule that 'silence means consent' may occasionally apply, but yesterday the Assembly did not decide to refer the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council to the Political Affairs Committee. Mr Wischniewski made his speech and explained the Council's proposals. This was followed by speeches by Mr Spénale and Mr Giraud, but Parliament did not take a decision.

**President**

In this connection, I would inform the House that the Bureau has appointed a delegation to consult with the Council in the near future on the Council's draft decisions. All the political groups are represented in this delegation, which also includes the chairman of the Committee on Budgets, Mr Spénale. It will be proposed in the Bureau tomorrow that the delegation meet, if possible, this month to discuss the draft decisions the Council has submitted to us. This is in line with the agreement reached by the President of Parliament, the chairman of the committee and the President of the Council that the Council should not reach a final decision on these matters until they have been considered by Parliament's delegation and the Council—not simply the President of the Council but the whole Council. The first discussions are scheduled to take place on 24 June. The Council will then submit its proposals to Parliament, which will discuss them in due course.

We hope that this can all be done as quickly as possible so as to make up for lost time and to allow the whole budgetary procedure to come into force at the beginning of the 1976 financial year. Treaty amendments will be required; under Article 236 of the EEC Treaty, Parliament and the national parliaments must be consulted first. We hope that this procedure can come into force at the beginning of 1976.

We will be discussing this matter in greater detail at the Bureau meeting tomorrow. If Mr Giraudo has anything more to say on this subject, I would ask him to inform the chairman of his group or those who will be attending the Bureau meeting so that his comments can be examined more closely. We hope, however, that the procedure regarding the Council's proposals can be put into operation as quickly as possible. We would not like to see several months passing again before we discuss these matters with the Council.

I call Mr Broeksz.

**Mr Broeksz.** — (NL) Mr President, I hope you will not take it amiss but the meeting of our group took somewhat longer than expected, and we did not therefore hear everything that you have just said.

Is it the intention that you hear the opinions of the political groups as soon as possible in the Bureau, if not in the enlarged Bureau? If this was in fact the intention, I would lament it, because my group has scarcely had an opportunity to discuss this subject. We should like to have a little more time. We feel that this matter should be put on the agenda for a full debate at the beginning of the part-session in Luxem-

bourg. Another factor as far as our group is concerned is that neither Mr Spénale nor Mr Vals can be present. If, then, decisions are to be taken quickly, we shall be in difficulty.

**President.** — I should perhaps briefly repeat what I have just said.

Mr Wischniewski yesterday presented the Council's proposals regarding our budgetary powers. During the discussion between the presidents or chairmen of the three political bodies concerned, it was agreed that the Council should not reach a final decision on this subject until discussions had taken place between a delegation from Parliament and the Council as such, in other words not simply the President of the Council, but the whole Council. As a consequence the Bureau has appointed a delegation, which will include our great specialist, Mr Spénale, and then a member of each political group, who will be, where possible, also members of the Committee on Budgets. The intention is that this delegation will discuss with the Council the draft that it has now submitted to us. You know the form that the Council has chosen for this.

We will try to hold these discussions this month with Mr Genscher in the chair. In due course a final proposal will then emerge from the Council, and this will of course be put before us again. The Council's intention is—I am sure I have understood this correctly—that the form chosen is not a 'covenant', on which Mr Spénale had certain ideas, but that Treaty amendments will follow.

The Council's proposals for the amendment of the Treaty will therefore be submitted to us under Article 236, and then to the national parliaments for ratification.

That will be the course of events, Mr Broeksz, as we see them. We will naturally try to make up as much time as possible and not begin by referring these matters to this or that body, because then the document will be lying around for months and no headway will be made before the recess. We want, if possible, to mark up some progress before the recess. Of course, the possibility is not excluded that we shall be able to discuss this subject in greater detail, possibly in a plenary sitting, either during the second June part-session in Luxembourg or in Strasbourg in July.

This item will therefore be on the agenda for the meeting of the enlarged Bureau tomorrow, and it will then be discussed with the delegation. Final decisions will not be taken, but I would suggest that we discuss with the Council the proposals now before us.



**President**

I call Mr Broeks.

**Mr Broeks.** — (NL) Mr President, this does mean that the representatives of the various political groups will have to work out their positions, provisional though they may be, by the time they meet in the Bureau. The political groups will therefore have to meet to discuss these matters at very short notice. I hope that all the groups are aware of this. It will be possible for us to adopt a provisional position if we can meet after today's sitting, but I do not know whether this is possible or if the interpreters will be available. Furthermore, the possibilities are, as you know, somewhat limited by the fact that there is a garden party this evening. All meetings will therefore have to be completed by a certain time.

If then the enlarged Bureau really wants a provisional point of view tomorrow, we have very little time available. We sympathize that you want to discuss the matter with the Council before the end of the month, but this will be possible if a provisional decision is taken at the groups' meetings in Luxembourg on 26 June. This is the earliest that the political groups can meet and announce their provisional positions. If you can so arrange, discussions can still take place with the Council before the end of this month.

**President.** — Mr Broeks knows the saying that one must strike while the iron is hot. It also applies to the present situation.

As Mr Broeks knows, the Bureau has decided to form a delegation to be composed of representatives of all the political groups and of the specialists concerned to put into effect the agreement reached a few months ago with the Council, presided over by Mr Apel. The Council will not take a final decision without having consulted Parliament.

We are thus being given a say, which in itself is a concession by the Council. The delegation has now been appointed. Tomorrow I will submit a proposal to the enlarged Bureau. Mr Genscher, with whom we had a discussion yesterday, is in principle prepared to discuss this matter with us after the Council meeting of 24 and 25 June. The plan is therefore that the discussions should take place then. Of course, a final decision will not be taken at that time. The delegation will not say Parliament accepts this or that. It will be speaking on Parliament's behalf.

The matter will naturally be referred back to Parliament again later. I hope that it will be possible for the members of the delegation to consult with their groups beforehand so that

they may voice feelings that are generally shared to a greater or lesser extent. That is the procedure that we must follow. I repeat that discussions are to take place without obligations being entered into. We will merely try to conduct a constructive dialogue with the Council.

I call Mr Giraud.

**Mr Giraud.** — (I) I apologize for speaking again, but I wish to signify my full agreement with the procedure for discussion with the Council of Ministers. However, I must point out that page 2 of the minutes states that the President indicated that this document would be referred to the Committee on Budgets. I wanted the words 'and to the Political Affairs Committee for its opinion' to be added. There is no need to specify whether this opinion should be delivered before or after the discussions with the Council of Ministers: the two procedures are quite separate. I believe that if Parliament refers the document to the Committee on Budgets as the committee responsible, it should at the same time refer it to the Political Affairs Committee for its opinion.

**President.** — I call Lord O'Hagan.

**Lord O'Hagan.** — I wish to ask two brief questions about the most important statement that has been made this morning.

Could the Assembly be told on what basis this delegation will negotiate with the Council of Ministers? Are these to be talks about talks, as it were? Are they merely to discuss the formal mechanisms which will come into play between the two Institutions, or will they engage in the beginning of a discussion about substantial matters?

I come to my second question, Mr President. You mentioned the Bureau. Tomorrow, you said, the enlarged Bureau will discuss the composition of Parliament's delegation. Could you tell the Assembly what provision will be made for those Members who are not affiliated to any political group to take part in this most important work of Parliament? How many places will be reserved in this delegation for *non-inscrits*?

**President.** — The answers to the two points raised by the noble Lord are as follows.

A discussion will take place between this delegation and the Council without any prejudice to the final results. We shall merely discuss with the Council the proposals made by the Council, and through the delegation we shall convey our first reactions to, and remarks on, these proposals. We shall put forward any questions arising

**President**

ing from these proposals and point out any omissions that may be found in them. That is the answer to the first question.

In reply to the second question, the delegation is composed as equally as possible of Members belonging to the several political groups. One of the most distinguished Members will be Mr Spénale, chairman of the Committee on Budgets. Of course the non-attached Members will have full rights to take part in any debate. There will be further debate when the matter comes back to the Committee on Budgets, the Political Affairs Committee and other committees to which you have free access.

I call Mr Bermani.

**Mr Bermani.** — (I) I wish to say a few words only. Since the chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee is not present in this Chamber, I wish to say, in my capacity as vice-chairman of that committee, that the Political Affairs Committee seems to be quite justified in wishing to be consulted. I also feel that the Legal Affairs Committee should be asked for its opinion on a matter of such great importance.

**President.** — The answer to Mr Bermani's question is that it will of course be possible to consult a number of other committees. But that will entail some delay, which is what we wanted to avoid as far as possible.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — There is no doubt in my mind, Mr President, about the importance of the statement that you have just made. I entirely agree about the need to strike while the iron is still hot. This is obviously right. But it is also true—and we have heard many honourable Members already on this matter—that we must not let this opportunity get lost in a mass of verbiage, which is liable to happen. Therefore, when our delegation—I am not arguing about or questioning its composition—starts the negotiations, to use your words, with the whole Council, it must have a positive position which is agreed by Parliament.

I am worried that this positive position will not be taken and that there will be aimless discussions on various points of interest concerning these important proposals on the budget. I should like to know how you, Mr President, envisage the Parliament delegation—perhaps under your leadership—taking this positive position and discussing these proposals in a meaningful way, not just running round the point. They are extremely important not only for Parliament, but for the future development

of the Community. It would be a great pity if we did not take full advantage quickly and positively of the initiative taken by the Council.

**President.** — I call Mr Alfred Bertrand.

**Mr Alfred Bertrand.** — (NL) Mr President, I have simply asked for the floor because I see that the minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting state in connection with the three joint guidelines established by the Council of the European Communities on the strengthening of the budgetary powers of the European Parliament: 'The President announced that this document would be referred to the Committee on Budgets'. I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the Political Affairs Committee took part in all the discussions. I would therefore ask you to decide formally that these documents should also be referred to the Political Affairs Committee, which has appointed Mr Kirk rapporteur on the European Parliament's powers and in which I myself am directly concerned with these problems as the rapporteur on the European Union. I would ask you not to leave it at an ordinary statement, but to decide that the matter should be referred not only to the Committee on Budgets but also to the Political Affairs Committee.

**President.** — Mr Bertrand, I feel that we should be grateful that the President of the Council put this matter before us yesterday; it has also been stated that all the Members of our Parliament are to receive the whole package. In plain terms, Mr Bertrand, I wanted to avoid losing too much time by referring the subject to all kinds of committees. The Political Affairs Committee is of course quite free to discuss the Council's proposals; the same applies to the Committee on Budgets.

If, Mr Bertrand, you want this matter formally referred to the Political Affairs Committee by Parliament, you can make a proposal to that effect. The Political Affairs Committee, however, is quite free to discuss this document since all Members have received it.

Tomorrow I will inform the enlarged Bureau of the discussions I had yesterday with the chairman of the Committee on Budgets and the President of the Council. I have already said that the Council is prepared to have first discussions on 24 and 25 June. This seems to me to be a worthy goal and in the interest of this Assembly. If, however, the Assembly wishes to decide that discussions should not take place and that we should wait for months and months, I must accede to that view. But then my good intentions will have been thwarted.

**Mr Alfred Bertrand.** — (NL) Mr President, thank you for making the position clear. I formally propose to the Assembly that this document be referred to the Political Affairs Committee as well.

**President.** — What is concerned here is a delegation which has been appointed by the Bureau in consultation with the Council. It has been decided that we should make contact with the Council in this matter. I should therefore like to link Mr Bertrand's proposal with the suggestion that Parliament's delegation, in which all the political groups are to be represented, have an initial exchange of views with the Council at the end of this month. One proposal does not exclude the other. I do not exclude Parliament because under the Treaties and in particular Article 236 of the EEC Treaty, the final decision must first be put to this Assembly. If Mr Bertrand is prepared to combine the two proposals, we are in agreement.

**Mr Alfred Bertrand.** — (NL) Mr President, I agree on condition that you consent to the reference of this document to the Political Affairs Committee as well.

**President.** — Mr Bertrand is therefore formally proposing to the Assembly that the Political Affairs Committee be asked for its opinion on these Council proposals.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

Are there any other comments on the minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

## 2. Apologies for absence

**President.** — An apology has been received from Mr Burgbacher, who regrets his inability to attend the sittings of 13 and 14 June.

## 3. Documents received

**President.** — I have received from the Council of the European Communities a request for an opinion on the following document:

— Communication and proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council: Towards a new energy policy strategy for the European Community (Doc. 136/74);

This document has been referred to the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology.

## 4. Membership of committees

I have received from the Socialist Group a request for the appointment of

Mr Calawaert to the Legal Affairs Committee and, to replace Mr Delmotte, the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth;

Mr Glinne to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, the Committee on Development and Cooperation and the Delegation of the Parliamentary Conference of the EEC-AASM Association;

Mr Delmotte to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

I have received from the Liberal and Allies Group and the Group of European Progressive Democrats a request for the appointment of Mr Rivierez to the Committee on External Economic Relations in place of Mr Bourdellès and of Mr Brøndlund Nielsen to the Committee on Development and Cooperation in place of Mr Rivierez.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

## 5. Receipt of a petition

**President.** — I have received from Mr Etienne Hirsch, President of the European Federalist Union, and several thousand co-signatories a petition on a draft constitution for the creation of a European government answerable to a directly elected European Parliament.

This petition has been entered under No 5/74 in the register stipulated in Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and referred to the Political Affairs Committee for consideration.

## 6. Presentation of an opinion on a petition — Forwarding of a document to the Council

**President.** — By letter of 10 June 1974, the Legal Affairs Committee informed me that at its meeting of 7 June 1974 it had adopted an opinion on Petition No 3/74 by Mr Virgile Barel concerning the extradition of Klaus Barbie.

The committee has asked that, pursuant to Rule 48(4) of the Rules of Procedure, this petition and the opinion of the parliamentary committee be forwarded to the Council of the European Communities.

## 7. Authorization of reports

**President.** — I would remind the House that during the sitting of 10 June 1974, I stated that

**President**

I had authorized the Committee on External Economic Relations to draw up a report on 'The development of the political situation in Greece, insofar as it affects relations between Greece and the EEC'. I would point out that the committee has been asked for its opinion on this subject.

8. *Petition No 1/73: International Charter on Migrant Workers' Rights — Petition No 1/74: European Charter for Migrant Workers*

**President.** — The next item is the report drawn up by Mr Wieldraaijer on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on Petition No 1/73 on an International Charter of Migrant Workers' Right and on Petition No 1/74 on the proposals for a European Migrant Workers' Charter (Doc. 84/74).

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

**Mr Wieldraaijer.** — (NL) Mr President, I would like to make two preliminary observations.

Firstly I would like to say how sorry I am that parliamentary procedure makes it possible for us to have debated the political rights of migrant workers yesterday when today's debate is on petitions affecting the general position of migrant workers, which in fact means that our work is duplicated.

Secondly, I would like to remark on the fact that the Member of the Commission responsible for social affairs is not present although we have such an important social problem on the agenda. I presume that his absence is connected with the fact that we amended the agenda on Monday and Mr Hillery has perhaps been unable to arrange to be present.

We often speak about important matters in this Parliament, matters of economic, social and political importance. Often I, and, perhaps, many others, have the feeling that such debates go over the heads of many people and are not seen to be debates which concern their daily work and their position in daily life.

These two petitions, on an international charter on migrant workers' rights and the European charter for migrant workers affect, it seems to me, a not only day-to-day existence but also the future opportunities of a category of the population of this Community comprising many millions of people, for whom the Member States, and therefore all of us, have a special responsibility. There are 10 million people who have left their country and their society, often also their immediate family, relatives and friends, to

escape from a situation marked by inadequate employment opportunities, unemployment and undernourishment, and who have often travelled hundreds and sometimes thousands of miles to take a job which for them means hope for a better future and dispels the threat of poverty and unemployment.

The number of people concerned is perhaps 10 million. We have to speak in terms of rough estimates since the people concerned are not only those who have been granted work permits and residence permits to work in the countries of the Community but also people who are here, as we say, illegally.

I have already said that the Member States of our Community, individually and collectively, have taken on a special responsibility. Why? We have not succeeded, in past years, in promoting the economic development of our continent in such a way that the sources of employment were better distributed, e.g. between the countries of the Mediterranean and the states of the Community. We also failed to spread employment opportunities within the Community, in the framework of our social and economic policy, over the peoples of the Members States, although this would have prevented many people leaving their own country and might even have meant a gradual return of others to their mother country. On the contrary, we now have to accept the fact—founded on several reports, including one by the United Nations—that by 1980 we must expect an increase in the number of migrant workers in the EEC, with all the subsequent consequences, such as weakening of the social and economic structure of their countries of origin. I must also add that in view of the inadequate reception facilities in Member States increased migration will also lead to increased tension.

Mr President, when we speak about the contents of the charter, we are talking about things which for most of us are logical and about which we personally have no worries: employment, being with one's wife and children, having a proper dwelling, a school for the children where they can be educated to be citizens in a future society, and the conviction that we, for example by our participation in elections can defend not only our own interests or rights but can also contribute to changes in society and social structures. These are things which we have come to expect to a great extent.

Besides us, or rather beneath us, there is however a category of second-class citizens. For many of them this means that they are part of a category of twentieth-century pariahs for whom essential things which we regard as our right, are uncertain elements in an uncertain

**Wieldraaijer**

future. In some cases the fact that life has been improved somewhat can be ascribed to private initiative. It is much more difficult for all those people to obtain rights which we regard as natural and which must be natural in an ordered society. They often find it very difficult to receive proper information, and often have to try to get things done in what for them is a difficult foreign language, dealing with officials sitting on the other side of a counter or office desk.

Our Parliament has already discussed the problem of the legal position of migrant workers. I would remind you of the Califice report which states that Parliament and Commission must endeavour to give special protection to such workers and to offer guarantees so that they can defend with greater success their civil, political, social and human rights. This report was presented to Parliament a number of years ago. Parliament adopted a resolution at the time expressing the wish that such a charter should in fact be drawn up.

It is with some bitterness that I note that the Commission and the Council have not succeeded in finding a way to do this. There has even been mention of violent opposition.

On the one hand we have, in our industrialized Europe, the opportunity to transfer enterprises from one country to another. There is also the possibility of merging enterprises. Enterprises can undertake all kinds of legal action. Enterprises are powerful. I need only point to the power of the multinational enterprises which also exist in our Community.

On the other hand, we have the migrating workers. When we consider their position we must admit how insignificant their power and legal position is, in fact, in relation to the large undertakings.

The situation as I have described it shows where our priorities lie in this society, and this Community and in the Member States. People are subordinate to the requirements of the production process, and not vice versa.

Studies undertaken for the Commission have not yet led to a comprehensive package of measures for migrating workers. On the contrary, there have been some fragmentary measures and there are probably one or two more to follow, but we have still not managed to get the Commission to decide in favour of a charter for migrant workers. Meanwhile the call for a fully comprehensive charter has become louder. Apart from the arguments put forward in favour of such a charter, which are reproduced in the report of the Committee on Social Affairs and

Employment, I would also like to refer to the plea made by the acting President of the French Republic about a month ago during celebrations marking the 25th anniversary of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. He stated that apart from the 17 Member States there was in fact an 18th—a state without frontiers—but with more than 10 million inhabitants. He was referring to the migrant workers and their families and, the President continued, it would do credit to your Committee of Ministers if a special charter could be established for these people. No single country, no single concept, no single person exists in isolation any longer; there are no frontiers for the new generation. The young people of Europe all have the same problems.

This opinion is one that counts. I have quoted the statement not only to show our appreciation for Mr Poher's efforts, but also to show that the desire for better treatment of migrant workers exists in not just one but in many political groups. I would point out that the present report was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I would also like to point out that the International Association of Free Trade Unions recently held a world conference on migrant workers. The main objective of this conference was to establish a 'charter for migrant workers' which would guarantee at least minimum legal protection for this least favoured group of our capitalist society.

It would be both unforgivable and proof of political and social cynicism and callousness if the institutions of the Community of Nine, which employs the majority of such workers, were not to follow up, as speedily as possible, the appeal made to them from so many quarters concerning the general legal position of migrant workers.

It also seems to me important that this Community, which so often aspires to be a social Community, should not let slip this chance of showing European workers, by means of such a statute, that it is serious about creating a social Europe. I would therefore also like to ask the representative of the Commission today for his promise that the Commission will consider the charter forthwith and conclude its examination as speedily as possible in close consultation with the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

The motion for a resolution mentions the end of 1975 as the deadline. I intended this to be a final deadline which must not be exceeded. I believe that the Commission would be giving an indication of its political awareness if it agreed to create this charter by that deadline.

**Wieldraaijer**

You will have noticed that I have not gone into the numerous aspects of the charter for migrant workers. Many of these aspects are dealt with in the report. I am convinced that the ensuing speakers will underline a number of these aspects.

I would like to emphasize one single aspect which I believe to be the essential point of the petitions underlying this report. This is the request that the host countries should grant political rights to migrant workers. At the same time I would like to point out that the Community is falling somewhat behind other countries in this respect. I would like to recall at this point the initiative taken by Sweden where immigrants will be entitled as from 1976 to take part in elections for local representative bodies.

I would also like to refer to the initiative taken by Mr Bermani and Mr Corona who have tabled a Bill in Italy which would give citizens of Community countries who have lived in Italy for five years the right to vote in local and regional elections. I would also like to recall a similar Bill tabled in the Belgian Chamber of Representatives on 14 May 1974 by Mr Glinne and his colleagues.

The incorporation of such provisions in the legal systems of our nine countries would, I believe, be of crucial importance for migrant workers since it would mean that we were meeting at the same time another essential requirement, namely that they should also have direct influence on their fate and be able to exert their rights directly and that they would no longer be dependent on the votes of others. After all, we do impose tax on their incomes, and the old concept—that people who have to pay tax should also have the right to take part in decisions—a concept expressed as long ago as 1773, is something we must put into practice today.

Parliament can and must seize this opportunity to show the peoples of Europe, and especially the younger generation, that the spirit of the Community is not dead, that Europe is not only the province of technical, financial, agricultural or other experts, but that Europe can also grant legal rights to the lowest-paid and least favoured members of the Community.

Of course, I know that even a good charter for migrant workers will not resolve all problems. The Community's policy should be directed first and foremost at the abolition of the basic causes of migration in the Community and from outside the Community; I have said this on many occasions in the past. Secondly I believe that immigration policy should be coordinated.

The first of these priority aims, the abolition of the causes of migration, will require a particularly long time. For this reason it is essential that the millions of workers who contribute to the economy of the Community and to the welfare should be given substantial legal rights. I hope Parliament will support this desire today.  
(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Pisoni to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Pisoni.** — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, before beginning my brief address on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group to indicate that we shall be voting in favour of the resolution, allow me to thank the rapporteur for the work he has done in this area which we consider to be of great importance, affecting as it does so many people.

Our Assembly has considered the problem of migrant workers on many occasions, and only yesterday there was a debate on this subject following a question by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli. The complex subject was approached from various angles. Today we are considering it in a different light since this debate does not concern specific aspects of the problem—however important they may be—but is dealing on the contrary with the recognition and possibility of exercising the principal rights of migrant workers as people and as employees. We have before us what may be termed as an appeal for a Magna Carta of migrant citizens.

In our capacity as leaders of organizations which are concerned with emigration and keep a close watch on its development, we view this as one of the most far-reaching and welcome steps. This is also confirmed by the fact that the motion for a resolution under consideration is a direct consequence of two petitions by two major associations, FILEF and UNAIEF, to the European Parliament. Having said that, I do not wish to imply that our commitment to eliminate forced emigration at its source is in any way diminished. On the contrary, emigration today is still a pathological factor whose negative effects are only too well known: impoverishment of the areas of origin, departure of the migrants from their land, cultural roots and traditions, the splitting up of families, urban growth, lack of housing, schools and services, impossibility or difficulty of exercising the basic liberties and civil rights.

Our main aim is to modify a model of development of society which all too often sacrifices man to the cause of profit and maintains an excessive freedom of movement to cope with short-term changes. Regional policy, geographical re-

**Pisoni**

equilibrium and the Social Fund are admittedly useful instruments but they are only partly effective. And this is a political and social commitment which cannot be implemented in the short term; it is a matter for the medium term at least. That is why, against the background of our constant commitment, we feel obliged to guarantee migrant workers the best possible living conditions wherever they may be working, and in particular to those who are employed in the Community.

The proposed charter which we formulated in the petition corresponds to a proposal for an effective new European citizenship. We wish to define the profile of a citizen of Europe and a citizen of the world. That is why we are proposing the content of real citizenship.

We have no wish to hide the difficulties which will be encountered, but we know that a firm political resolve can overcome them all. It is that resolve which we wish to see in Parliament and in the Commission and Council.

The motion for a resolution under consideration deliberately refrains from considering detailed aspects of the problem and invites the Commission to do so instead by providing it with a clear guideline and the main themes in the UNAIEF and FILEF petitions annexed to the resolution. We realize that the Commission is not particularly enthusiastic about this task and may perhaps be exaggerating the political, practical and legal difficulties. The delays noted up to now and the request to be allowed the whole of 1975 to submit a proposal are further evidence of its lack of enthusiasm. We hope this situation will change. There must not be insuperable difficulties or shortcomings in the Treaty when it comes to defending human dignity by suitable means, guaranteeing fundamental rights and allowing the benefit of basic services and the exercise of civil, union and political freedom. An inventive spirit may even allow the legal limits to be overcome provided that the political resolve exists. Until the citizen is guaranteed his right to work, is able to enjoy decent housing and has at his disposal appropriate educational facilities and social security, he cannot exercise with complete freedom his right to personal opinions as well as union and political liberties, and until he is able to participate in an active and responsible manner in public life at his place of residence, the adoption of adequate instruments binding on all concerned is absolutely essential.

These are some of the main features of a European or International Charter of Workers' Rights. But it is clear from what I have said that this aim cannot be achieved through the instru-

ments available to the Council of Europe whose energy and work we nevertheless greatly appreciate. To meet our aims legislative instruments at Community level are required; in other words regulations and, in some instances, directives. I do not wish to go into detail about the proposals, the nature of the rights to be guaranteed or their application at European or international level. I prefer to await the Commission's proposals, which we should like to receive not by the end of 1975 but at the latest in March 1975, before going into each aspect of the problem in detail. At this stage I simply wish to point out that the petitions under consideration put forward requests and demands and propose certain solutions. It must be stressed that we wish to safeguard the interests of all citizens and workers employed and residing in the Community. We do not want these safeguards to be confined to Community citizens for whom guarantees can be provided quite simply but also for persons of all other nationalities, be they Portuguese, Spanish, Yugoslavs, Greeks, Turks or Moroccans. In our view this is possible unilaterally, without reciprocal arrangements or bilateral agreements with the countries of origin. We do not wish to sow dissension among migrants.

In conclusion let me draw attention to the fact that the migrant workers' charter is awaited with widespread and keen interest. We do not view this charter as a substitute for the Social Action programme now being prepared; the latter must be fully implemented at the earliest possible date and its aims achieved soon. The charter provides a basis of security and strengthens the right of workers and men as such; it is a basic instrument to safeguard human dignity and an essential guarantee of that dignity and freedom.

I feel confident that the political resolve which I have already mentioned, exists in full measure and that Parliament, the Commission and Council will provide practical confirmation of the ideals of justice, humanity and equality to which they so frequently refer.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Glinne.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, paragraph 8 of the motion for a resolution calls upon the Commission of the Communities to use the petitions it receives as a basis for future proposals and also to take into account the bills recently submitted in certain Member States in connection with the legal status of migrant workers. I should like to point out to the Commission that a number

**Glinne**

of proposals for legislation, distinct but to a large extent uniform in character, are about to be submitted to the Belgian Parliament, and at the same time a bill is being drafted at government level.

The two proposals for parliamentary action, prompted by the work of an *ad hoc* committee under the chairmanship of the late minister, Mr Rollin, and by the apposite remarks put forward in the Consultative Committee on immigration, are, I think, more in keeping with the expectations of those concerned with improving the situation of migrant workers and defending their rights than is the bill.

Mr President, I wish to draw the Commission's attention to a factor common to the two bills, which propose consistently generous treatment for migrant workers.

Both bills stipulate that prospective migrant workers from third countries should be in possession of a temporary residence permit. This is a question that has not received sufficient attention, and one that occasionally provokes incidents and scandals. It is absolutely essential to prevent illegal immigration in all the Member States, whether the illegal immigrants come into the country as tourists or in other ways.

Illegal immigration is not an illusion; the immigrant himself usually pays dearly for it, as he is forced to pay often exorbitant sums to various middle-men and traffickers. And when he finds a job, of necessity on a clandestine basis, he is often exploited from the point of view of wages and working conditions, by unscrupulous employers.

If illegal immigration became any more widespread, I feel it would even jeopardize the gains already achieved by indigenous workers and migrant workers who have entered the country legally, either from other Member States or from outside the Community, by establishing a parallel employment market.

The existence of such a market, which could not be controlled, would make any rational employment policy impossible in the various Member States and in the Community as a whole. If, therefore, immigration from third countries is to be closely controlled by requiring the migrant worker, in the migrant workers' charter, to have a temporary residence permit or possibly by reintroducing the visa system for workers from third countries, the penalty for illegal employment should be exacted from those who profit the most, in other words the agent and the employer.

I should also like to draw the Commission's attention to another proposal for legislation

submitted to the Belgian Parliament, which has already been referred to the National Employment Council, a joint body of workers' and employers' representatives. The essential aim of this proposal is to restrict and control, and in fact curtail the activities of the employment agencies. This is in accordance with ILO Convention 96, but the secondary aim is to suppress illegal trafficking in workers. The text makes provision for strict administrative and penal sanctions, the maximum fine being three million Belgian francs, but these are imposed exclusively on employers and middle-men; no penalties are imposed on the illegal immigrant, who is regarded more as a victim than an accomplice.

To conclude, Mr President, I should like to make two further observations. I think it is absolutely essential, for the Member States to coordinate their immigration policies in regard to third countries at the same time as the Commission is drawing up the charter and the draft charter, or even before these are drawn up. The Commission will never be able to propose a rational and consistent draft, if each Member State feels that its sovereignty is at risk, that its concept of sovereignty allows it to take unilateral action on its own territory, in the immigration policy it pursues in regard to a particular country outside the Community. Coordination and the gradual harmonization of Member States' immigration policies towards third countries are absolutely essential.

A final word on the link that undoubtedly exists between migration and development cooperation. It is rightly said—and the rapporteur has referred to this briefly—that migratory movements, as they are at present organized (or disorganized) represent, in the developing countries, a kind of cooperation in the development of the richer countries. The fact that there are large numbers of adult male workers on the Western European employment market means that the poor countries are contributing to the growth of countries that are already developed. The problem must be considered from the opposite point of view: how can the vocational training of legal immigrants, immigrants from outside the EEC who enter the Member States, be integrated into development programmes and an employment policy implemented in each Member State, should the migrant worker return to his country of origin. This is very important.

I would therefore stress once again that immigration policy should not merely be considered in conjunction with short-term economic factors in the Member States. It should be an overall Community policy and form part of an



**Glinne**

international concept of development cooperation.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Lady Elles to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Lady Elles.** — Mr President, speaking on behalf of the European Conservative Group and as supporters of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights, I wish to tell Parliament that we are convinced that discrimination against any individual within the Communities must be of immediate concern to all Members, both of this Parliament and of the national parliaments of our Member States. Therefore, we should like to acknowledge the considerable work done by Mr Wieldraaijer in this report and by those who have drafted provisional charters of the rights of migrant workers contained in Doc. 84/74.

I should also like to welcome the comments made by Mr Glinne and the provisional measures before the Belgian parliament, which are a positive effort towards solving what is, perhaps, our greatest and most difficult social problem today in the Community.

I want next to make certain general observations and then to offer a few remarks on the particular difficulties which face us within the Community.

We must be aware that large-scale migration is in no way confined to Europe, either to the Nine or to the Seventeen or to the Continent of Europe. Migration is taking place within countries, within continents, and from continent to continent. I do not think that we can divorce our study of these problems from a recognition of the universal character of migration.

These migrations are taking place for political, economic and social reasons, and they have been facilitated by easier transport, the extension of tourism, and increasing divergences between economies—not only between less-developed and developed countries, but within all these countries themselves as they vary from region to region. All these considerations are relevant to the document we should like to see produced as a result of studies.

I also want to draw attention to the fact that in the preamble to the Migrant Workers' Charter contained in this document reference is made to international instruments, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is not always clear to everybody that the Universal Declaration makes a very clear distinction between those of the nationality of the

state concerned and non-nationals. Article 2 of the Universal Declaration refers to 'national origin' and not to 'any nationality', so there is already a built-in discrimination, even within the Universal Declaration.

Further, Article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—one of the United Nations instruments that has not yet come into force—specifically refers to the citizen's right to vote and stand for election.

I draw attention to this because both these instruments are based on the general principles of international law. We must take into account the duty of governments to protect the nationals of their states wherever they may be, either in the state concerned or outside the state. They must also consider the economic consequences of their policies. All these are particularly relevant to the state and condition in which migrant workers are living today, as Mr Glinne rightly pointed out.

The international instruments promoting human rights distinguish between nationalities. The present draft Charter which is before us appears to be limited to a certain type of worker and does not deal with all the problems which are arising; nor do these workers come within any identifiable legal concept.

I wish briefly to enumerate the kinds of migrant worker we have within the Community, who are not covered by the terms of the Charter in all cases. We have those who come within Article 48 of the EEC Treaty, who are EEC nationals. However, there is no mention of those under 18 or even 16 years of age who are moving from country to country within the EEC and are in great danger of being exploited throughout the Community, because there is no reference to, or control of, the use of their labour.

There are the nationals who come from third countries which are in association with the Community. There are nationals who come from third countries which are not in association. There are seasonal workers who have come from within and without the Community. There are those who cross the frontier daily and who daily return to their place of origin. There are thousands, if not millions, of illegal immigrants: those who are still not recognized as legally present within the Community; those who have been granted amnesty for certain periods of time; and some who are awaiting proof of their now legal status within a country.

There are those who come for a short period on a twelve- or six-month work permit. There are those who come for two years. There are the refugees and the stateless, who are accepted immediately within the Community in accordance with the behaviour of civilized nations.

**Lady Elles**

There are those in the United Kingdom who come from the British Commonwealth and do not technically come within the term 'migrant worker' as defined by the Community. There are those holiday tourists and visitors who remain in a Member State and take up work.

These are only some of the categories with which we are faced and for which we have to find an acceptable form of legal protection.

I therefore urge the necessity for a new international instrument to cover all these categories of worker and, indeed, not only the workers but the dependants of workers. It should be more in the form of a charter for non-citizens who are legally residing in one of the Member States, because these are the only two common denominators I can find amongst all these categories.

Not only is there the question of categories of person, but no reference has been made to the size of income. I notice in the Charter a reference to members of the 'working class'. We may well ask, what is the working class? All of us here know that we work very hard, but perhaps in certain terminologies we might not be called 'working class'. This phrase is no longer relevant to legal discrimination.

On behalf of the thousands of Indians, Pakistanis and other Commonwealth citizens in the United Kingdom, I resent that they should all be termed 'second-class' citizens. Some of them have made excellent lives for themselves. They are earning a good living and bringing up their children decently and in comfort. What they need is legal protection, which they are still not granted. But they are by no means 'second-class' or—I believe this term was used—'second-rate' citizens. I accept that that may have been a mistranslation. I certainly do not accept that they are second-rate citizens or pariahs in society, because they are contributing to the wealth both of our own country and of other Member States of the Community.

I believe that the various difficulties of definition should not preclude action by the Community. I have outlined the common factors which unite all these migrant workers. There are legal problems, and discrimination, which face all migrant workers, one of which is the precariousness of stay, quite rightly mentioned in the resolution. In considering this precariousness of stay, both the terms and conditions of entry on which these people come into the Community and their length of residence must be taken into account. Length of residence is a very important factor. This was not considered when the Ugandan Asians were turned out of Uganda and came to shelter in the United King-

dom. Many had been there even for generations. It is not, therefore, sufficient to say that as they have been in a country for five years, they are protected, because at present they are not protected. I shall deal with this aspect when I make my final proposals.

We accept that housing and education must be available, subject to the choice of the migrants themselves. There is a great variety of opinion among the migrants as to the kind of education they want for their children. Some of them in our country are demanding a far higher standard of education for their children than some of our schools are at present offering. They will not accept mixed schools, they will not accept the lack of religious instruction and they naturally insist on having their own language taught in order to maintain their cultural traditions and their own history.

Taking this into account, I wish to put forward one or two proposals. First, the position and protection of all foreign nationals within the Community must take into account a common migrant policy, freedom of establishment, an employment policy and a vocational training policy. This must be based realistically. It is no use simply saying that migrant workers' wages are lower than others. I would remind the Assembly that women's wages also are lower than those of men—£42 a week for a male manual worker and £21 for a female manual worker. The difference in wages therefore applies not only to migrant workers. I ask the trade unions, when studying the differentials, not to keep these types of workers at a lower level.

There is over-emphasis on the intellectual attributes in our education and a lack of willingness on the part of Europeans to do some of the manual work. Unless Europeans are prepared to do some of the manual work—but at proper rates of pay—we shall fail to solve the problem of the migrant worker, because we shall always be drawing on people from other countries to do the jobs that we are not willing to perform ourselves.

There is much lack of consideration of procedural and administrative measures which can be applied under existing legislation. There is, for example, the protection of minors, which I have already mentioned, heavy penalties on employers who exploit illegal immigrants, and heavy penalties on traffickers. There are agreements with third countries to protect immigrants coming from those countries. There are contributions by employers towards improving housing for migrant workers. The trade unions have a responsibility for ensuring that there is no discrimination between workers.

**Lady Elles**

Our actions must not be a sop to our conscience because of a feeling that we are indulging in getting rich on the backs of migrant workers, or prompted by political motives—trying to get votes and power at lower levels. Any proposals made must be made for humanitarian reasons, respecting all human beings within the rule of law.

Therefore, I make the following proposals. We should encourage the observation of the European Convention on Human Rights. This should be incorporated into national legislation where it is not already embodied in existing constitutions. We should observe the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments by making use of information and the mass media. We should urge Member States to sign the draft European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers, on which so much work has already been done by the Council of Europe. Since the European Convention can be ratified only by members of the Council of Europe and not by third countries, I ask support for the introduction of a new international instrument by the United Nations to cover all non-citizens who are legally resident in a country other than their own. There is a draft declaration before the United Nations sub-commission on the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities.

Nevertheless, the Community has an obligation to take action, and not to rely only on international and Council of Europe instruments. The Community must prepare a directive for Member States to implement legislation covering the rights, obligations and duties of non-citizens, including dependants in particular, the right to acquire the nationality of a country in which they have been residing for five years. This right should be reciprocal for EEC migrants to other countries. They should also have the right not to be deported without due process of law before a tribunal, with the right of appeal, plus the right to remove from that country their own legally-acquired property. These are some of the rights which I recommend the Commission to take into consideration.

Further, when the Commission studies the position of EEC nationals, I submit that it should consider their voting rights when discussing direct elections to the European Parliament.

I support any form of consultation at municipal level so that minority groups may be represented, their views heard, and their needs and demands met wherever possible.

I thank Parliament for listening to my comments. I hope that the Commissioner will take

all these points into consideration when studying non-discrimination against migrant workers.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Rivierez.** — *(F)* Mr President, we are discussing a matter of social justice and humanity, and it is only natural that the Group of European Progressive Democrats should give its approval straightaway to the conclusions of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. May I join my colleagues in congratulating and thanking the rapporteur.

It is a question of social justice, and also a duty for all of us who live in Europe, because it is a fact that all migrant workers in the Community make an enormous contribution to our economies, the economic progress we have achieved over a number of years and to life in our cities. How indeed could these cities be maintained if we did not have migrant workers to keep them clean?

We therefore have a duty towards these workers, who enable us to live as we do.

From the human point of view, the matter presents no problems; but when we consider it in depth, it has a number of different aspects. There is no difficulty as far as workers from Community Member States are concerned; their rights are safeguarded by the Treaties, but it is natural and necessary to go beyond this, and they will eventually be granted political rights.

As for workers from third countries; here, too, a distinction must be made. We have special relationships with certain third countries, in Europe or close to Europe; and progress can be made in regard to these countries. And then there are more distant third countries, in North Africa and Black Africa. At present, particularly in France, the immigrant workers are mainly from Southern Africa, the Sahara or North Africa. In this case, progress cannot be considered in terms of reciprocity. This is why we need to devise a charter for migrant workers, and make every effort to implement this charter, to ensure that migrants' rights are respected in all the Member States, in the way that we would hope and expect.

Mr Glinne emphasized one point in his speech and rightly so, because when we are discussing such important matters we must be fully aware of the situation. You were courageous enough, Mr Glinne, to raise the question of immigration control, and you mentioned the research that had been carried out in the Belgian Parliament.

**Rivierez**

Indeed, for the reasons you set out, and because illegal immigration means that the immigrants themselves and the indigenous workers in the host country suffer, it must be stamped out; it also causes resentment among the nationals of the host country and may lead, in the short or long term, to renewed outbreaks of racialism.

Therefore, in the interests of the workers from overseas, and in the interests of Europe itself, we must prevent this illegal immigration. And I must emphasize that it is not sufficient to help workers who enter illegally, simply regarding them as future supporters of one political party or another, without worrying about the effect it will have on the workers themselves if they are treated differently from European workers. I say this because I want to defend their interests.

There is also the important question of political rights. It is gratifying that this matter has been raised. But this is a question that affects the sovereignty of States; political rights are bound up with nationality. It is a sacrosanct principle, and before anything can be done in this field, considerable progress will have to be made.

We shall reach this stage one day. Certainly in the case of migrant workers from the Community, as I said earlier; in the case of workers from other European countries it will take a few decades, and in the case of workers from outside Europe it will take even longer, because, as I pointed out, these workers come to Europe and we do not go and work in their countries, so it is a one-way process.

Anyway, the question of political rights must be raised, because it is our duty as men in the vanguard of human progress. The fact that we are Members of this Parliament implies that we wish to contribute to the achievement of the 'world citizenship' mentioned by a previous speaker. But we must realize that this citizenship is a star and not a planet. We can sense it, but we cannot yet see it. It is, however, a good idea to maintain that it will exist one day, if only to give us reason to hope.

Perhaps political rights should be seen in terms of contribution to local life, as they are in Belgium and Sweden. Indeed, when migrant workers live in a town, participate in its life and economic activity and send their children to the local schools, it is desirable for them eventually to become part of this local life.

Thus the concept of this involvement in local life as put forward in one country, Sweden I think, in a form to be considered, either directly through election to local councils or initially by association with a consultative body, would

be reasonable and just. But first of all the migrant worker must be defined.

Is someone who merely comes to spend a few months in a Member State a migrant worker? Is a man who comes to work regularly in the Community, season after season, a migrant worker? Is a frontier worker a migrant worker? There is thus a need to define the term.

And this right to participate in local life, which it is our duty to promote in the initial stages, must be dependent on the migrant having lived in the country for a certain period.

The foreign worker who has been there two or three years cannot become involved in local life in the way that we wish. He will have to be there for a longer period, perhaps five or ten years. These questions must be considered and discussed.

The analysis and the search for a solution could perhaps have as their starting point the position in France where there are different rules for foreigners. At one time—I do not know if this is still the case—there were 'privileged residents', in other words foreigners who had been in France for a certain period. There could be a 'privileged migrant worker' who would have pseudo-political but not full political rights in the initial period, since the sovereignty of states must not be endangered; we must only consider aims which are attainable, and not be unrealistic. The idea is to have a plan for the future, and not to attack what States consider most sacred, their sovereignty.

I have finished my speech, and I must say that what has been said by my predecessors has been extremely gratifying. The common denominator of all these speeches has been goodwill and generosity towards these migrant workers, whose situation is of particular interest to me.  
(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr D'Angelosante to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr D'Angelosante.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to state at the outset that my group agrees to the motion for a resolution now before us just as it approves the accompanying report by Mr Wieldraaijer. We hope that the time has at long last come for the Commission, noting the unanimous resolve of this Parliament, to decide to take a real step forward in the direction we all hope for. We cannot forget the fact that the Commission has for too long failed to live up to the commitments it has given in this matter to Parliament: I refer in particular to Petition No 4 of 23 November

**D'Angelosante**

1970 which, while not being as extensive as the petitions referred to in the present report, nevertheless called for action by the Commission which was never taken. It is particularly striking that no action has been taken as the proposals under discussion do not suggest granting migrant workers enormous rights and facilities but merely set out to limit and if possible eliminate grave disadvantages and equally serious discrimination in patent violation of existing international and Community standards.

An adequate and serious solution would consist in eliminating the causes of migration by remedying the disequilibrium of development and reversing existing processes, bringing capital to the sources of surplus labour rather than vice versa. I believe that we are all convinced that to do this there is a need for effective and active common policies such as a valid regional policy, which seems nevertheless to be very slow in seeing the light of day.

The Community cannot achieve its original and fundamental objective unless it solves this problem at its social roots and ensures for workers employed on its territory a minimum standard of equality in the exercise of basic rights, including the rights involved in the contract of employment (recruitment, wages, tasks, social security, assistance, conditions of employment, dismissal, etc.), the rights pertaining to the family life of workers (right to transfer their families and obtain education for their children) the right to humane living conditions through decent accommodation, social and political rights as well as the fundamental right of association in order to defend the interests of migrant workers and, under certain conditions, enable them to play a part in the life of the urban communities to which they belong. All the Member States grant these rights, although in practice to varying degrees, to their own citizens: in our view refusal of them to foreigners as such is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Treaties.

The Community must reject as altogether unworthy the system reminiscent of slavery by which workers are employed through intermediaries. Mention was just made of the problem of distinguishing between legal and illegal immigrants; but it is a fact that these immigrants, legal or illegal, provide their work and the fact of being illegal is certainly not an advantage for them: the fact that they are illegal is an advantage to their employers, who are able to exploit them more and pay them less. I must say that this distinction between free access by workers into a Community country or illegal entry in violation of the laws is a problem which we must consider, not with a

view to excluding illegal workers from the category of migrants but to save them from the exploitation to which they are exposed precisely because they entered the country in which they now work illegally; that is certainly not their fault. In our view the Community should reject formally neutral definitions which in substance, however, allow the benefits of uncivilized situations such as that facing seasonal workers. We know that in some Community countries (which are nevertheless quite civilized) the classification of workers as seasonal is not based on objective data but depends on the goodwill of the employer who decides to limit the duration of the work contract not to a season but to eleven months. In other words, the employer does not extend the contract to a twelve-month period in order to ensure that his workers fall into a special category and are subject to unworthy treatment; they cannot be accompanied by their wives and children, and they live under conditions which none of us would, I believe, accept. These distinctions which are based on a pseudo-objective observance of the legal category or certain qualifications are in fact inventions brought into being by certain vested interests; they bear no relation to an objective criterion for distinguishing between categories of migrants. This is the reason why we do not accept the argument put forward by some that before attempting to solve the problems which derive from migration some time should be spent in studying the definition of migrant workers.

I should also like to stress our rejection of the trend noted in the Community countries, in dealings with workers from not only third countries but also other Community countries, namely to dismiss personnel in various ways when crises like the one we are living through at present occur.

This is another reason for supporting the document now before us which—let us not forget—does not call for the Community to promote (as some of the previous speakers suggested) a series of national initiatives in the context of international legislation; similarly, it does not make any reference to the discussion which has been continuing for ten years now in the Council of Europe on a convention for migrant workers. What it demands is Community action, action under Community law, in short Community legislation to deal with this problem and solve it as rapidly as possible. The rest is mere evasion of the matter in hand.

Having said that, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. I must point out that we are all in agreement on these principles, on the need to safeguard migrant workers and to ensure equal

**D'Angelosante**

conditions for them and a minimum of parity for their legal status; however this agreement is not always sufficient to achieve practical conclusions because it is clouded by legal sensitivities which should be overcome by a common awareness of our duty. There are apparently problems of the legal basis for the decision or decisions which the Commission should propose in the appropriate quarters, problems of the form which the required provisions should take and other problems of competence. These objections are not convincing, and we agree with the rapporteur: there are difficulties, but they can be solved if the political determination is there. In our view the main objection which has been raised from the legal angle has no foundation since the problem we must solve is that of interference with the legal provisions of third countries. The Community does not in fact have to exceed its powers since it is not taking decisions affecting third countries in an area exempt from Community law. The problem is that of influencing that part of the legislation of the Member States which determines the situation of migrant workers, and we believe that this is possible from both the subjective and the objective angle in view of the links between many of the objectives and rules of the Treaties and secondary Community legislation for the promotion of humane social and political conditions for migrant workers. In my view, there are a number of Treaty objectives in the area of the economy and freedom of movement and a range of Community provisions which would allow requirements concerning the employment of labour to be implemented; these requirements could fall within the aims of the Community. However, if that is not the case or appears not to be the case, I believe we could always fall back on Article 235 of the Treaty.

It would indeed be strange, Mr President, if the Commission, which considered this article applicable to implement conditions of equality and indeed special benefits for capital originating outside the Community, and also found it applicable to legal persons (as in the case of the Statute for the European Company), should now consider that the same standards cannot be applied as the legal basis to regulate the presence of foreign workers on the territory of the Community.

We are well aware that this proposal does not solve everything; there remain sectors which cannot be regulated; but apart from the fact that these areas are fairly restricted, I believe that the countries of origin of the migrant workers or indeed other countries could stipulate in this matter provisions which would be broadly applicable and generally valid. We consider

that there is a legal basis for Community norms and that those sectors which remain outside such norms could be governed by other legal instruments. We hope that the Commission will accept the proposals put forward by this Parliament and that it will accept them not merely in a platonic manner but as an incentive to put forward measures which will call for detailed discussion rather than vague philosophical consideration.

**President.** — I call Mr Alfred Bertrand.

**Mr Alfred Bertrand.** — (NL) Mr President, as chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employments I would like to thank Mr Wieldraaijer for his detailed and notable report on the petitions made to the Parliament. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the petitions made to this Parliament have a better fate than petitions made to national parliaments, about which one seldom or never hears.

The present report has arisen as a result of petitions served by two major associations of migrant workers who have also attached to their petitions a charter for migrant workers.

I am especially pleased that the report and these petitions have been the cause of such extensive debate and have brought out a number of ideas and direct questions to the Commission connected with the possible creation of a charter for migrant workers.

I would point out that the question of migrant workers is a matter of great interest at this moment in all countries now that the migrant workers themselves have become aware of the fact that they have a certain power in various Member States where they are at present employed.

I would thank Mr Rivierez for his understanding approach to this problem. It is only too easy to forget that we asked these guest workers to come and do the work our own people no longer wish to do and that all the heavy, dirty and unhealthy work, or work that involves round-the-clock shifts, including the week-ends, and work that presents a certain risk, is done in our countries by guest workers since the local population no longer wishes to do it. It is thus a prime requirement of human justice that we should grant a charter to these workers who make our welfare possible and help to maintain it.

We note, however, that at national level initiatives are being taken under pressure from the guest workers' associations. Mr Glinne has just told you what the Belgian government and

**Bertrand**

the Belgian parliament has been considering in the way of national initiatives. I am afraid that if the Commission does not draw up a draft charter quickly, national regulations will be created which will in turn create discrepancies between the charters of the different Member States. It is possible then that one country will make a concession which is not accepted in another, and that one country will impose conditions which have not seemed important to another. This will make it difficult to harmonize at Community level measures for migrant workers.

We know what harmonization implies in connection with taxes or dimensions and weights in the transport sector. We are well aware of the difficulties presented at this moment by the approximation of certain matters at Community level. We are confronted in such cases by the legislations in force in the various Member States. A similar development is now taking place in respect of measures for migrant workers. As chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment I would therefore like to urge the President of the Commission to draw up as soon as possible a draft charter for migrant workers in the framework of the social action programme which could provide a basis, as a framework law, for appropriate measures in the Nine Member States.

I also believe that draft regulations should be drawn up at Community level but that the implementation and application of these regulations should be left to Member States. This means that we should not try to create a new administration of thousands of officials at Community level to enforce this charter and see that it is complied with. This should be left to the national administrations of the Member States. However there is a need for a Community framework law to establish what general points should be included in the charter for migrant workers.

This, it seems to me, is a very urgent question if we do not wish to be overtaken by a number of national decisions which have already been adopted.

Mr President, I believe that this matter is very important. The report by Mr Wieldraaijer only covers the petitions which have been served; the problem of the charter as such has not been broached. The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment would like to see this Parliament debate on the contents of a charter for migrant workers on the basis of a text submitted by the Commission, as soon as possible, so that we can give our opinion on it. With this in mind I

believe that this debate has given the Commission a number of ideas, guidelines and reflections which will make it possible for its members to take account of the views of the Parliament on the European charter or the international charter for migrant workers.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Della Briotta.

**Mr Della Briotta.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we anticipated yesterday the discussion of these problems, brought to the attention of our Parliament in two separate petitions and the report by Mr Wieldraaijer. The speech I made yesterday concerned the recognition of political rights to migrant workers and met with a broad consensus among the speakers belonging to various political groups, as to the importance of the problem.

Today we are returning to the subject on the basis of a document which my political group hopes will not merely remain the record of discussions between friends meeting for an amicable conversation but will become the point of departure for positive action by the Commission and Member States and in the appropriate quarters to define a charter of the rights of migrant workers.

This positive action should above all be pursued in the institutional framework of the Community even if there are some problems which exceed the terms of reference of the Community; the obstacles which surely exist and are no doubt numerous must be overcome and they are not insuperable.

I do not intend to dwell on this point because the political resolve of workers and men in government may always modify the national and Community legal framework in order to adapt it to changed situations or situations which were not anticipated when the proposals were drawn up.

When the Treaties of Rome were signed the situation in the six original Member States was such as to make the guarantees provided for workers moving from one country to another appear satisfactory. In general, it was thought that it was already an important contribution—and this was indeed an important contribution—to offer workers from the less developed countries, or from the least developed country, which was then Italy, the possibility of finding employment in which they would enjoy wage conditions equal to those of indigenous workers and benefit from more advanced social legislation, which would be observed and applied to them in full.

**Della Briotta**

For several years we continued to talk endlessly about the free movement of workers and Community social security legislation, without stopping to think that there might be other problems.

I say this with my customary frankness, because the responsibility for this situation cannot be attributed solely to the governments of the host countries; the countries which allow them to leave also have their share of responsibility, viewing as they do emigration as a necessary safety valve to relieve population pressure or as a safe outlet for long-standing political and social tensions which still exist.

The mutual convenience of areas of high industrial development and others in which the population lived in a state of need such that its very survival was threatened, overshadowed a whole range of problems which has now come to the fore carried by a growing awareness and maturity of opinion among the general public and among workers.

Today the Community numbers some ten million workers who have cut their ties with their countries of birth and are seeking to establish new relations with the country in which they live and for whose economic prosperity they are working by making an essential contribution which should not be thought of solely—I hope my colleagues who have spoken in this debate will bear with me when I say this—as the work of cleaning our streets or performing any other most unpleasant task (even if that actually happens).

We cannot consider ourselves satisfied with the existing situation and continue to say that basically, from the angle of emigration, Community regulations represent an important step forward because they have enabled the narrow vision of the Treaties and bilateral agreements to be overcome with all the limits they entail which are perfectly apparent in our country—when we are still forced to discuss each year with countries which do not yet belong to the Community the problem of the rights of our seasonal workers.

We cannot be satisfied as Europeans because these ten million citizens who have been forced to seek their social and political identity in other countries weigh heavily on our conscience.

It is precisely from this awareness of the existence of the problem and of its numerical relevance that the need arises to find solutions which may to the extent that this is felt desirable or necessary, be only gradual but which must be viewed against a background of certainty, as Lord O'Hagan rightly said yesterday

and Mr Glinne repeated this morning. I must point out that economic development, which lay at the start of the process of European construction, also compelled millions of workers on their own or with their families to move from the poorer or less developed regions towards the more highly industrialized areas.

In the post-war years the Community, like France in the 1920's, has witnessed a phenomenon already seen in the United States in the 19th century when thirty million Europeans originating in all the poor countries of the time (which are the poor countries of today with certain others which were then poor) crossed the Atlantic and played a decisive part in the birth of the America we now know.

Admittedly this wave of emigration cannot be compared in any way with the present movement because it was characterized by a total absence of guarantees, even of a minimum nature.

Today workers travel to their countries of destination with regular contracts of employment and generally find in the unions valuable assistance in defending their economic and earning rights as well as a meeting place and an opportunity for participation. The new climate of cooperation in the international trade union movement has opened the door to a more serious discussion which allows a narrower margin for protests of the maximalist type and which tends to cover a series of interests not confined to the economic and wage sectors and the immediate protection of earnings but extending also to social security. And it is quite natural that this should be the case because the improvement of working conditions has found its natural spokesman in the union movement backed by the certainty of solidarity among workers.

But even this commitment and historical merit of the union movement, which my political group may rightly consider part of its political heritage, encounter insuperable obstacles when faced with problems such as that of re-uniting families, obtaining accommodation, providing schooling and allowing participation in local life through direct consultative representation or the right to vote on the same basis as other workers. The charter for migrant workers would therefore be an effective instrument to improve this situation.

And the request for such a charter has come from the associations of migrant workers—this has been shown by discussions—as a contribution to the construction of legal provisions or instruments.

Mr Wieldraaijer's document which we approve indicates the problems to which a positive



**Della Briotta**

answer should be given in the charter. When speaking for our group, Mr Glinne analysed the question and indicated the matters to which an answer must be found.

In addition to the recognition of political rights of which I spoke yesterday, I should like to highlight the need for proper schooling.

Yesterday Mr Bertrand said that we should be careful when we set in motion measures favouring the process of integration because the states from which the migrant workers come sometimes have different ideas. The problem certainly exists. I am familiar with the content of the agreements and Treaties. I believe we must free ourselves from this approach to the problem and not treat migrant workers as the interchangeable cogs in an economic system and emigration solely as an instrument of short-term economic policy. It may be so in the eyes of economists and we must take account of that fact, but if we put ourselves in the shoes of the persons directly concerned we are bound to recognize that each individual is entitled to aspire to a normal life for himself and for his family.

If we were to analyze the reasons for the mobility of foreign labour in the Community countries, it would be apparent that this mobility is not due solely to a free choice but to specific causes such as the lack of housing for families, the difficulty of finding a place in the community and educational problems.

It would be interesting to have data on failure to complete courses of education and on diplomas earned by the children of migrant workers who have brought their families with them, in order to change the assumptions spontaneously adopted in some quarters and to show the inadequacy of all that has been done in this sector by the countries of origin, the host countries and the Community. But there are the European schools which cost the Community and the countries of origin a great deal of money, as I pointed out in the debate on the Social Action Programme.

But the children of migrant workers are not European citizens. And so we have educational establishments whose operation is exposed to national interference when they wish to safeguard the linguistic and cultural heritage of the country of origin which differs from or conflicts with that of the host country. And when an attempt is made to use the school for the purpose of socialization and integration, there is a risk of cutting off vital links which are as necessary as the air we breathe or the water we drink. Generally it becomes difficult to ensure the social and cultural development of

young people who live far from their homeland because of economic mechanisms and political or governmental actions. And so after their fathers the children, too, pay their tribute to the economic growth of our community.

We do not accept this logic, just as we reject the logic of emigration itself where it is not an essential instrument to restore demographic balance but a simple consequence of inadequate economic development policies. We do not accept this logic, just as we do not wish workers to be penalized for faults which are not their own.

That is why we shall vote in support of the Wieldraaijer document which we fully endorse, in the hope that the Commission will derive from it the strength to establish legal instruments for emigration enabling migrant workers to be safeguarded and Europe to gain the possibility of harmonious development, making appropriate use of migrant workers, but not simply to clean its city streets.

**IN THE CHAIR: MR BEHRENDT**

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Lemoine.

**Mr Lemoine.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if there is one question to which our Parliament should devote its attention and try to find a solution, it is the position of the migrant workers in the Member States.

This is an extremely important human and social problem, which the report by Mr Wieldraaijer and the attached petitions rightly emphasize, although the motion for a resolution is expressed in very conditional terms and the explanatory statement mentions a number of difficulties still to be resolved.

It is indeed a social problem, since it concerns ten million workers: more than 4 million in France, with their families, 3,6 million in West Germany, 2,5 million in the United Kingdom and 1 million in Switzerland, to mention just a few countries. Clearly the use of immigrant labour is an economic necessity, for France and for the other countries in Europe, and no one here would deny that immigrant workers make an important economic contribution to the life of the host country.

This is true in West Germany, Luxembourg and Belgium, as in France, the Netherlands and Switzerland.

Millions of them—2 500 000 in my country—work in the essential economic sectors: the steel, automotive, building and chemical industries.

**Lemoine**

The capitalist monopolies use them, even more than other workers, to meet the demands of their unrestrained desire for maximum profit. 40 % of immigrant workers are unskilled labourers, 33 % skilled workers. To promote concentration and the accumulation of capitalist wealth and to obtain and provide cheap labour, they encourage large-scale, often illegal, immigration.

In addition, immigrant workers are often forced to do the most strenuous or the most tedious jobs.

This is indeed a human problem, because not only are they victims of the greed of employers where their wages are concerned, they are also victims in that they are usually forced to live in dilapidated and squalid conditions. Are there not hundreds of thousands of them still living in shanties, sordid furnished rooms, slums, decaying and poorly maintained accommodation?

The efforts so far made to provide vocational training have been derisory and the presence of millions of men and women, and 900 000 children, in France alone, gives rise to appalling problems in regard to housing, health, education and culture.

The communist parties, which have been defending the rights of immigrant workers unceasingly for over fifty years, welcome the fact that today many individuals and democratic organizations are calling for an end to the discrimination practised against these workers and that our Parliament is endorsing this.

Whatever their nationality, these immigrants are members of the same working class; like workers in our countries, they create wealth which is mainly taken over by the employers as profit. They have to suffer low wages, social and legal discrimination; as our rapporteur has said, they enjoy few, if any, of the basic political rights such as freedom of expression of political views, freedom of the press, freedom to hold meetings.

But now they are no longer willing to be the slaves of the modern world; they want equal rights in all fields. This is their ambition, and that of all the other workers with whom they are fighting more actively than ever to achieve a better standard of living, a different and more dignified way of life.

The fundamental changes that we are seeking, and that they are seeking, cannot be brought about merely through high flown speeches and good intentions.

Today, a different immigration policy is possible and necessary. The essential principles of this

policy have been worked out in the joint programme evolved by the Left in France and in the motion tabled in my country by communist Members of Parliament, whose internationalist principles accord with the national interest. A real immigration policy must be pursued in a spirit of international cooperation, in the mutual interests of our countries and the third countries which provide manpower.

First of all, it must guarantee the workers and their families, who contribute to the economic and demographic development of the countries concerned, complete equality in law and in all other fields.

This is our duty to our fellow human beings, in accordance with the traditions of freedom and hospitality, and the interests of all workers.

It is the only way to meet the needs of the immigrant workers, who, in this day and age, also want better living conditions.

This is why a true democratic and social charter must be adopted without delay, to guarantee immigrants complete equality in law with indigenous workers.

The charter must take into account the fact that indigenous workers and immigrant workers are at the same time equal and different; equal because they belong to the same class, different because they come from different countries with varying cultures and historical backgrounds.

The charter must guarantee equal rights and respect for national character, help the immigrants to integrate, express themselves in their mother tongue and follow events in their countries of origin.

The scale and urgency of the problems dealt with so objectively in Mr Wieldraaijer's report lead me to say, in conclusion, that Parliament should urge the Commission and the Council to submit practical proposals, so that a democratic European charter of immigrants' rights can be drawn up without delay, taking into account the demands of the workers, and with the assistance of the major trades unions, with due respect for the dignity and personality of the workers.

The Communist and Allies Group will do all it can to ensure that the legitimate demands of millions and millions of migrant workers of all nationalities are satisfied, and that this is done without delay.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** —

(1) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission considers that in improving living and working conditions—which is the fundamental objective of the Community's social policy—no distinction can be made between national and foreign workers since efforts to achieve this objective apply equally to national workers and migrant workers. The Commission is taking a great interest in the motion for a resolution concerning the proposal for an international Charter of Migrant Workers' Rights referred to in Petitions No 1/73 and No 1/74 because this charter reflects its own concern about the condition of these workers.

The motion for a resolution and the accompanying explanatory statement provide a valuable overall assessment of the problem of laying down a charter for migrant workers and their families, defining their social and economic, cultural, civil and political rights. The Commission would therefore like to express its keen appreciation and gratitude to the rapporteur and the whole of Parliament for the work they have done. It cannot be forgotten that the problems raised by the living and working conditions of migrant workers are more complex than those which occur in the case of national workers, above all because of the discrimination which the factor of citizenship is liable to engender in political matters and in everyday life. The motion for a resolution shows a sense of realism and does not hide the considerable legal and political difficulties involved in solving these problems. The increasing influx of foreign workers into the Community has highlighted, especially in recent years, the resulting social disadvantages and distortions to such an extent that the search for solutions aimed at ensuring complete social justice in the Community has become a particularly urgent matter. The Commission is fully aware of this as is shown by its efforts in recent years to bring the whole subject of migration into the sphere of responsibility of the Community so as to ensure equality for all migrant workers. The Commission considers in fact that the improvement of living conditions of workers presupposes application of the principle of equal treatment for national and migrant workers as well as full enjoyment by foreign workers of human rights in general.

I consider it superfluous to examine in detail the considerations put forward by Mr Wiel-draaijer in his motion for a resolution, because I fully endorse them. I therefore support the conclusions put forward even if it seems to me that many obstacles and difficulties remain to be overcome before a genuine charter of migrant workers' rights can be achieved. The obstacles

and difficulties standing in the way of this aim which the rapporteur has analysed and explained in such detail mean that great caution is necessary if damaging delays are to be avoided, especially now that the Commission has the genuine intention of achieving concrete results.

As you know, the Commission has already submitted to the Council of Ministers, in the context of the Social Action Programme, its proposals on migrant workers whatever their origin, with a view to ensuring effective equality of living and working conditions, treatment and enjoyment of economic and social rights, as well as to allow all migrant workers and their families to participate in the life of the national and local communities.

The draftsman of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee referred to this initiative on the part of the Commission and I am grateful to him for doing so. But the Commission believes that great prudence is essential in this area—as well as goodwill and diligence—in order to achieve an objective which the draftsman of the Legal Affairs Committee's opinion himself recognizes to be almost impossible when he says that, 'it must be noted that the Community does not have any legal instrument at its disposal which could be used as a basis for a text establishing a charter of migrant workers' civil, political, social and human rights' and goes on to say that 'in any case it is not competent to legislate in respect of workers who are nationals of non-member states'.

Despite this fact, I think Parliament will acknowledge that the Commission has not allowed itself to be intimidated by the difficulties and that the Council of Ministers in its resolution of 21 January 1974 on the Social Action Programme included the objective of implementing a programme in favour of migrant workers who are nationals either of Member States or of third countries, by invoking the provisions of the Treaties, including the famous Article 235.

In this connection I should like Mr D'Angelosante, who referred just now to the possibility of applying that article, to note the decision already taken in the matter by the Council of Ministers.

The mandate given by the Council now enables the Commission to proceed more rapidly in the direction outlined.

As to the substance of the problems raised in the two petitions, the Commission is well aware that the situation of migrant workers originating in the Member States and third countries is determined by a number of legal and economic conditions.

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

From the legal point of view discrimination has been noted; the particularly weak situation of workers from third countries places them in an even more unfavourable position than migrant workers moving from one Community country to another.

The legal and economic problems are accompanied by social difficulties and discrimination. The situation in the matter of social and civil rights—this must be stressed—is alarming. There is discrimination not only in respect of housing, education and social services but also in the enjoyment of social security rights and participation in the social, political and economic life of the Community.

In addition, especially in the case of workers from third countries, rights vary from one state to another as a function of domestic legislation, the existence or otherwise of bilateral agreements with the countries of origin and the content of these agreements.

We must remember the need to remove at the earliest possible time certain forms of discrimination and their causes which still affect social protection for workers originating in Member States.

The authors of Petitions No 1/73 and No 1/74 hope that an end will be put once and for all to these forms of discrimination and distortion by means of a charter defining the rights of migrant workers so as to guarantee equality and the theoretical and practical enjoyment of equal rights for all workers.

This objective coincides with the aim which the Commission hopes to achieve at the earliest possible date by taking measures initially under the Social Action Programme. At the same time the Commission intends to examine as a matter of the greatest urgency the problems brought to its notice in order to work out a charter conforming to the indications given in the two petitions and taking into account the suggestions put forward in the report of the Committee on Social Affairs and Youth. The Commission hopes that the proposals asked for will be presented very soon.

Allow me to add, Mr President, that, at a time when the Community is pursuing a firm commitment to acquire a human face and allow its own citizens to participate in the construction of Europe, there is a need not only for coherent action by the Community institutions, which must be achieved at an early date, but also for increasing frankness and awareness as regards our responsibilities to all those people from outside the Community who have come to share in our adventure and have become

direct protagonists in our progress. It would be quite unacceptable, having regard to the role which the Community intends to play in the world and the expectation and interest aroused by its actions, if it were to overlook the needs of its own adoptive citizens and in so doing emphasize even more strongly its mercantilist function.

I am therefore sure that an adequate solution will be found to the legal, political and human problems linked with the phenomenon of migration, so that the European Community will present to its own citizens and to the world at large the true image of a just society in which all inhabitants enjoy the same rights.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

Before we proceed to the vote on the motion for a resolution contained in Mr Wieldraaijer's report, I would point out that there is a mistake in the German version. Paragraph 9 of the German text should be deleted and paragraph 10 should become paragraph 9.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

On the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6 I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6 to the vote.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6 are adopted.

On paragraph 7 I have Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Pisoni and Mr Girardin and worded as follows:

Amend the end of this paragraph to read as follows:

'...present practical proposals to Parliament by the end of March 1975 at the latest.'

I call Mr Rosati, deputizing for Mr Pisoni, to move this amendment.

**Mr Rosati.** — (I) Mr President, in the absence of Mr Pisoni and Mr Giraud, I wish to move, if you will allow me to do so, this amendment to paragraph 7.

Paragraph 7 stipulates the end of 1975 as the date for presenting proposals for a charter on the basis of these petitions. The amendment on the other hand proposes that this date should be brought forward to the end of March 1975. In their speeches this morning, the rapporteur and Mr Pisoni already outlined the reasons for this request so that there is nothing for me to

**Rosati**

add. The aim is simply to accelerate the presentation of this charter. During the debate the importance of formulating the charter was emphasized with a view to its taking effect in the first few months of 1976. I therefore recommend the Parliament to adopt this amendment.

**President.** — What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Wieldraaijer, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I appreciate the reasons for this amendment. My starting point, in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, was the need to think realistically. This is the reason why I wished to fix a final date. In my opinion the deadline is reasonably generous. Of course the Parliament can decide to change it. If the member of the Commission present has no objection to the deadline being brought forward then I too have no objection. If he says that the Commission needs the time to draw up the charter then I would wish to retain the original text.

**President.** — What is the Commission's position?

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — I agree, Mr President.

**President.** — You have heard the Commission's answer; it means that the rapporteur also agrees.

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is adopted.

I put paragraph 7 so amended to the vote.

Paragraph 7 is adopted.

On paragraphs 8 and 9 I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put paragraphs 8 and 9 to the vote.

Paragraphs 8 and 9 are adopted.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole incorporating the amendment that has been adopted.

The resolution so amended is adopted.

#### 9. 1974/1975 Information Programme of the Commission

**President.** — The next item is the debate on the report drawn up by Mr Broeks on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth on the 1974/75 Information Programme of the Commission of the European Communities (Doc. 106/74).

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

**Mr Broeks, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, last December the Commission submitted to the Parliament the 1974/1975 information programme which refers to the policy of the Commission itself. The Parliament has, quite rightly, always been greatly interested in information in general and also information about the Council and the Parliament itself; it has been concerned with this since 1960. The most recent Parliament report on this matter, which was drawn up by Mr Schuijt on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee and covered EEC information in general, dates from February 1972. What we are concerned with today, however, is a specific programme which only covers the Commission's information work.

Meanwhile, in the Parliament's case, there have been changes. Information is no longer the province of the Political Affairs Committee but of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth, a great part of whose work is concerned with information. In the 1970 report it was asked whether the EEC was well enough known by the public at large; today there are fewer grounds for pessimism than then, as a result of the important events which have taken place meanwhile. The accession of the United Kingdom, Ireland and Denmark to the Community and everything connected with that, and the present discussions on renegotiation of the conditions of the United Kingdom's accession have certainly made the Community better known.

On the other hand it has unfortunately also become better known as a result of its failure to act on a number of important matters. I need only mention monetary affairs, the energy crisis, the lack of unity vis-à-vis America and the regional policy. These are only a few of the points which have received radio, television and press coverage in virtually every state.

The question now, however, is whether a greater awareness of the Community has also brought with it an understanding in the Nine countries of the need for a united Europe. This question is difficult to answer. It is certainly true of an interested superstratum of its population but whether this is so for the public at large—and this would be very important—I greatly doubt. Furthermore, in the last few weeks this understanding has been damaged by the measures taken recently in Italy and Denmark, although the Italian measures have been somewhat modified.

The aim of information work is to give an impression of the objectives and policy in the

**Broeksz**

longterm of the EEC, or to strengthen this impression. Another objective is to provide specific information on the day-to-day policy of the Community. A natural question here is whether such information can be successful in our Nine countries and outside if the policy of the Community is not only not crowned with success, but also in a state of stagnation and even falling behind on certain points. The Commission is very aware of this problem and in its document of last December it wrote that much depends on whether the objectives of the Paris Summit Conference are achieved.

There is therefore little cause for optimism at the present time about the chances of success of information work. Another factor is that providing information about the objectives and policy of the EEC is more difficult than the provision of information about objectives and policies by the Governments of the Member States, as their citizens and groups of citizens naturally feel less affiliation with the European Community than with their own national community to which they so clearly belong. Perhaps an exception could be made in the case of farmers and, of course, also for farmers' organizations.

Another difficulty is that there is no definite European Government and as a result the tasks of the Commission and the Council are not always clear to the world outside. It is known that the European Parliament is not elected directly and that this Parliament moreover does not have sufficient powers and does not even have the right to decide on the budget—the first thing that any national Parliament has—although there may perhaps be an improvement in 1974, in view of the results of the last Council meeting. Furthermore this Parliament also leads a somewhat fluctuating existence. The fate of the EEC is mainly decided by a *novemvirate*, an oligarchy of ministers of foreign affairs, sometimes replaced by other ministers. I would repeat that there is therefore no clear government. This all makes it very difficult to give good information in depth about the EEC. It would be possible to give information with somewhat more success about the measures connected with day-to-day policy taken either by Commission or—as does happen now and again—by the Council.

Even so, for such an important matter as information considerably greater sums should be earmarked than the Community accepts at present if the information is to be effective.

One looks in vain for a statement of budgetary implications in the 1974/1975 information programme. Our Committee sympathized with

the fact that when this document was compiled it was difficult to draw up a budget for the two years. Now, the amount for 1974 is almost double that for 1972. We should not, however, forget that since then three new Member States have acceded to the Community and that inflation has increased the level of costs. Furthermore, of the ten million units of account that are now earmarked for information, 3.2 million units of account are allocated to the Official Journal, which is an increase of 2 million units of account.

If the budget for information is not considerably increased for 1975 the Commission will be able to implement very few of the fine words of its document. If the Community's allocations for information are compared with the amounts which even small states devote to this end or those allocated by a single multinational undertaking then it is easy to understand that information can hardly be provided at the level which the Commission would like to see.

It is indeed true that it would be possible to cooperate on information work with organizations committed to EEC principles of which some, but not all, deserved subsidies.

Our Committee did not feel so obliged to concern itself with the budget for 1974/1975 as the reorganization mentioned in the programme will mean that the real cost increase will only take effect later.

If, however, we forget the matter of the 1975 budget and concern ourselves with the Commission's general target, I must say that our Committee is full of appreciation. We know that on almost all points the objectives will have to be worked out in greater detail, but we are satisfied with the guidelines, which meet the Parliament's wish for more concentration in information work. In 1972 Parliament considered that this concentrated information should be the responsibility of the President of the Commission as the amalgamation could then have led to real unity. Now information is concentrated under one member of the Commission, but the Spokesman remains responsible to the President, which in our view is correct, given the present structure.

This distribution of work does however necessitate coordination between the activities of the Directorate General for Information and the spokesman office. This is still some way from the so greatly desired coordination between the information policy of the Council and the Parliament but at all events a step has been taken in the right direction. Here we would like to express our hope that the allocations for information will also be concentrated as far as

**Broeksz**

possible in the 1975 budget. The creation of a documentation centre is also a definite improvement.

Our Committee does have some desires with respect to the basic principles laid down for the 1974/1975 programme. The main one refers to the priorities mentioned in Chapter I (b). We are sorry to see that consumer information is not concluded. Meanwhile the necessary attention has been given to this point by the European Parliament as a result of a report by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs at the last part-session. This underlined the need for consumer information. It must not be forgotten that the consumer is closely concerned in many ways with EEC policy not only as a user of consumer goods; the health policy, the environment policy, the social policy, the regional development policy, to mention only a few, are of importance for the consumer.

These matters have a great and direct bearing on the day-to-day life of the majority of the population of the Nine Member States, if not for us all, whom I refer to for the sake of simplicity as 'the consumer'. Information is urgently necessary about everything which the Community does and wishes to do in these areas.

I do not wish to refer here to information for youth since we conducted a debate on this yesterday but I would like to speak about our commitment under Article 50 of the EEC Treaty concerning the exchange of young workers. I hope that the Commission will continue to see this as an urgent point.

Nor do I wish to speak about information on the free movement of goods and services and the very important problem of recognition of diplomas, since Parliament recently debated these matters in full on the basis of the Hougardy report.

In the matter of another priority, information for teachers, we are of the opinion that such information is required not only in secondary schools and universities, but that one should start with teachers in primary schools. Radio broadcasts for schools, for instance, could be given more attention.

Contacts with the trade unions could easily be improved if the workers were to benefit from them more than has been the case in the last few months. The same is also true for information for political groups.

Our report, however, raises a number of other points. We recall the special problems of the new Member States and the need to contribute to creating a better image and a positive view

of the objectives and work of the Community in those countries especially.

We express the hope that the Commission will continue in the future to increase the effectiveness of its information policy by carrying out opinion polls and a critical assessment of return information.

It is especially necessary for the press and information offices to be consolidated and we point out the importance of systematic investigations into the availability of information to the various sectors of the public.

We consider it of great importance that the role of mass media and modern audio-visual aids should be thoroughly investigated and special attention should be given to the increasingly popular video-cassette.

We also ask for measures to be taken to bring the reception facilities for groups of visitors in Brussels into line with existing information requirements and that the information officers in the Member States should be provided with adequate personnel at an early date.

We also believe that, in general, quicker reaction to important events and decisions is of great importance if information is to be effective.

Summing up, I would therefore like to say that the Committee concurs with the programme but strongly doubts whether it can be carried out in practice anything like as well as the often convincing phrases of the document would suggest. In February 1973 Mr Ortoli said how desirable it was to associate the peoples of Europe in the creation of the Community, and that one of the ways of doing this was to provide objective information which could be universally understood.

And this brings me to the question of how the Commission intends to involve people in future in the development of the Community and to what extent it has already involved the people in this process by way of its information work. In considering the question of what is objective and understandable to everyone the Commission should ask itself what image the public forms from its information work.

I believe that information will be exceptionally difficult if the work of the EEC is not more successful. We should remember the dictum: one does not have to hope to attempt, nor does one have to be successful to persist. We have some doubt about the possibility of providing good information under the present circumstances, but this does not mean that we would not support the Commission's policy.

**Broeksz**

Information is and remains necessary and it is to be hoped that substantial allocations will be earmarked for this purpose at least for 1975.

Our Committee is able to concur with the programme, as is stated in the report and as I have already said, even though we have a number of extra wishes. We are grateful to Mr Scarascia Mugnozza for the excellent co-operation which has arisen between us and himself and his staff. We count on similar cooperation in the further elaboration of the programme. We wish him and his hard-working staff much success in their information work.

**President.** — The spokesmen of the political groups have agreed to give Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli the floor now because she has to return to Italy. Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli is speaking on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli.** — Mr President, allow me first to thank the Members who have permitted me to speak first, thus breaking with the traditional order of speeches.

The programme which the Commission has submitted is a good one, and I agree with Mr Broeksz' assessment of it. Criticisms have been put forward; it has been said that the ideas are sometimes too vague, that there are not enough practical proposals and that the statistical indications are inadequate. In my view the programme as such is technically quite satisfactory.

Now for a political comment. It seems important to me that the sectors responsible for information are aware of the risk of working in a vacuum. It has been openly recognized that the basic problem is that of political reality. That is a good beginning, which deserves to be noted. Only yesterday Commissioner Scarascia Mugnozza said that in the absence of good politics there could be no good information. Otherwise information degenerates into propaganda; I do not think that any of us here wish to engage in propaganda.

The programme carries a date: 12 September 1974. It has been drawn up on the basis of the conclusions of the Paris and Copenhagen Summit Conferences and overlooks subsequent failures. But we cannot disregard those failures. It is reasonable to refer—as the programme does and as the rapporteur did just now—to President Ortoli's call for involvement of the people in the process of European unification. But that call sounds rather strange today in face of the pressing difficulties of the moment. In dealing with this problem we must not overlook the political reality; we must be aware of it in order to determine these responsibilities

of the persons in charge of information and recognize, as we must, the extreme difficulty of their work. Let us look at the facts squarely: a few years ago when we decided to open an information office in Latin America or in the third world, that was a significant step because we were in a position to note proposals. Today our situation vis-à-vis our future partners is much more difficult. And when we ask our information offices to speak of European union and to seek converts, we are hampered by the fact that everything in the Community is in a state of crisis.

It is essential to provide information on the process of democratization of the European Community. One criticism which must be made here of the European Community is that it has not had the courage (I would refer here to the words of Mr Corona, whom I see present in the chamber) to state frankly which forces have opposed this process of democratization and to state frankly that to achieve our ends a system of political dialectic must be established.

The Commission says that the categories which must be better informed are readily apparent. I personally believe we must have the courage to say that information is not sufficient; we must also define the categories which need mobilizing if progress is to be made.

These are all general political tasks which cannot be entrusted to technical offices responsible for information. But if the political decisions were taken, the information services would then become extremely valuable.

In paragraph 3 of the explanatory statement the rapporteur says that it would be important to know the nature and causes of the criticisms directed at the European Community. We must be aware that criticism has grown enormously in recent months among the new Member States (as is apparent from a few hints in the programme and report) while there is diffuse hostility among the people in the other Member States. This reality and the existence of these hostile attitudes cannot be denied. This is not a passing phenomenon based on the greater or lesser commitment of certain men to Europe, but a fundamental necessity. An information policy may help to understand such deeply rooted necessities which determine currents of opinion. We know in fact that opinions—negative or positive—are formed on the major themes and not on isolated matters; sacrifices may be called for to achieve great aims and high ideals but not to implement sectoral policies.

As regards the problem of information designed to mobilize opinion, that could perhaps be achieved through an independent vision of



**Romagnoli**

Europe and the search for a European identity. I believe that the task entrusted to the information offices is extremely demanding because it consists not only in supplying information but also in overcoming major difficulties due to the fact that public opinion, already diffident, is now largely hostile.

The tasks of all of us, and of these offices in particular, have therefore become extremely delicate because we are faced with a public opinion which might once have been open to the new ideas of Europe but is now alarmed, especially in some countries, at having to pay a high price for processes imposed upon it which it is unable to control.

This brings us to the theme of democratization: public opinion—and this concerns us in particular—sees that of all the European institutions the one to be deprived of the right of initiative is the European Parliament, which should be closest to public opinion.

The report indicates clearly that public opinion wishes to be informed and our task, the task of the Community, is to supply that information. But it must also be realized that this right to information will be practically meaningless unless the possibility of public opinion exerting its own influence is accepted as the basic premise. That explains the vital need for information feedback, which, more than a simple matter of information, is also a basis for arriving at political conclusions.

We welcome the initiative to change and improve the structures of information and believe that this opportunity should be taken by Parliament—and I feel also by the Commission, which will no doubt do so in the reply by Mr Scarascia Mugnozza—to stress this basic political aspect and not to present, as in other instances, resolutions which are sterile: resolutions in which Parliament confines itself to pointing to the existence of problems and saying that they can only be solved by technical means. We are living at a time in which solutions cannot be merely technical; we are living at a time when solutions can only be political.

While stressing, therefore, the importance of this information service and welcoming the goodwill shown in seeking to reorganize it and make it more efficient, we must still recognize the fact that its operation depends on a specific political line which may become better or worse depending on our ability to influence it.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3.05 p.m.)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR DALSAGER

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

## 10. 1974/1975 Information Programme of the Commission (resumption)

**President.** — The next item is resumption of the debate on the report drawn up by Mr Broeks on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth on the 1974/1975 Information Programme of the Commission of the European Communities (Doc. 106/74).

I call Mr Van der Sanden to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Van der Sanden.** — *(NL)* Mr President, in the political situation in which the Community now finds itself, the Christian Democrats believe more than ever that we must have an information policy which is in line with the requirements arising from such a situation. The Rossi report on the Seventh General Report reemphasises a number of points. The resolution contained in the Parliament's report stated that an urgent appeal must be made both to national Parliaments and political parties and to public opinion in the Member States. That appeal must naturally be supported and in my opinion also guided by the information services of the Community which, in my view, must be available to the whole Community.

Here I would like to make a single remark since—as I have realized this morning—information can be seen in a rather dubious light. There are two different attitudes. The first is that the provision of information is in fact a way of keeping troublesome journalists at bay by providing the minimum information required to keep them happy. The second view is that information should be a form of propaganda—this is an opinion I have heard this morning in this House—and should therefore be seen in the wrong light right from the start. It is frequently added that the work of the body on which information is to be given should speak for itself and thereby create its own image.

Although this last point naturally cannot be denied these two attitudes on information are

**Van der Sanden**

clearly not shared by us. We reject this definition of the concepts of information. We consider it to be inaccurate and false to approach information and information workers in this way. It is our opinion that information can and must take usefulness as its prime object, usefulness for society as a whole and for the group to which the information is to be directed, e.g. in connection with specific problems.

The objective of providing information, solicited or unsolicited, is—and this is what I believe it is all about—to give our citizens a proper picture of the objectives which we are striving to attain, in this case the policy of the European Communities. Information must therefore not be seen as a sort of necessary evil. On the contrary, we believe that information is our bounden duty. The citizen both inside and outside the Community is quite simply entitled to it. A good information service does after all serve the interests both of individual citizens and of the Community as a whole. Information work therefore requires frankness. All those in authority in the Community must be convinced that the greatest possible frankness towards the outside world is the primary condition for a successful, effective information policy.

Apart from this, information must also serve the institutions of the Community itself. I believe that the concept of information implies by definition two-way traffic. The Community and its senior officials must be constantly informed about the opinions of the population of the Member States. I would like to draw this point especially to the attention of Mr Scarascia Mugnozza and I would like to ask him whether in fact enough attention is being given to this aspect and whether anything is done besides the very important opinion poll surveys.

In summing up these few general observations I would like to say that the present situation of the Community calls for aggressive, rather than passive information policy, now more than ever before.

I would naturally be failing in my duty if I were not to take this opportunity to mention that my political group has great admiration for the devotion, the resourcefulness and the very great effort with which the information officials of the Community carry out their work. I would add that I hope and expect that in the coming year especially, which will probably be a decisive year for the Community, they will continue to carry out their work with the same energy and European enthusiasm.

On behalf of my group I am able to give general approval to the motion for resolution which the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth has

presented to Parliament today in the excellent report by our colleague Mr Broeksz.

The priorities laid down by the Commission in its programme have our full support but my group does request that the priorities should be reflected in the policy. There is not much point in fixing priorities if they are not then clearly adhered to. Trade Unions, Youth, Teachers' and Political Organizations should indeed be given priority as a target group.

Paragraph 10 of the motion for a resolution expresses the wish that press and information offices should be strengthened. I would like to endorse this wish today very strongly but not without a marginal observation.

I would like to point out that strengthening in this way does not necessarily mean that more established staff should be taken on. In the light of the priorities for the new budgetary year my group considers it would be much better and also less expensive—this would be a side-effect—to consider other possibilities apart from taking on more staff on a permanent basis.

Why, I would like to ask Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, can such partial projects, which are often of a temporary nature, not also be staffed by temporary officials for two years, for example, on the basis of special contracts? I would like to put this suggestion to the Commission since it would enable them to adopt an extremely flexible policy in the future both with regard to job-filling and also, above all, in tackling special projects.

And a second observation. The work of the press and information offices must be, and continue to be, guided by the Community. However Europe-minded national governments may be, they must allow the Community's Information Offices in their country full freedom. Any extra action at national level can and must be undertaken on the sole responsibility of national governments.

Our information about the United Europe which we are striving for requires—and I shall phrase this carefully—centralization of policy and decentralization of implementation.

Now, policy is made in Brussels. It is from there and not from the national ministers of, for example, foreign affairs that the flow of information should go to the press and information bureaux. I hope that Mr Scarascia Mugnozza fully understands what I mean.

And now to my third observation. Speaking of the flow of information from Brussels I would, on behalf of my group, ask for special consideration to be given to the technical facilities for processing this flow of information. Here one

**Van der Sanden**

requirement is predominant, namely rapidity. All is in vain if the information official only receives his information by the telex from Brussels hours after the news has appeared the morning papers. This is an impossible situation for any information official.

I would therefore urge Mr Scarascia Mugnozza most sincerely to streamline communications between Brussels and the National Information Offices, by, perhaps, a direct telex link to be used solely for this kind of information. A propos, Mr President—and here I address myself directly to you—our Parliament also suffers on occasion from slow feed-through of information. Why, I would like to ask, do we as members of this Parliament do not receive in good time information which reaches the daily papers in the countries of our Community by other channels?

I would like to give two examples: the first is the cabinet crises in Italy and the second the discussion that we had yesterday evening with the President of the meeting of the Council of Ministers held on Monday in Luxembourg. Yesterday evening we had a meeting of the Political Affairs Committee at which Minister Genscher read out whole passages of a press communiqué which had been issued to the press on Monday evening in Luxembourg.

Why—and this question is addressed to the Bureau of this Parliament—can such press reports not be issued quickly and efficiently to the members of the Parliament? If that had been the case we would have been better informed for our discussion with Minister Genscher. I believe that these two examples, which are not directly concerned with the Commission's information policy, underline what I was talking about when I referred to 'speed of information'. This speed is essential for the work which has to be done by the information services. In this short speech on behalf of my group I do not wish to go into all the matters which the rapporteur so excellently covered this morning.

He also dealt with a number of details which are to be found in the motion for resolution. Our group fully supports this resolution. I have to tell you that my group will be pleased to approve Mr Broeks's motion for a resolution, and that we thank the rapporteur for his excellent work and hope that Mr Scarascia Mugnozza will respond very positively to the wishes related to the aspects which I have dealt with today.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Seefeld.** — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, information is extremely important in our lives. Hardly anyone would dispute the necessity for giving information. This of course also means that a parliament like ours and institutions such as the Commission and the Council must develop an information policy.

We all know that Europe is extremely complicated. We also know how difficult the machinery is in Europe. If we have difficulty in understanding this or that, how difficult it must be for our fellow-citizens in Europe to understand what is happening and why this or that can only be accomplished in one way and not in another.

The fact is that a good information policy very much depends on the results achieved with the policy. Where there is no policy, no-one can expect magnificent information to be disseminated. In other words, anyone wanting to pursue a better information policy presupposes that the results on which he wishes to disseminate information are such that it is worth informing the citizens of Europe on them.

Mr Broeks has submitted a report on behalf of the committee responsible. On behalf of my group I should like to thank him for his work. I do not intend to go into every item included in the motion for a resolution because some Members have already done so and others will do so after me. All I want to do is underline, criticize and comment on a few aspects.

The reason why I first wish to spend a few minutes—not, of course, as long as yesterday—on youth questions has to do with the fact that part of the Community's information policy is directed at this group. One basis for an appraisal of the information policy of the European Community must be point 16 of the communiqué issued at The Hague Summit Conference in September 1969, which—and this is a subject which we have discussed in detail on several occasions—calls for the close association of the younger generation in all the creative activities and actions conducive to European growth.

The communiqué goes on to say that the Communities will make provision for this. In his speech before our Parliament on 13 February 1973 President Ortolí called for the direct or indirect participation of the people in the construction of Europe and again referred in particular to the younger generation.

If we now ask what practical results the instructions given by the Heads of State or Government in December 1969 have produced, the answer is rather disappointing. Apart from the proposals for the setting up of a Youth Advisory Committee, which we discussed yesterday and

**Seefeld**

which I do not want to go into further, almost nothing positive has emerged. But the Commission does not bear the sole responsibility for that, as we have said.

As far as I know—and I am now referring directly to the subject under discussion—only the Bonn information office has taken action to inform young people systematically by regularly publishing information on Europe. I would like this to be noted and would add that it would be a good thing for such information specifically aimed at young people to be published by the offices in the other Member States of the Community or centrally by the relevant directorate-general.

There continues to be considerable interest among young people, and above all in the press catering for them, in what is going on in European politics. The fact that this sector of the press has hitherto only very rarely reported on European events is simply due to the lack of the necessary material. Magazines and information services catering for young people do not have the money either for their own correspondents in Brussels or to subscribe to the expensive services of news agencies. They are therefore particularly dependent in their work on support given by a Community information service.

Mr President, the Commission announced several years ago a major campaign involving the publication of a special brochure for young people to be distributed in large numbers to school leavers. This came to nothing. I ask myself and you why not. It would really have been a very positive step towards gaining the interest of young people in the construction of Europe and of associating them with this work in the long term. As it is, the impression has not unreasonably arisen that the information policy of the Directorate-General for Information continues to be exclusively restricted to the youth organizations, universities and secondary schools. This means that the Commission is giving preference to the very people who, compared with the broad masses of early school-leavers and apprentices, are in any case in a privileged position because of their education and the possibilities open to them for obtaining information. Point 37 of the 1974/1075 information programme unfortunately confirms this privileged position.

In this connection, honourable Members, it would appear necessary for the funds spent on information given at secondary school and funds spent on information for workers to be looked into and put in proper proportion. It is simply not acceptable for some press officers in the Community to spend well over 50% of their

funds on information for students, professors and university staff, while paying little or no attention to the broad masses of the working population. In almost all the countries of our Community there are organizations designed to publish information for secondary schools and having at their disposal large sums of money. For information specifically intended for workers however, the national offices have had nothing or almost nothing. So stark a disproportion is no longer acceptable. It surely cannot be the task of the information services of the Community to support the research work of university institutes.

As regards information intended for workers, the only useful work I know of is being done at the Bonn information office, though I admit I may not have all the relevant information. This office has organized 20 week-end seminars for young workers so far this year. In addition, preparations are being made for a publication aimed specifically at workers and in particular young workers.

Mr President, the information policy of the European Community must in the view of my colleagues be concentrated on direct information to a greater extent than at present. Direct means that it must be aimed at the man in the street. The Community institutions must stop restricting their information policy, as has long been the case, exclusively to information-disseminating organizations, associations, and leading personalities of various groups.

Information should, as I have tried to indicate, be spread wider and have a greater impact on the people. Inherently connected with this is the necessity for information to be disseminated directly by the relevant Community institutions. This again means that information should no longer be given almost exclusively through information organizations and associations.

Honorable Members, information policy cannot merely consist in the granting of subsidies. I do not mean by this that I find the financial support of certain activities of individual organizations unnecessary. Of paramount importance, however, should be direct information given by the Commission itself. This is the only way in the long term in which the people can get to know and later identify with the Community in which we live and with its institutions.

The target groups given priority in the information programme, such as trade unions, the youth and teachers, are in fact groups to which the information policy should pay particular attention. However, such factors as I have just tried to describe should also be considered.

**Seefeld**

The term 'information for trade unions' seems to me somewhat too restricted in that all workers should be better informed. Perhaps, therefore, the term 'information for workers' would be preferable. I am not sure that the trade unions will continue to play the priority role in informing workers that they play now. The term 'information for trade unions', however, appears in itself somewhat too restricted, and the Division for Information to Trade Unions of the Directorate-General for Information should take greater account of this than hitherto.

In this connection, I would repeat that funds should be made available to the various external offices of the central office for such worker information.

A particularly sad chapter of the information policy, it would seem to me, are the brochures. Apart from the failures with the youth brochure, it is noted that the Commission has still not succeeded in submitting good publications regularly and when needed. Again and again we have periods when no general brochures on the Community are available.

In this connection the question should also be asked as to why after more than 1 year the position of head of the Division for Publications is still vacant.

Generally speaking, the impression cannot sometimes be escaped that hierarchical structures and cumbersome administrative procedures are not exactly conducive to an up-to-date and generally understandable information policy. It would seem to me that the reorganization of the Directorate-General for Information carried out at the beginning of 1973 has not as yet produced any results worthy of note, which means that the information policy, despite welcome impulses, has not been substantially improved. Mr President, I therefore appeal for fewer administrative procedures and fewer subsidies, less bureaucracy in the information policy and, instead, greater flexibility. I should like to see good team work and the various publications being right up to date and more readable, and, if possible, a more journalistic touch.

In addition to information for young people, trade unions and teachers, information for consumers is particularly important, especially as the Commission recently submitted its provisional programme for consumer information and protection. Here again what I said just now and what I will now say again applies, namely that information should not be exclusively limited to a small number of disseminators; thought should also be given to the need for information for 260 million consumers on what

is being done about consumer policy in Brussels and here, on what there is and on the extent to which the Community has produced benefits for the consumer.

Only if this is done can we overcome the growing suspicion of large sections of the population of what 'those people in Brussels', as they are generally known, are doing. Here again the widely held view that the Community has so far brought its citizens many disadvantages and few advantages must be countered. This view is widely held in my country in particular.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I feel I must also mention the efforts being made by some Member States to have national governments or their press officers put exclusively in charge of information on the European Community disseminated within each Member State in the future. The argument advanced is that the interests of the national governments and of the Community are identical. We Members of the European Parliament should as a group emphatically oppose such intentions. It is simply not acceptable for information policy to be renationalized. The European Parliament must resist any attempt to limit the joint information service to informing third countries and to European information within the European Community and any attempt to put the national governments exclusively in charge of European information within the European Community.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this and a number of other points should be noted. In particular I should like to ask the Commission how it views the reorganization of its information offices and their cooperation with the Spokesman's Group and what improvements there have been. As you see, there are many points to be mentioned, and perhaps other Members will go into them.

Finally, I should like to thank the rapporteur once again and to say that the Socialist Group will vote in favour of this report.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Helveg Petersen to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group.

**Mr Helveg Petersen.** — *(DK)* Mr President, on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group I should like to begin by thanking the rapporteur, Mr Broeksz, for his excellent work.

A number of speakers have already said—and this is also mentioned in the report—that the prerequisite for a sound information policy is that there should be something to provide information about, something valuable to communicate. And this is a matter which deserves

**Petersen**

a great deal of attention when discussing the effects of the information policy which is pursued.

Youth was on the agenda yesterday and has also been mentioned today as being an essential factor when discussing information. The truth is, however, that many young people regard the Community as an immense bureaucracy with which they do not really identify and in which they find it hard to discover any motivating ideals. Everything which concerns its economics is important—that is quite true—but it is not easy for young people to take an interest in that. This is one of the obstacles which we must take into consideration.

Time and again here in the Assembly we have dealt with the difficulties connected with information policy. It has been extremely difficult to determine its actual impact.

The last time the question was raised was at a symposium held in Luxembourg, at which there were discussions between parliamentarians and political scientists. One of the topics was the relationship between parliaments—not only the European Parliament but also the national parliaments—and the public, and one of the conclusions reached was that it was very hard to put anything across through the media unless it was dramatic and clear-cut. Personal experience at home also shows us that most of the information given out by the mass media, especially the television, is concerned with clear-cut situations, whilst day-to-day work is hardly mentioned. Furthermore, the information given by the mass media often jumps from topic to topic, is incoherent and fragmented, so it is very hard for the public to form a sound opinion of what is going on.

I should also like to mention, Mr President, that often proposals and ideas are confused with decisions that have been taken. How often we read in the newspapers of ideas and proposals which are being considered by one or other of the institutions and which are presented as something which is already decided, and so discussions are based on completely erroneous premises. Thus discussions and arguments often become quite absurd.

Where the mass media are concerned, it is evident that the European Parliament and the national parliaments can achieve very little. We must simply keep the problem in mind and try to do everything possible.

The Commission has submitted a whole series of proposals, and this is emphasized in the report drawn up by Mr Broeks. We must welcome the fact that the Commission wishes to establish priorities taking into account the groups with

which special contact is desired. This is worthwhile.

I should like to point out how important it is to study the impact of information on various groups. I believe that it would be extremely useful to find out just what effect the material distributed actually has; for we are perhaps a little over-confident as regards the effects of material distributed to the public. On this matter I should like to say that, for my part, I have no doubt at all that we must lay far greater stress on establishing a dialogue. We must lay far more stress on seminars and meetings where people who want to find out about something can meet others able to answer their questions—but also offer an opportunity to put forward criticisms so that there can be genuine two-way communication. People are bound to be unwilling to have information foisted upon them when they have no opportunity to argue.

I should perhaps mention, Mr President, that in Denmark before the 1972 plebiscite we had a fairly drawn out information campaign during which we stressed the fact that people could get together to ask experts questions and put forward their views. I believe that about 500 000 people took part in meetings of this sort, and I am convinced that if we are really to solve the problem, we should lay much more weight on two-way communication and determine the appropriate forms for it to take. There has been some attempt to do this in Parliament here and in Luxembourg. There are groups who travel about in order to obtain information—but there are too few, especially where youth questions are concerned. We must introduce completely different methods if we are to achieve something concrete. This does not mean that people should travel to Strasbourg or Luxembourg, but it means there must be an opportunity for such discussions throughout the Member States. This is not something for the European Parliament to deal with; the process must be instituted by national parliaments. However, the European Parliament can provide inspiration and of course also implement a number of measures itself.

Mention has been made of further education colleges and other educational institutions. It is very important that material should be produced which can be integrated coherently and naturally into educational courses, which means that there must be contact with the teaching profession, in order to determine together what methods should be used and how the publications concerned should be written.

I shall not go into the numerous details in depth, but I would like to say that we expect a great

**Petersen**

deal of useful information and good ideas to emerge.

There is, however, one thing that I should like to point out to the Commission, and that is that we must get away from conventional attitudes. I have expressed a number of viewpoints, and we must remain open to new solutions. We must examine the effects of what is done in order to make the necessary improvements.

Mr President, information policy is a very important aspect of our work. It is more or less crucial. Without information and communication which is genuinely wide-ranging and thorough, we will not be able to have any further and open discussions, which after all are a prerequisite for participation by the people in the work carried out by the Community.

I would like to thank the rapporteur again for his report and I hope that it will help us to take a major step forward in this sector.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Lady Elles to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Lady Elles.** — On behalf of the European Conservative Group, I welcome this report on the information policy of the European Commission and congratulate Mr Broeks on his illuminating and comprehensive introduction and presentation of the motion for a resolution.

I will not go into detail because a great deal of ground has already been covered. I should like to make a few points which do not appear to have been mentioned. That does not mean that I do not concur in what has been said by others on this item.

We must realize immediately the difference between, on the one hand, information policy, which, as I see it, deals with matters in the short term, both day-to-day matters and the attitudes of people over a given period, and, on the other hand, education and cultural policy, which deals in the long term with educating and instructing youth and other groups throughout the Community on the culture and civilization of Europe. We must appreciate that the two follow quite distinct patterns and must be seen with different attitudes, using different methods.

In paragraphs 4 and 5 considerable emphasis is laid on youth. I agree that young people are interested in new ideas and are ready to have their minds stimulated and encouraged to consider European problems and so forth. But we should not forget that other sections of the population must be catered for.

We must be realistic. A large proportion of electors in Western Europe, particularly within

the Member States, are not young people. On the contrary, they seem largely to be over 65. These are the large majority who comprise the electors of national parliaments and form a considerable part of opinion polls, the results of which influence others on pro- and anti-European attitudes. Therefore, while recognizing the essential requirement that youth should have the opportunity to learn, to exchange ideas, and so forth, we must not neglect other sections of the population.

In this connection I would single out the voluntary organizations throughout the Community. A considerable number of these organizations deal with special interests—and not only those whose sole and primary aim has been to promote European unity. One such organization, of which I have the honour to be international chairman, is the European Union of Women, which was formed over 20 years ago with the aim of fostering European unity and understanding.

These organizations should be used as spearheads throughout the Community to propagate the European idea, thereby interesting people at all levels in the European idea. I am not just asking for money, though of course financial aid is very useful. I am asking also for documentary support and the other kinds of support that we need in organizing and briefing meetings and getting round the country. Considerable use could be made not only of these voluntary organizations specifically geared to European problems but also of other interest groups such as Chambers of Commerce, groups of housewives, municipalities and so on.

The information should be geared much more to specific areas and communities because farmers will always understand the farmers of another country much more easily than the farmers of one country will understand philosophers and professors of the same country. On this basis we should encourage information resources to be made available to people in similar occupations.

Thirdly there should be much more study of the anti-Market propaganda—and I mention this in view of our position in the United Kingdom—which is being spread throughout Member States, and in particular among the new adherents to the Communities. Anti-Common Market propaganda of this kind falls on ears which are ignorant, perforce because they have not been informed or are prejudiced through long tradition and fear for the future. Sometimes this involves false rumours and misrepresentation.

If we are to present realistic information through the Community services, such attacks

**Lady Elles**

on the Community should be answered clearly, if possible before the attacks are made; because we know that defence after attack is the worst form of defence. If we are to defend ourselves we have to take action first and to put forward the case for the Communities before propaganda against it can be used.

What method should be used for this kind of information? There is some emphasis on video-cassettes, but, let us be honest, we buy only those video-cassettes in which we are interested. If I like Beethoven I will buy a cassette which plays Beethoven. In the same way, I will not buy a pro-Market cassette or one on European civilization if I do not like the idea of Europe. What is much more important and what makes far greater impact is the visual aspect, the publication of drawings, graphs and films, for example. It is the visual impact which eventually reaches the audience.

We should use the methods that are used by the critics of the Common Market in their propaganda attacks on our progress in Europe—the daily press, films and television, the kind of mass media used by everybody—rather than emphasize the specialist type of media. Very few of the documents published by the information services are written in a language comprehensible to the ordinary man or woman. In the Communities, and certainly in all the institutions of the Communities, we have grown used to speaking in a kind of shorthand. This is very convenient for us. It speeds things up when we use certain terminology, which some of us try to understand, but it is absolutely incomprehensible to people outside the institutions who are not dealing with such matters from day to day. I plead with the institutions to ensure that publications are written in a way that makes them understandable to the ordinary man, if such a person exists, and readable; otherwise the information offices throughout the Member States and the Communities will continue to be full of unread and unreadable documentation.

Again, it is no use expecting the ordinary people, the 250 million people of the Communities, to take an interest in the political wrangles going on within the institutions. Why do we not have, for instance, wide circulation of information about the policies of the Commission? Why do we not publish documents such as are published in the United Kingdom, documents which we call Green Papers, containing policy programmes? These are not legislation but documents open to discussion by the public. They set out the kind of programmes envisaged by our national legislature. This type of document should be produced by the Commission for discussion by the public. Only through discus-

sion, conflicting views and interest can we expect the people within the Communities to realize what is being done.

How many people outside the institutions know about the Social Action Programme? If we analyse it, we find that it is an extremely interesting and dynamic programme, but no-one knows about it. It is written about, perhaps, in a back-page column of a national newspaper but that does not show that it deals with individuals, which is in fact what it does. I suggest, therefore, that much more attention should be paid to the presentation of these programmes as a basis for discussion, particularly on matters which we all know to be of general interest to the public.

We in this Parliament have probably heard *ad nauseam* about the environment, transport and consumer problems, but those involved, who actually suffer the consequences of legislation, either from the Communities or from their national parliament, are completely unaware of what is happening. Here again, information should be given, because information is of no use unless it is communicated. What is important, too, is what is communicated, how it is communicated and to whom—and its style. We must remember that the ideals for which we have all worked will remain unfulfilled unless we try to project our vision so that it is understood and appreciated by all the people of the Communities. Idealism and dynamism are either regressive or progressive. In order to ensure that it is progressive dynamism, we must apply the stimulus that is necessary to interest people in what we are doing, what the Commission is doing and what our hopes are for the future of our people.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr John Hill.

**Mr John Hill.** — Mr President, I thought that it would be inappropriate if no back-bencher were to welcome Mr Broeks's report and to congratulate him on adding the duties of rapporteur to the heavy burdens he has been carrying as chairman of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth and—as I would like the title to be altered—'Information and Education'. It is very unsatisfactory that a committee dealing with the very important subjects of information and education should not carry those words in its title. I hope that we can get an amendment, by whatever authority is appropriate, to the title for future part-sessions.

I think that we all realize that 1974 is a year of reorganization of the information services,



**Hill**

so that it will be easier to judge success at a later time. My impression is that the services, at any rate in my country, are already much improved. I hope that the trend will continue.

There is the primary difficulty, which the information services as much as any of us politicians face, of getting anything across to the general public, especially while the Community and the Member States are going through a critical economic phase. It is always much easier when there is a flow of good tidings, but, just as a farmer who in a bad year cannot expect to make good hay out of poor grass, nevertheless has to make hay as best he can, so information policy must be no less active in difficult times.

I join my colleague Lady Elles in stressing the importance of immediately remedying ignorance and rebutting ill-founded criticisms. On the subject of ignorance, what proportion of the citizens in our respective countries do we think could even name the nine Member States of the Community? The measure of ignorance is the measure of the effort still to be made. We must answer destructive criticism. There is, as Lady Elles and others have said, a highly developed anti-Community campaign in several states, especially in the United Kingdom, and the Community is often used as a scapegoat for irrelevant criticisms, which are very often difficult to refute because they are emotional and narrowly nationalistic. Yet it is essential for the information services in each Member State to shape their vindication of the Community's policy and character to meet the special criticisms in each country.

I recognize that some critics—there are a fair number of politicians among them—have made a new career out of opposition to the Community, and in doing so they have acquired considerable detailed knowledge of the articles of the Treaty and are in a position regularly to quote them, like the scriptures, to their own purposes, often based on highly selective statistics and information which it is not easy for the average supporter of the Community to rebut in detail.

I therefore urge that the information services give special attention to meeting these specious arguments and getting the detailed answers right, with particular reference to the lines of criticism being run in the different Member States. I hope that they can go on pointing the advantages to Member States that are already flowing from EEC membership.

Despite all the present obstacles to progress there is basically a good story to tell—all variation on the theme that a Europe moving towards

unity is infinitely to be preferred to one on the road to disintegration. However, this needs continuous explanation and illustration in simple terms, in popular language, of what is happening. There is the problem of presenting information that is already available but buried, for example, in the written answers to questions put by Parliament. Therefore we need information that is speedy and up to date, as Member after Member has emphasized.

An obvious example of where speed is desirable concerns our debates yesterday, which Mr Seefeld mentioned. I hope that the Commission can explain the proposals that Parliament approved yesterday for a youth forum, stressing the positive opportunities offered, because I am sure that otherwise the field will be left to the many vocal critics who invariably react against anything positive that is done.

In this connection, although it is more a matter for our parliamentary procedures, it would have been enormously helpful if a single-language report of yesterday's proceedings had already been available instead of at some as yet unknown, but promised date in the future.

I turn next to another small point. Where we have good publications—and I instance in my own country 'The Common Market and the Common Man'—it is important to keep them up to date. Their ability to convince is often based on the statistics that they are carrying, and a stale statistic is worse than stale bread: one cannot do anything with it, and it implies a lack of interest in the provider and invites a lack of interest in the receiver. I therefore hope that on these key public documents we can accept the expense of annual updating rather than on the lines of year books.

Then again—and this may be done, but they do not come to me—we could circulate lists of what is available. Too often excellent publications are lying on someone's shelves or in store.

I am glad the rapporteur in paragraph 7 added consumers to his list of priority target audiences, because all consumers are voters and all voters are consumers, which is not the case with trade unionists, youth, teachers and politicians, however important they may be for priority treatment.

I wish to say a short word on education. Clearly it is desirable that teachers' materials and courses should be interesting, inexpensive and geared to the particular character and needs of individual Member States. However, I should like to know how much those materials are actually being used in the classrooms.

**Hill**

As to adult education, again this is important at two levels, the popular course and the more specialized course. In this connection, I assume that the Commission has helped our own Open University, which, inaugurated last winter, offers among a series of part-time courses on special interests lasting about six or eight weeks, a course on the European Economic Community. I do not know how that turned out, but I hope the Commission will at some time tell us whether that technique has proved effective and whether it can be used elsewhere in the Community.

Just as we need to add a European dimension to national educational systems, so I believe it should be given progressively growing emphasis in the mass media, but this can come about and succeed only if it is intrinsically strong and interesting enough to evoke a response from viewer, listener and reader.

I personally remain hopeful that the television and broadcasting authorities in the different states will come round to the view that the theme of Europe as expressed in entertainment, culture and political terms is well worth projecting to mass national audiences. There is plenty of evidence that European programmes on popular culture and sport attract audiences of millions. I hope we can build outwards from that, not in grandiose terms but, if possible, in personalized terms, which all experience shows to be more intelligible and attractive to individuals and families.

This is a challenge to us all, but especially to those working in the Community information services. They have a vital role to play in stimulating thought and innovation within the communications industry in each Member State. I am sure that we wish for, as we certainly need, success in this endeavour.

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

**Mr Hunault.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at a time when the Community is faced with serious problems, the Commission has recognized the need to involve the people of Europe in the construction of the Community, and to persuade the public to take an interest and participate in European integration.

We can only welcome such a proposal. Information is a necessary prerequisite for action. This is the essence of what the Commission proposes in its programme, which is aimed at two-fold action at Community and non-Community level.

After considering the Commission's information programme and Mr Broeks's excellent report, I feel that three comments are necessary. First of all, the Commission states that the audience for which the programme is designed consists mainly of trade unions, young people, teachers and political circles.

As regards youth, speedy positive action is already possible as a result of the Commission's recommendations to the Council on the decision setting up a Committee on Youth Questions and a Youth Advisory Committee.

It is surprising that the Commission has not included consumers in its list. However, it should be remembered that during the last part-session in Luxembourg, we congratulated it for its proposal on a preliminary EEC programme for consumer information and protection.

As regards information, that programme will certainly make use of the one we are considering at present for better dissemination of the necessary information.

Moreover, the time is already past when information was restricted simply to helping the consumer choose between quality products and different prices. Nowadays a consumer programme should also, for example, give information on the procedure governing the decisions of the management of the company before a product is launched and its price is determined.

The weekly magazine 'Industrie et Société' is at present running a very interesting series on what television is doing on behalf of consumers in the Member States. This study will enable the Commission to decide what methods are most appropriate to ensuring better provision of information within the Community.

A second comment relates to public interest in Europe. The 1973 opinion poll on the European Community shows that attitudes towards the Common Market and European unity varied depending on the following seven factors: education, sex, income of the head of the family, identification with a political party, age, affiliation to a trade union and profession of the head of the family, the two decisive factors being education and sex.

This analysis shows that people who have continued their studies beyond secondary school level say that they are more interested in Community problems, read press articles on the Community more regularly, prefer to have more critical and exhaustive articles, are more frequently in favour of a European government to deal with the problems of environmental pollution, are less afraid that the various nations will lose their cultures and their individuality in a united Europe, are in favour of the Common

**Hunault**

Market developing towards political union and election to the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage, and believe that progress towards the unification of Europe should be speeded up. It should be noted that women are less preoccupied with detail than men, prefer television broadcasts on the Community to articles in newspapers and that in all countries, except France, both men and women prefer brief news items to detailed reports and articles. The two variables, income and identification with a political party, are not decisive, except in France, nor is membership of a trade union, except in Ireland.

It should be noted that young people do not take much interest in Europe, but those who do are slightly more in favour of unification than their elders.

The opinion poll shows that these attitudes towards Europe can be attributed more to the individual's impression of society as a whole and of Europe in the making, his psychological characteristics, and the system of values which he uses as a reference point, either consciously or not, than to objective social situations and immediately observable sociological characteristics.

The Commission should therefore enable the individual to make assessments and form opinions on the basis of information which is accurate, objective and understandable by everyone, which implies not only that an effort should be made to publicize current major problems, but also that information should be provided on a permanent basis with a view to developing the role of scientific journalism as a means of reaching the public.

The Member States should take practical steps to improve mass media education and access to sources.

Our third and last comment relates to the dissemination of information. We believe it necessary to reinforce the links between the Commission, as the source of information, and the recipient Member States.

Stress should be laid on the role which information officers are called upon to play. They should not restrict themselves to the dissemination of information received but should also act as a source of information for the Commission so that a two-way system can be established which will make it possible to tackle problems more effectively.

In the same way we believe that, in order that full information may be disseminated, the Commission should be in close contact with the Council and the European Parliament. When the Commission makes a proposal for action to

the Council in a given field and this is submitted to Parliament for its opinion, coordination should be established between the three institutions so that the public can be informed of the decisions taken.

It is by telling the people of Europe what is happening and encouraging them to participate in the construction of Europe that we shall stimulate their interest in the Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have listened with great interest to the debate today on the Community's information programme and I wish to express our warm gratitude to Mr Broeks in his dual capacity as chairman of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth and rapporteur: as chairman of the committee, because I and my colleagues have been able to see the efforts he has made this year to enable the committee's work to proceed under the best possible conditions, and as rapporteur because I greatly appreciated the vigour with which he approached the subject and, through the motion for a resolution adopted by his committee, indicated the basic elements which the committee considers should be the future guidelines for information policy.

As you will remember—and as I have stated several times to the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth—at the end of 1973 we attempted to give Community information a new directive by attempting to work out a programme which—while only covering one year in terms of budget commitments—nevertheless provides measures extending over the two years 1974-75.

It is against this background that we have fixed our aims, provided for reorganization and established priorities. These priorities are not understood as exclusive directions for Community information but as decisive elements on which to base that information.

I was therefore a little surprised to hear some speakers criticize the fact that these priorities did not include consumer information.

In this connection I fully agree with Mr John Hill, who said that it was certainly impossible to give priority to all the sectors without creating a situation in which work would no longer be feasible.

Moreover, as I have already pointed out, the Commission has put forward a programme for consumer information. Parliament has already

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

approved this programme and the Council should in turn adopt it before the end of the summer; that programme deals with the problem some of you would like solved today.

However, quite apart from this general observation and in order to show that consumers have certainly not been forgotten, I would add that in the context of measures—as I have already told Parliament—to give the Community a human face, to keep the citizens informed of the actions being taken in their interests and to receive their own suggestions through a system of information, we have in fact been intensely active, without this matter being specifically included among the priorities set.

I must say I was rather perplexed when some Members spoke ironically in a committee of Parliament: I told the Committee on Public Health and Youth and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs that, with a view to informing consumers, we had begun to open a series of contacts with all the leading daily papers and women's weeklies, and I heard ironic retorts from various Members of Parliament suggesting that women's weeklies had no influence in the consumer sector.

Nevertheless, we have begun our work. We have invited not only the editors of women's weeklies but also the editors of all the major national newspapers interested in this problem to contact the Commission's services, thus beginning to establish a form of cooperation which we believe may be fruitful; all this has been done without the problem of consumers being included among the priorities because if we had been concerned above all to respect the priorities, our efforts would have been concentrated on those areas of public opinion likely to present an interest from the political angle. That is why we have dealt with questions of youth, trade unions and teachers; that is also why we have spoken of political forces.

Several speakers have said today that the present situation of the Community creates difficulties in the area of information because when the news is not good, it becomes harder to publish it. I would certainly not deny this principle because I remember having stated it myself last year in Parliament. But I must recognize that while it contains an element of truth, the experience we have been gaining in recent months in the Commission shows that it is not only necessary to have good news to 'give' but also to be in a position to give all the news which the Community possesses. There have been many examples of this: the latest was provided by the measures adopted by Italy, which were certainly not good news for Europe but required nevertheless a great mass of infor-

mation for all the Community countries reflecting the keen interest of public opinion in gaining information and the vital need for us to meet this massive demand for information. Let me quote just one problem, that of meat and the difficulty of ensuring supplies of that product in the European Community. Following requests to our information offices, an immense amount of work was necessary to provide information on this particular item.

Therefore, while it is true that the Community must be in a position to publish the good news well and show what progress is being made, it is equally true that at times of crisis and also at times when everything is normal, the Community must be able to confront all the information problems with the maximum vigour and objectivity. That is the reason why through the detailed work we have been carrying out since the beginning of this year, we are seeking to improve the sources of information and also to improve the flow of information to third countries. Members of this House will certainly remember what was said last year, namely that in dealing with this two-year information programme, I considered that the first year, 1974, should be a year for adaptation of the structures and ideas with a view to setting off again from a more solid basis in 1975. This process of adaptation is now underway and it is not simply an inward-looking process involving 'selling' the idea to our colleagues in Brussels; on the contrary we are also summoning all the heads of our information offices and establishing wider contacts with all sectors of public opinion.

We have reached the conclusion that if information is to be satisfactory it must be decentralized; this means that Brussels must define as far as possible objective criteria for information provided by the offices located in the capitals to meet the requirements of the countries and populations for which it is intended.

Clearly citizens of Italy, France, Belgium or the United Kingdom require news presented in different ways and also differing news as a function of their varying interests in regard to the European Community.

The criticism which the Community may arouse or the support which may be given to some of its actions suggest that information must be diversified and—to be diversified—it must be decentralized. This means that the offices in the capitals (giving information referring to the Community countries) must adapt their structures to the respective requirements, and their principal requirement is to reach the largest possible number of citizens using all available media. We do not propose to confine ourselves to specialized interest groups but seek instead

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

to reach some 80 % of the whole population, to gain the interest of our citizens and—as has been requested here and was already included among our aims—to receive in our turn information representing the criticisms raised by public opinion which will allow the Community to improve its actions and strategy.

Following the decentralization and in view of the work done outside in this way, we have concluded that the directorate-general must no longer ask for the structures of the information offices to be aligned with its own structure in Brussels but on the contrary must adapt its structures to those of the peripheral offices. This is the only way of ensuring that an effective flow of information will go out regularly from Brussels to the peripheral offices and then return to Brussels in the shape of fruitful criticism and comment.

Referring to the various priorities, Mr Seefeld made two comments: the first related to youth and the second to information for workers. As regards youth we are trying to make the greatest possible effort. I consider this effort essential but see a link between the problem of informing youth and that of informing teachers since a connection must be established between these two important groups of European citizens.

As to the information of workers, we have preferred to speak of union information although we know that not all workers in the Community belong to unions; but we need a term of reference and I can tell you, Mr Seefeld, that union information is functioning very well and your concern that young workers may be excluded from the information flow simply because genuine information action for their benefit has not been initiated may, I believe, be irrelevant since, in the context of union information, we are placing great emphasis, not only by providing documentation but also by giving material aid, on union schools operated by each of the major union central organizations in the countries, and work of great interest is underway here in agreement with our offices in the capitals.

Mr President, having said that, I would repeat that our concern is to reach the largest possible number of citizens in the European Community. For this purpose an effort must be made through not only specialized journals and the ordinary press but also the radio and television. I believe that Members of this Parliament are aware of the difficulty of this task for a number of reasons which certainly will not escape them. I would also remind you that we are making a real effort to improve our publications, even if a number of matters give rise to concern here

especially as regards the possibility of information reaching its destination as quickly as possible. Lady Elles, Mr John Hill and others have spoken on this point.

It must also be said that we have done a good deal to unify the Commission's departments. The Spokesmen's Group and the Directorate-General for Information are working in close cooperation; we have also established extremely close relations between the private offices of the individual Commission members so that for each sector of information, indeed for each item of news, there is a specialized working group ready to give the news at the most appropriate time and, Lady Elles, in the most readable and clear manner; for my part I am able to supply, when requested to do so by the offices in the capitals, additional answers to questions put by journalists. For this reason we need to widen our means of contact with the offices in the capitals and, with this aim in view, we are examining the possibility of creating direct telex links between Brussels and the offices in the capitals and in some cases, such as Italy or England, 'diplomatic bags' to move documents; where possible telephone relays will also be set up to ensure that lines are free and available at any time.

I have outlined our working methods. I would also add that we have adopted the custom of meeting the heads of the different departments in the Directorate-General for Information once a month in Brussels, as the heads of the information offices in the capitals work on the assumption that only the constant possibility of meeting and exchanging views can make for greater efficiency of their work. My personal impression is that we are making good progress here and that in the next few months it will be possible to lay down new and positive targets. So far, Mr President, I have spoken of direct information within the Community, which appeared to me the main point stressed by Members of this House. I should like to add, however, that our efforts in regard to information directed to countries outside the Community are being increased.

Our contacts with the United States have made good headway, and I am happy to inform Parliament that during my recent visit to Washington I found great interest in all quarters in the programme of scholarships which has already been implemented thanks to the intervention of Parliament following the Schuijt initiative and will enable the first exchanges to be organized with the United States this year. I would also add that the office in Ankara will be opened shortly and that we have solved the legal and political difficulties which had

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

arisen with Tokyo; it should therefore be possible to open our information offices in that city at an early date. We also hope to establish an information office in Canada.

In conclusion I wish to assure the European Parliament that we are working with enthusiasm and commitment: all my officials in Brussels, in the European capitals and elsewhere are perfectly aware of the importance of their work. We therefore hope that, despite the objective difficulties and lack of resources which are frequently encountered, our work may help to make Europe better known and appreciated.

(Applause)

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

11. *Adaptation to technical progress of directives on protection and improvement of the environment — Recommendation on cost allocations and action by public authorities on environmental matters*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on the report drawn up by Mr Willi Müller on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a resolution on the adaptation to technical progress of directives on the protection and improvement of the environment (Doc. 101/74) and the report drawn up by Mr Jarrot on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Member States regarding cost allocations and action by public authorities on environmental matters (Doc. 114/74).

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

**Mr Willi Müller, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am sure of your approval when I say that in line with the subject of my report I will be kind to my environment with this presentation. In other words, I shall be very brief and concise in my statements as rapporteur.

What is this proposal about? It is about a number of technical arrangements that will have

to be made to implement the European Community's environmental action programme. In the Commission's view this should be done by a committee of experts, by an *ad hoc* procedure. The Committee on Public Health and the Environment, the committee responsible, approves this proposal by the Commission. It supports this effort but feels that the working methods of the committees of experts should be governed not by the Commission's proposals but by the amendments proposed by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment and unanimously agreed by its members.

Through its representative, the Commission has stated in committee that it agrees with these amendments.

On the question as to why the committee has made these amendments, I should like to point out that a similar procedure was adopted as long ago as 1969, when it was a question of eliminating obstacles to trade and the movement of goods. We wanted in this way to ensure that the Commission retained its full responsibility and did not delegate rights to a level over which there was no longer any control.

Mr President, these were the thoughts that led to the final version of the report, but I should like to add a brief personal comment. The cover page states that the report concerns the adaptation to technical progress of directives on the protection and improvement of the environment. What we discussed in committee was what constituted the criteria for technical progress. Opinions vary on this subject in the Member States of the Community, as they do in my country. In the Federal Republic a distinction is made between requirements resulting from the present state of scientific knowledge or research and requirements that are to be incorporated after all the necessary testing has been carried out. I would link this description with the personal request to the Commission to devote special attention to this aspect. In its discussions the committee considered reverting to this matter in the foreseeable future and asking the Commission to give precise and clear comments and to create the conditions for preventing misinterpretations.

Mr President, that completes my remarks as rapporteur. I have already emphasized that the motion for a resolution in the form before you is based on a decision unanimously taken by the committee.

I would recommended the House to approve the proposal.

(Applause)

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**President.** — I call Mr Della Briotta, deputizing for Mr Jarrot, who asked to present the other report.

**Mr Della Briotta, deputy rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, I shall present the report of my colleague Mr Jarrot, who has been called upon to take office in the government of his country. The document concerns implementation of the action programme for protection of the environment approved by the Council in 1973, which stipulated that by 31 January 1974 the Commission was to submit to the Council a proposal for the allocation of costs incurred in the control of pollution.

The Commission outlines in the form of recommendations the principles and procedure to be followed in allocating costs and for intervention by the public authorities. This solution may be summed up in the words 'the polluter must pay'.

We all agree on this principle but difficulties arise when it comes to its application. The distortion of competition which may be created by the application of this principle can be avoided only if we succeed in defining clearly what the costs are and how and to whom they are to be allocated.

As to the question 'What costs?' we find in the Commission's proposals the recommendation that the polluter is not only required to make good the damage for which he is responsible but also to repair all damage caused and to eliminate the causes of pollution. On the other hand the public authorities must bear the cost of constructing, acquiring and operating pollution control installations.

The Commission does not give a clear answer to the problem of the instruments which the public authorities may use to combat pollution. The document refers to two instruments, namely legal or administrative means, without stipulating when each of these is to be given preference. Since the costs an enterprise may have to meet to comply with legislation may well be higher than it incurs in applying administrative rules, this problem is certainly not irrelevant from the angle of distortion of competition.

In our opinion the main requirement is that legislation should be laid down by the Community even if it is not possible to overlook the differences between the individual regions. For example the legislation applicable to industrial areas will necessarily differ from that which applies in other areas.

It is, however, essential for this legislation to evolve in step with the progress of scientific

research, always bearing in mind the reality of the Community.

It may be considered that the 'polluter pays' principle cannot be directly applied to existing undertakings, since for many of these the requirement of complying with quality standards at an early date may be impossible to meet.

The opinion drawn up by Mr Notenboom on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs states that a measure of harmonization is also necessary in regard to the granting of aid and the duration of the transitional period in order to avoid distortions of competition.

Our committee also feels that the granting of credit is a more appropriate aid than tax facilities. Two exemptions from the 'polluter pays principle' may be admitted: when difficulties in applying the environmental quality standards are encountered mainly for economic, technical or social reasons and also when conflicts arise with other policies such as regional, social or research policy.

We have just spoken of the first exception. As to the second, we would refer to the opinion given by the European Parliament on Thursday, 10 February 1972 that Community regulations set out from the principle that the persons responsible for atmospheric pollution must bear the corresponding cost while the use of public funds must be confined to solving specific problems.

As regards the problems which arise in connection with the various points raised above, allow me to refer to the statement made by the representative of the Commission at the meeting of our committee on 24 May last at which, after recognizing that the problem dealt with in the draft recommendation is not yet sufficiently clear or precise to be made the subject of a directive, he promised that the Commission would be preparing directives on each of these points at the earliest possible date.

I would therefore stress that the Commission must forward to Parliament as soon as possible a calendar giving precise references to the individual areas. We shall then be able to give our agreement to the legal framework for its document, namely the recommendation which, within the meaning of Article 189 of the Treaty, is not binding.

As to paragraph 7 of the motion for a resolution requesting the Commission to take into consideration pollution which crosses Community frontiers, it is perhaps useful to refer to the Council's draft resolution on the Community

**Della Briotta**

action programme for protection of the environment (Doc. 62/73, page 7) which states that in the spirit of the declaration on the human environment issued on the occasion of the Stockholm conference, it is essential to make sure that activities pursued in one country do not cause a deterioration of the environment in another.

In short we agree to the 'polluter pays' principle.

I should like, however, to stress once again that both the quality standards and the methods of financing must be fixed by the Community.

In regard to the quality standards, the financing procedures, the question of subsidies, the duration of the transitional provisions and the question of exceptions, we expect the Commission to submit shortly a series of proposals on which our committee will present a detailed report; we hope that the Community programme for protection of the environment and in particular the application of the 'polluter pays' principle will then make real progress.

**President.** — I call Mr Notenboom.

**Mr Notenboom**, *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.* — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and as draftsman of their opinion I would like to make a number of observations on the proposal for a recommendation to Member States on cost allocations and action by public authorities on environmental matters, the subject on which Mr Della Briotta has just spoken.

The conclusions of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs could no longer be attached to the motion for a resolution of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment as the latter had already completed its report. I would therefore like to request the Vice-President of the Commission, on behalf of my committee, to take our conclusions into account in further work in this field.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs naturally studied this question from an economic point of view. I would like to point out first of all that there is a macro-economic view, which is based on the assumption that the price for environmental assets, in as far as they have become scarce, should be included in macro-economic calculations and that as far as possible the 'external effects' must also be included in the calculations of the economic agents.

This basic principle adopted by our committee is not new; it has been employed on previous occasions. The principle is that the Community

possesses a patrimony of environmental resources and that any form of damage to them causes social costs which must be taken into account.

This may result in a radical change in existing cost and price relations but in our opinion it is the only correct principle on which to base our new European environmental policy. It is better to take a correct principle from the outset and to allow digressive exceptions during the transitional period than to base policy on an inadequate foundation which would then have to be built up. The basic principle is: the polluter pays.

This, however, does not cover everything by any means. What has to be decided then is precisely which costs should be charged to the polluter and in which way this should be done. If it is not done properly the result may be distortion of competition. The avoidance of such distortion comes under industrial economy, the second aspect of these problems. Avoidance of distortion of competition resulting from government intervention by Member States has always been one of the primary objectives and fields of action of the EEC. It should therefore also be applied to this new sector of European policy.

Our committee has tried to distinguish four types of costs caused by environmental pollution, somewhat more clearly than in the Commission's document. We have been told by the Commission's representative that there is agreement on this.

First of all there are costs incurred in order to prevent or repair by technical means any damage to environmental resources; such means usually have to be employed to meet certain standards or as a result of certain levies. Secondly, there are the costs connected with the indemnification of third parties where pollution of the environment cannot be prevented. This is in fact not an allocation of costs but more a liability towards third parties. Here it is noted in passing that the Commission has disregarded the question of whether this principle should also be applied to trans-frontier pollution; there is not a single word on this question. Why is this so? Thirdly, there are the other calculable costs related to environmental policy, for example, the cost of research, of installations to measure pollution, supervision costs, expenditure on making the public environment-conscious, etc. Fourthly, there are the costs which cannot yet or can hardly be expressed in terms of money such as the destruction of the ecological balance, the disfigurement of the countryside, etc. This is a difficult category which is open to varying interpretation but we must make this distinction.



## Notenboom

The costs of the first, second and fourth category must be charged to the polluter. In this respect we agree with the proposal for a recommendation.

The third category of costs is however a different case. The Commission would like to see these costs met from public funds. Our committee wonders, however, whether this is necessary in every case. If these costs were to be met by a surcharge on levies this would seem quite reasonable to us. It would lighten the burden on public budgets and should therefore help to encourage a fair allocation of production factors.

Mr President, I have already stated that the basic principle is fairly rigid and radical.

This would be acting *fortiter in re*, but I would like to see the provisions enforced *sauviter in modo* during the early years of the transitional period, since rigid application of the basic principle may hinder the smooth running of the whole branch of industry or even the complete economy of a Member State or region. The Commission's proposal accepts this fact and therefore includes the transitional measures in which a distinction is made between old and new undertakings.

In what cases would there be justification for a more flexible system? The Commission is not clear on this point; but it does acknowledge the fact that it is very difficult to specify. However, further criteria must be evolved as rapidly as possible, as Mr Della Briotta has already pointed out. The form in which the public authorities make any concession to industry or a branch of industry is also very important. What is required here is digression of taxes leading to a system in which there would be no exceptions. In our view tax concessions for environmental investments should not be given such great importance. I do not exclude them, but they do not seem to us to be so important since it is less possible to direct them towards the place where they are required. Their effect is, generally speaking, too general. However, they exist in the Community and for this reason it is necessary for us to acknowledge them. There have been various calls in the past for a summary of tax concessions in the Community and I sincerely regret the fact that the Commission has not yet compiled such a summary. I would like to refer here, for instance, to questions which I put in the past and which were replied to in August 1972, i.e. almost 2 years ago. We were told at the time that the Commission was in the throes of compiling such a summary. It is regrettable that the list of existing exceptions are still not available to us.

One important problem is the question of whether to impose levies or standards. Which device shall we choose? In what way are the charges to be imposed on the polluter? Is this to be done by a physical regulation or perhaps also by financial regulations? From the point of view of possible distortion of competition it is quite important to know which instrument is preferred. In this respect too, many points will have to be worked out in greater detail since the country which has made most progress in this field—I am referring to the Federal Republic—is still far from deciding clearly which instruments are most desirable.

A word of warning about the so-called 'incentive levy'. This is a levy whose purpose is not to redistribute expenditure incurred but to restrain certain types of production. We shall doubtless need such a levy but it will frequently seem rather arbitrary and there is a large chance that mistakes will be made. If this is so such a levy must in my personal opinion not be enforced.

A further observation on the standards; in fact this is repeating a point. Our committee believes that these standards must in principle be applied throughout the Community—Mr Della Briotta put forward the same view on behalf of his committee—but this does not mean uniformly. These standards must be established on a basis which would give us a general impression of what is happening throughout the European Community but they must not be fixed identically for each geographical part of Europe. Various factors may influence them: density of population, the way in which land is used, the question of whether the area is agricultural or industrial, in brief all the points which Mr Della Briotta mentioned are points which we put forward too.

Finally I would like to underline another point made by the previous speaker. We consider a recommendation to be a rather inadequate solution. We would naturally rather have seen a directive but it is impossible to deny that ideas are still based largely on principles and have not yet been sufficiently worked out. This observation on the recommendation is not a reproach but a statement and we hope that, if this recommendation cannot be converted into a directive, it will be followed as soon as possible by a binding directive for the Member States.

We have set down our ideas in an annex to the report of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, and therefore not in the conventional form of paragraphs for the motion for a resolution. We did not consider this was the best way of doing things for the committee

**Notenboom**

responsible but we hope our views will be taken into account by the Commission in its work which will doubtless require much study, much experience and much time. We wish the Commission much success.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Noè to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Noè.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at the Luxembourg part-session we looked into standards for surface water intended for human consumption. Today we have before us two resolutions, one relating to the procedures for implementing the 'polluter pays' principle and the other concerning adaptation to technical progress made by the Member States.

In this way we are on the point of implementing in stages the general programme outlined here some time ago by Vice-President Scarascia Mugnozza. I wish to make a few observations in this connection. It is logical for these problems to be dealt with sector by sector within a general framework. It would not be possible to do otherwise; but, as there are close links between these problems, it would perhaps be desirable if for example after the parliamentary recess in September the Committee on Public Health and the Environment were given the opportunity of examining—if Vice-President Scarascia Mugnozza considers this appropriate—a summary (not a long document) showing the initial objectives and the aims already achieved. I consider in fact that, given the complexity of the arguments there might be some surprise or dissatisfaction if we were to wait until the end of the procedure. On the other hand a correction to our course might be extremely useful. Moreover, this is a modern approach which we consider useful, given our own way of working: we do not have a fixed meeting-place, we are often travelling and it is difficult to have an overall picture at all times.

Having said that I should like to make just one basic point which will explain why I tabled my two amendments. Above all sufficient importance does not seem to have been given to the definition of the geographical areas and procedures for applying the present directive. We believe in certain principles, but if these are to be translated into practical action we must take into account the technical and administrative structures existing in the various countries. These structures are generally obsolete because they meet requirements which existed many years ago and have generally not been brought up to date. Above all the structures lack interdisciplinarity because they deal

with the various individual problems without an overall view demanded by the complexity of modern problems.

There is also the question of space. When we dealt with the subject of drinking water in Luxembourg we inserted a small chapter affirming the need for all the problems of water to be considered in the context of geological basins.

Similarly where paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution refers to regional areas, I consider it opportune for the quality targets to be set on the basis of well-chosen physical areas. These areas, in regard to water and protection of the soil, are easy to identify while difficulties arise in the case of the air. However, the aim is not an impossible one. Meteorological science, using satellites and detectors mounted on satellites, has made enormous progress so that it is possible to define accurately enough which areas have homogeneous meteorological characteristics. The study of the control of atmospheric pollution will therefore be carried out within these areas. Corresponding studies have been conducted at the Berlin Technical University and a small group is also working on environmental problems at the Ispra establishment. This group includes talented researchers who have made considerable progress here. Research into appropriate areas is all the more necessary. In the Frankfurt region for example, with financial aid from NATO which is supporting a number of studies in this area, a space has been defined around the industrial city of Frankfurt and been the subject of a highly detailed examination leading to results which it will be possible to extrapolate to other areas.

I have put these considerations in one of my two amendments, namely that relating to physical areas. For greater brevity I have stressed this aspect and will look later into the other concerning the requirements of the presence of experts from various fields working in a co-ordinated manner to solve the problems which arise. That is another requirement.

My second amendment, Mr President, is on the lines of the comments made by Mr Notenboom in the concluding part of his speech. These showed a preference for measures favouring redistribution rather than encouragement. I wished to reflect this concept in an amendment which is not rigid in the sense that it does not remove the rules for measures of encouragement and replace them by redistribution only. But I have given marked preference to redistribution—and I hope my colleagues will approve this line.

Noè

However, if this system is to be put into practice, it will require compliance with the condition I referred to earlier, namely that there must be interdisciplinary teams to interpret the requirements and give guidance.

Redistribution means that each industry and each urban group which causes pollution must pay amounts which will then be redistributed on the basis of an organic study providing for action in an entire area with a view to reaching a pollution limit acceptable to man with minimum expense.

A quite different system would consist in placing industry before the alternative of respecting the limits or paying fines. Industrialists could also choose between payment of the fine (no result would be achieved in this way) and preventing the cause of pollution (but in this case the expenses would be greater than in the overall solution based on the system of redistribution).

In conclusion I hope that further thought will be given to this document, which is already satisfactory and of which I approve. I would also invite the Commission to look into the question of interdisciplinary teams responsible for finding a practical solution to these problems since the present organizations are generally too obsolete to meet the current needs.

Finally, I hope that Parliament will approve my two amendments which set down formally only part of the ideas I have put forward; the Christian-Democratic Group will vote in favour of this motion for a resolution.

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I should like to make a few comments on the Jarrot report.

I entirely agree with Mr Noè about a review and about the Commissioner putting forward a report in the autumn on the areas in which progress is being made and in which we hope progress will continue to be made. However, I find one or two points in the recommendation somewhat disturbing. This is one of the most imprecise documents to come from a Commissioner. Doubtless the reasons arise from the problems facing him. Nevertheless, the imprecision is extraordinary.

Reference is made to the costs of anti-pollution measures in principle being borne by the user and the cost allocation being carried out by whatever legal or administrative means offer the best solution from an economic and admin-

istrative point of view. These points are vague. I do not disagree in principle, but I think that we should have more precision at this stage from a Commissioner who is well known for his legal acuity.

I am worried about redistribution. If Mr Noè's interpretation of the redistribution part of the levies is correct, I have little quarrel with him. However, one could interpret that section of the proposals as a very different type of redistribution.

I query the basic concept whether, as a Parliament, we know what we are trying to do with the theory that the polluter should pay. I do not think that anybody objects to that in principle, but the cost to our industries and the effect on the prices of products could be substantial. As our standards improve, the costs to those who pollute the air, water and land will be increasingly severe. In principle, that is right. But in the economic climate of 1974/75, how far along this road should we go and how hard should we press this matter?

Mr Noè referred to the fact that unhappily his country's economic situation is not very bright. Is he prepared to see these measures brought in this year? Such measures will put additional costs on those industries which are causing pollution of the atmosphere, land and water. To what extent should the costs be borne by the polluter? Perhaps national or Community funds should be brought to their aid. Is it right at this time to talk about the severe levies which could be imposed on certain enterprises?

I am not against what we are trying to do. We are following through the decision taken at the Summit in the Commissioner's original programme. However, I query the timing and whether we can afford to advance as rapidly as some of us would wish.

Following Mr Noè's suggestion, I should have thought that we might have a more definitive document from the Commissioner when we meet in the autumn after the summer recess. Such a report should be more precise in setting out what has been achieved and what the Commissioner wishes to achieve in the near future in these areas.

Perhaps after further and fuller consultation with national governments we could consider the exact severity of the measures which should be taken concerning the principle of the 'polluter pays' theory in the economic climate of today.

I put forward these hesitations, which are uppermost in my mind, not because I wish to retard progress in these fields but because I feel that this is not the time to go full steam ahead with these proposals, good though they are.

**Scott-Hopkins**

May I make a final point. I know what the answer will be when I ask who is to collect the levies once the various pollution standards have been set and a decision has been taken on the industries which are to qualify for levies. I know I shall be told that national governments will do so, that they will set the standards and do the collecting and that the Commission will oversee it, to ensure uniformity in all the Member States. But some countries may not have the machinery to do this. They may have to create new machinery at new cost to the tax-payer.

Are we right at this time, in 1974/75, to envisage this kind of extra cost? When governments start collecting large sums of money, they have also to start checking that the collection is being done without fraud and that the money is being passed on to the Commission without fraud. What is the cost of that kind of organization to be? In this context, I hope that when the Commissioner comes back in the autumn he will have put down on paper more precise ideas so that we can assess them more thoroughly than we can at the moment. But in principle I will not at this juncture recommend any of the honourable Members to oppose either of these reports.

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

**Mr Bourges.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as Mr Della Briotta has said, our rapporteur, Mr Jarrot, cannot present his report because he is now a member of the French government. I should emphasize that the government has quite rightly made him responsible for the struggle against pollution, and I am pleased that this tribute has been paid to the ability of a Member of our Parliament.

I should like straightaway to say that my group considers the proposed directive necessary and fair. We fully support the 'polluter pays' principle. I should add that since the Ministry of the Environment was set up in France and since we recognized the importance of these problems, this principle has already been successfully applied.

This should reassure those of our colleagues who are afraid that such a system may not be workable. However, it is clear that pollution levels, i.e. the norms which will be accepted and the fines which will be levied, should be harmonized in the Member States of the Community in order to avoid distortions, in particular at economic level. We therefore welcome the guidelines proposed.

My group therefore supports the report and the directive submitted by the Commission.

I would agree with those Members who have said that this directive puts forward principles which are rather general. However, this is understandable in a relatively new field where one would have expected the Commission to tackle this aspect of the problem with a degree of caution.

We believe that the general trend of the proposals and the principles put forward are sound and invite the Commission to submit more practical proposals as soon as possible.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Müller.

**Mr Willi Müller, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make a few remarks on my own behalf and not on behalf of the Socialist Group.

In principle, what Mr Notenboom has said is very interesting and in most ways justified. The fact that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs assisted the committee responsible was welcome. As regards the form in which this was done I would also agree with Mr Notenboom in every detail.

Even if I do not agree with everything Mr Noé has said in defence of his two amendments, both deserve to be supported by this House since they supplement in the correct manner what the committee has decided.

Mr Scott-Hopkins was very restrictive in his comments. As someone who comes from Great Britain he has every reason to say that satisfactory experience has been gained there, for example in the field of water conservation. This encourages me to make a specific appeal to the Commission: it is no use at all to us—and this is not a form of new realism—if we put ticks all over our environmental programme and note that we have instructed that this or that should be done. It is more important for us to take the initiative in specific sectors and to press for progress to be made in them. Water, as I have repeatedly stressed, is our most valuable foodstuff, and our rivers link the countries of the Community, if I may be allowed to disregard Great Britain for a moment. Basically, the opportunity open to the Commission is to motivate the Member States to be a little more decisive in protecting waterways. And to this extent, because I am favour of realism, because it is a more serious way of doing things and because the citizens of Europe understand it better, I feel, contrary to a somewhat underhand criticism, that it is right for the Commission to make a recommendation rather than submit

**Müller**

a directive. Anyone willing to wipe the dust off the memoranda will know how difficult it was to make what the Commission had submitted with Parliament's support as its environmental action programme for Europe palatable for the Council of Ministers.

It was very much a touch-and-go decision. The Council was on the point of not approving the 'polluter pays' principle. That should never be forgotten. We should therefore go about our work with some care.

I feel the possibility of bilateral agreements, which are still around in the Community, should be considered as a way of getting the governments concerned to do more in fields where action is urgently needed.

I say this with regard to water conservation, particularly in respect of the Rhine; it is simply incomprehensible that there should not be an exchange of information when more progress is being made, whenever only one small step is made before the next, good as it may be to proceed at a slow pace. But in this case a decisive step forward must be made at some time, and it should not be in the form of two steps forward and one back. That is what I consider wrong.

I should like to say to Mr Scarascia Mugnozza that it is of decisive importance for something like a Euro-standard to be introduced, a new sign of quality in environmental protection, with national considerations pushed aside for once. The national parliaments should press for the introduction of this standard of quality, which could be called a Euro-standard.

In conclusion, I should like to say that when the opinions expressed here by Members of the most varied political conviction are considered—when we discuss environmental protection, I feel that we become one big political group—it will be clear to everyone that the standard cannot, of course, be set for uniform application to the whole area of Europe. It must be adapted to the various conditions that prevail.

In fact this would be a possibility of making progress and of again getting away from the almost incomprehensible, I would even say completely out-of-date idea, that the protection of the environment can be guaranteed within the area of one national state, since everyone knows that this is a world-wide problem and that in view of the magnitude of the problem even European solutions look modest and can almost be called regional.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Noè to comment briefly on the problem raised by Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Noè.** — *(I)* I should just like to give an explanation to Mr Scott-Hopkins. What I said earlier did in fact tend towards the direction indicated by him.

I support the principle of redistribution which enables industry, whatever its standards may be—and this is another major subject to which we will come one day—and the urban centres to arrive at low-cost solutions which are optimal because they are designed for a whole area.

On the other hand if the principle of encouragement is adopted, the individual polluter, be he the mayor of a town or the director of a company, has the alternative of providing appropriate facilities or paying a fine. Apart from the fact that he may be tempted to choose the second option, in which case pollution will continue, even if he chooses the first, much more money will be spent than is actually necessary.

I also approve of the idea of a European standard called for by Mr Müller especially as, since the problems differ widely from one area to another, I should like to see them approached in all the Community countries with equal vigour, identical high-level technology and close cooperation between the various areas in order to arrive at an exchange of information and results. Finally, still on the subject of the European standard, I would say that the difficulty consists not only in laying down the standards but also in implementing them, which is even more difficult.

This summer I visited a hydrographic centre on Lake Geneva where work was being carried out under the aegis of the Agence Rhône-Méditerranée, which has its headquarters in Lyons and operates on Lakes Geneva, Annecy and Bourget. Different techniques are adopted for each of these lakes. On Lake Geneva I saw an ultra-modern technique applied, which consists in pumping out the deep waters with a low oxygen content which hamper purification, and removing this water. This example shows the complexity of the problem to which I hope we will have time to return at greater length in the autumn.

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza to explain the Commission's views on the amendments adopted by the committee and on the amendments tabled to the text submitted by the committee.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(I)* Mr President, allow me to thank Mr Müller for

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

his report and Mr Della Briotta for having presented Mr Jarrot's report.

As to the first report, the Commission endorses the resolution presented by Mr Müller on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment but it does not endorse the amendments proposed to Article 3 (a) and (b).

This is in fact a long-standing problem. The European Parliament has always discussed these matters from the angle it has chosen today. With equal tenacity the Council has always assumed a totally different position. The Commission could not fail to take account of this divergence of views even though we are broadly of the opinion that the Council will decide on its own terms. At all events, without going into the merits of an argument which has been dragging on for several years I wish to say—if this is giving Parliament concern—that the Commission is certainly not losing its right of initiative merely by presenting one of its proposals for the opinion of the committee. If the committee expresses a unanimous view the Commission will of course take its proposal further, thus using its right of initiative. On the other hand, I consider it would be prejudicial to provide a procedure on the basis of which, if a decision is awaiting a second decision, a provision would remain in force for a period of two or three months only to be then modified. Therefore, in thanking Mr Müller and the Committee on Public Health and the Environment for the proposals made in the resolution, I would ask Parliament to depart for once from its position and maintain the text in the form presented by the Commission.

As to the second report, I wish to express my satisfaction at the fact that it has been written by a former Member of the European Parliament who is now not only a minister in the French Government but indeed the Minister for the Quality of Life with whom these problems will therefore have to be discussed. I recall the commitment given by Mr Jarrot when he was a Member of the European Parliament. I also read with great interest the statements that he made recently to *Le Monde*. These statements set out his action programme, and I would ask Mr Bourges to signify to Mr Jarrot that I hope to find in him the same enthusiasm and coherence of approach so that we can proceed in the Community towards an environmental policy on the lines now called for.

In connection with this second report I would point out that there are two courses of action open to us, that of the recommendation and that of the directive. We were not yet ready to present a directive which would have required a

more detailed study and probably aroused on the part of certain Member States reactions which might have caused the problem to be shelved definitively or for a long time while awaiting an analysis of the situation in the individual countries. We therefore thought it preferable to submit a recommendation indicating certain principles which we consider essential. We should like a full exchange of views on these principles with the groups of experts and the Council of Ministers. It is not improbable that this exchange of views will take place at the next meeting of the Council of Ministers, due to be held before the end of the month. When we have completed the framework and become fully aware of the importance of the problems—because as I have already pointed out to the European Parliament, it is easy to say the polluter must pay but it is difficult to translate this principle into practical terms without creating at the very least distortions of competition—it will be possible to pass on to the stage of presenting a directive.

I am therefore to accept the invitation made by Mr Noè, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Bourges and Mr Müller to re-examine the situation next autumn taking the calendar of our work into account. I shall go further. Within the next few days I shall send to each member of the committee a summary of the work done up to now, from which it will be possible to see the basic elements of the proposed directive submitted, the stage reached in their examination, the progress reached in the working parties and the possibility of discussion in the Council of Ministers. In this way we shall have an overall view in October and will be able, if necessary, to correct our approach in order to concentrate work on the areas where the need is greatest. In this sense I share the views expressed in various quarters that the problem of water is at present the one which warrants our closest attention.

With reference to the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs put forward by Mr Notenboom, I wish to say that we shall take account of the points made even if they are not formally annexed to the motion for a resolution; all the indications and concern expressed in the economic sphere will be included in the context of our assessment.

Finally, let me say to Mr Müller that his idea of a European standard is particularly attractive and is the one towards which we are moving at present. It will enable us to have norms on which to base our work and protect the environment of the European Community.

Because we do not think that, given the present situation, a rigid standard can be accepted by

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

all, we intend to lay down directives representing the outline to be followed by national legislation rather than regulations which, because of their restrictive character, may sometimes be rejected with obvious disadvantages to the Community. Having said that and expressed my view on the amendment proposed to the first report I would add that I support the amendments tabled by Mr Noè to the second report.

**President.** — Thank you Mr Scarascia Mugnozza. Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in Mr Müller's report.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in Mr Jarrot's report.

On the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2 I have no amendments or speakers listed. I put paragraphs 1 and 2 to the vote.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 are adopted.

On paragraph 3 I have Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Noè and worded as follows:

This paragraph should read as follows:

'3. Approves the recommendation in principle and hopes that in the more specific proposals to follow the levies will have a more redistributive than incentive function;'

I call Mr Noè to move this amendment.

**Mr Noè.** — (I) Mr President, I believe that I already explained the amendment sufficiently in my speech just now. I do not intend to repeat myself. The same applies to the next amendment. Thank you.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote. Amendment No 1 is adopted and becomes paragraph 3.

On paragraph 4 I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put paragraph 4 to the vote.

Paragraph 4 is adopted.

On paragraph 5 I have Amendment No 2 tabled by Mr Noè and worded as follows:

This paragraph should read as follows.

'5. Considers that quality objectives should be set on the basis of appropriately selected geographical areas and requests the Commission to bear this in mind when formulating its specific proposals;'

I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is adopted and becomes paragraph 5.

On paragraphs 6 to 10 I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put paragraphs 6 to 10 to the vote.

Paragraphs 6 to 10 are adopted.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole incorporating the various amendments that have been adopted.

The resolution so amended is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

12. *Regulation on the creation of a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on the report drawn up by Mr Jahn on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the communication and the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 306/73) for a regulation on the creation of a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions (Doc. 93/74) and of the report drawn up by Mr Marras on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on the communication and the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 306/73) for a regulation on the creation of a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions (Doc. 94/74).

I call Mr Jahn who has asked to present his report.

**Mr Jahn, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment I should briefly like to explain the main points of our report on the creation of a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**Jahn**

In principle, we welcome the regulation proposed by the Commission as an important part of the European Community's environmental action programme of 22 November 1973.

We have discussed in very great detail the tasks to be allotted the European Foundation when it is created. During these discussions it became clear to us in committee that the focal point of the Foundation's tasks would be, as the title states, 'improvement of living and working conditions' with environmental protection being paid somewhat too little attention.

We therefore urged the Commission to remedy this defect and to ensure that the Foundation spends at least 50% of its time on environmental protection problems in the narrower sense of the term. For this reason we also insist that the name of the Foundation be changed to 'European Foundation for the improvement of living, working and environmental conditions'. This is clearly expressed in paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution. I would point out that the Vice-President of the Commission, Mr Scarscia Mugnozza, agreed to this change during the discussions in committee.

In the last few years this House has given a clear idea of what it considers the Foundation's tasks should be. In this connection I would refer the House to paragraph 5 of the explanatory statement in our report. It would seem to me worth recalling that in paragraph 27 of its resolution of 6 July 1972 on the European Community's environmental protection programme Parliament repeated 'its request for a European environmental institute to be set up immediately to coordinate the research in this field so that the initiatives of the Member States do not diverge or conflict and to ensure there is no expensive duplication of effort.'

Article 2 of the proposed regulation now defines the tasks of the Foundations as follows:

- to promote medium and long-term research into the factors which determine living and working conditions;
- to promote or carry out short-term research in certain cases;
- to promote or carry out pilot experiments;
- to implement a system of documentation as well as ensuring the dissemination of knowledge.

We note with regret that this relatively limited concept represents a considerable step backwards compared with the tasks outlined by the Commission itself in its communication of 22 March 1973 on a Community environmental pro-

gramme. I feel the House should be reminded of this because we voted unanimously in favour. When the environmental programme was put before us, we said under paragraph 9 that the following should be done in the sphere of environmental protection:

'Desirability of a European Institute for the Environment, with particular reference to the action being taken in the Member States.'

The role of an institute of this kind might—it was said at that time and confirmed by Parliament—consist in ensuring coordination of studies and research in the field of environmental protection at Community level for the purpose of:

- deliberating further on the improvement of living conditions by conducting studies or holding seminars and conferences and drawing up a model of European civilization;
- drawing up a list of the Community's natural sources of supply and preparing a general long-term plan for the management and development of these sources of supply;
- collecting, processing, supplementing and disseminating information on environmental questions at Community level, particularly on new techniques and processes which can reduce pollution;
- holding training courses, above all at post-graduate level on environmental protection.

In paragraph 21 of the resolution adopted on 18 April 1972 we had already said that the European Parliament:

'Considers the establishment of a European body responsible for environmental matters indispensable in view of the urgent work which needs to be done on the coordination of environmental research at European level.'

We then called for a number of other measures which I do not intend to go into in detail here, but all having the objective of problems actually being tackled when the body was created.

I would urgently request the Commission to take full account of its own proposals and the decision of this Parliament on the environmental institute which we hope to be able to set up shortly. We consider it logical for at least some of the tasks enumerated by the Commission to take the place of the now very limited objectives. This is why we insist on Article 2 being supplemented by the following tasks:

'to develop and analyse basic considerations on the improvement of living conditions in the



**Jahn**

society of the future with a view to preparing models for European civilization.'

Article 4 (2) governs the seat of the Foundation. Unfortunately the Commission does not propose a seat, but leaves the decision to the Council. This should not, in my view, prevent the European Parliament from making appropriate proposals, especially as the committee has also made suggestions.

Your rapporteur proposed during the discussions in our Committee on Public Health and the Environment that Berlin be the seat of the Foundation. This proposal was not opposed nor were any counter-proposals made in committee. The proposed solution would appear to me especially appropriate since it has been decided that the recently established Federal Office for Environmental Protection is to be located in Berlin. This would considerably facilitate close cooperation between the two institutions, and I do not need to emphasize how necessary such cooperation is.

Your committee agrees to the arrangements of an organizational and technical nature proposed in Articles 5, 6 and 7. It feels that it will be of decisive importance for the Foundation to work rationally and unbureaucratically.

The Committee on Public Health and the Environment particularly welcomes Article 14 of the proposed regulation, which stipulates that the Foundation will determine its own programme of work. I would remind the House that it has called on the Commission in several resolutions to include a practical plan of work for the Foundation in its proposal. When drawing up the plan of work, the Director of the Foundation will have to take account not only of the proposals made by the Scientific and Technical Committee but also of suggestions put forward by the institutions of the Community. This means that as an institution of the Community Parliament is given a direct right of proposal, i.e. it will forward its suggestions and proposals directly to the Director of the Foundation without their being previously 'filtered' by the Commission and Council, in other words dropped or changed by them.

I should like to underline this particular aspect. In paragraph 4 of our motion for a resolution we have therefore referred with satisfaction to this direct right of proposal.

With regard to Article 13 (2) we have also proposed what we feel to be a fundamental amendment. This paragraph states that the general report to be drawn up annually on the activities of the Foundation is to be communicated to the Community institutions once it has been adopted by the Administrative Board of the Foundation.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, to ensure that the European Parliament receives this general report at the same time as the Council and Commission and thus to avoid unnecessary and tedious circuitous routes to Parliament, the committee insists that this provision be amended as follows: 'The Director shall communicate the general report directly to each of the Community institutions once it has been adopted by the Administrative Board'—in other words to Parliament as well, so that we do not need to wait to receive information through circuitous channels or even through the press, as has happened in the past. This demand has also been made in paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution.

Article 21 governs the date on which the regulation is to come into force, but the Commission has not proposed a set date.

The draft Social Action Programme submitted to the Council by the Commission provided for the Council to undertake to decide *inter alia* on the setting up of a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions (Action I 6) by 1 April 1974 at the latest. We realize that this deadline can no longer be observed. Our committee feels, however,—and Vice-President Scarascia Mugnozza agreed with us on this—that it is possible for the regulation to come into force by 31 July 1974. We have consequently added this date to Article 21 and called for it to be observed in paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution.

Finally, I should like to say a few words on the legal basis for this proposed regulation. We noted with satisfaction that the Commission has selected Article 235 of the EEC Treaty for this purpose. This is in line with the opinion expressed by Parliament on numerous occasions at the suggestion of your Committee on Public Health and the Environment. For example, in paragraph 6 of the resolution of 18 April 1972 on the Commission's first communication on Community environmental policy, our Parliament urged 'the Commission and Council, as is practical in most cases, to base Community legislation on environmental protection preferably on Articles 100 and 235 of the EEC Treaty.'

We are therefore in favour without reservation, of the legal basis proposed by the Commission—I would also refer you to paragraph 2 of our motion for a resolution—and we call on the Council to adopt this proposal as a matter of urgency. Further details of the problem of the selection of a legal basis for Community environmental provisions can be found in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the explanatory statement in my report.

**Jahn**

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I felt I should limit myself to these few points which I considered to be important and would thank you for your attention.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr D'Angelosante, deputizing for Mr Marras, who has asked to present the other report.

**Mr D'Angelosante, deputy rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, with the permission of Mr Bertrand, the chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, I am deputizing for the rapporteur, Mr Marras, who is unable to attend this debate because of important electoral commitments.

My task is therefore fairly limited since I am only to present to this Assembly the views already expressed in the written text by Mr Marras, which I should simply like to summarize briefly.

In my opinion, at this stage of the discussion the only problem remaining to be solved is that, already referred to in the report, of a certain ambiguity and vagueness in the text proposed by the Commission relating to the sectors under examination here.

The committee responsible pointed out that it was not clear to what point this text should apply in the ecological or social sectors. In the explanatory statement and motion for a resolution it expressed, as seems natural, a preference concerning the direction to be given to the activities of the proposed Foundation; this preference went in the first instance to the social aspect of the life of workers and to other questions with which Parliament was familiar.

Now a divergence—if we may call it that—has arisen between the two committees entrusted with the examination of this question; this divergence is particularly clear in the amendment which the Committee on Public Health and the Environment is proposing to Article 2 of the proposed regulation. Their amendment relates to the name of the Foundation.

The original text of Article 2 states that 'the Foundation's task in the field of improving living and working conditions in the Community...', while the Committee on Public Health and the Environment has proposed the following wording: 'The Foundation's task in the field of improving living, working and environmental conditions in the Community...'

This amended wording may not fully reflect in translation the spirit of the observations put forward by the Committee on Public Health and

the Environment, since, as I seemed to understand from the simultaneous translation, Mr Jahn just spoke of 'living conditions, conditions of employment and of the environment'.

At all events this proposed amendment leaves me rather perplexed since it would finish up by making all other considerations secondary to the defence of environmental conditions.

Since this slight difference of views has become apparent I can merely support the text of the Marras report and draw Parliament's attention to the fact that the amendment proposed in the Jahn report is perhaps superfluous in the sense that the European Commission explains with great clarity in the text of the communication what it understands by the terms 'improvement of living conditions' and 'improvement of working conditions'.

In fact on page 3 of the text of the communication we find a precise definition of the aims to be pursued under the headings 'improvement of living conditions' (having regard in the long term to psychological problems, waste products, etc.) and 'improvement of working conditions'. In my capacity as deputy rapporteur I therefore feel it would be preferable for this amendment tabled by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment to be withdrawn since the old text, in the authentic interpretation given to it in the communication appears clear, while the new wording gives rise to some ambiguity.

The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment also considered a number of other problems, Mr President: for example that of coordination between the Commission and Foundation. The committee was afraid that the creation of this Foundation, which in itself is a highly positive and desirable development, might eventually lead to a division between the activities of the Foundation itself and those of the Commission while also creating the risk of duplication of the activities of both; the committee therefore proposes to the Parliament that it should reflect on methods of coordination. I shall also refer briefly to the observations formulated by the rapporteur of the committee on the subject of the financial question, the most important element of which seems to me to be the reference to the percentage of the endowment of this foundation to be used for operating expenditure: this is 18% of the total funds. The committee considered this a high figure in comparison with the average incidence of American foundations which have similar operational costs; while in our case the figure is shown at 18% of the total, the American foundations manage with a figure of between 1.8 and 2%.

**D'Angelosante**

The organs of the Foundations also call for certain interesting comments. As regards the desirability of representation for each Member State on the Administrative Board, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment considers that it would have been desirable to give this board a more distinctly supranational character with representatives appointed by the Commission.

Finally, a rather interesting observation arose during the discussion of an amendment: according to the rapporteur of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment the concept of equal representation for workers and employees might be rather outmoded since it would be desirable to replace the concept of representation of the different interest groups by that of representation on the basis of the extent of their interests. An amendment was tabled this morning which, referring to the concept of equality, proposed a modification to the ratio of the number of employers' representatives to the number of workers' representatives in favour of the latter category.

As regards the location of the Foundation, the committee proposes Brussels for many reasons which I do not need to go into in detail here.

I have briefly outlined the grounds for which the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment recommends the Assembly to approve the second motion for a resolution on which we shall soon be voting; by giving this brief outline I believe, as I said at the beginning of my speech, that I have discharged my task fully.

*(Applause)*

**IN THE CHAIR: MR BEHRENDT***Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Van der Gun to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Van der Gun.** — *(NL)* Mr President, we warmly welcome the Commission's proposal for the creation of a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions. It can in our opinion only increase the possibilities of a European approach, and in the somewhat longer term, of a truly European policy.

We are certainly of the opinion that the tasks of the Foundation must be described in a somewhat more concrete manner. What the Commission means by improvement of living and working conditions must also be stated better and more completely. The Commission has, to

be sure, included some fine sentences in its proposal, but the whole remains in our opinion still too vague and not concrete enough. In our view it is self-evident that improvement of the environment must play an important role in the context of the Foundation's activities. We therefore fully understand that the Committee on Public Health and the Environment wishes this brought out in the Foundation's name.

Initially, there were a few differences of opinions between the Committee on Public Health and the Environment and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment as to which of these two committees should be the committee responsible. We think that such differences over competence must be avoided in future. We would therefore propose that the chairmen of both committees, in consultation with the Bureau of Parliament, should seek to arrive at a more definitive settlement of this matter. This is all the more important since the Commission, to our great satisfaction, wishes to give the European Parliament the chance to make suggestions for the annual work programme, and will also send an annual report on the work of the Foundation directly to the Community institutions, including Parliament.

In general we can subscribe to the suggestions which the two committees have made through their rapporteur. Nevertheless, I should like to make a few observations on some of these suggestions. I have particularly in mind the nature of the activities, the composition of the Board, and the financing and seat of the Foundation.

The nature of the activities must in our opinion be such that there is a balance between the theoretical and scientific activities of the Foundation on the one hand and the more practical and concrete activities on the other. From the allocation of available funds as proposed by the Commission we have the impression that the theoretical and scientific side is rather predominant, and this seems to us incorrect as regards both the role of the Foundation within the Community and the effort to interest the people in it. Accordingly, we would especially value an attempt at a better-balanced approach between the two aspects than is now, in our opinion at least, the case in the Commission's original formulation.

Now a few observations on the composition of the Administrative Board, to which the Commission proposes to appoint one representative from each Member State. We are of the opinion that the work to be carried out by the Foundation covers an area in which the social partners are also active, so that greater individual res-

**Van der Gun**

possibility than at present must also be assigned to the social partners in the context of the Administrative Board. The social partners of course have seats on the advisory and executive committee, but these bodies are not represented on the Administrative Board as such. A composition as proposed by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, namely three employers, three workers and three members to be appointed by the Commission, with a rotating chairman appointed in turn by the Council of the European Communities on the basis of the nationality of the President-in-Office of the Council, is in our opinion more correct, and furthermore corresponds more closely to the supranational principle than the Commission's present proposal. We therefore strongly prefer a composition such as the one the Commission proposed for the European Vocational Training Centre.

As regards the composition of the Administrative Board, Mr Wioldraaijer has put forward a much more radical proposal. My friend Mr Bertrand, chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, is about to go into this proposal in more detail.

As far as the financing of the Foundation is concerned, we would ask the Commission to pay special attention to the suggestion from the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment to amend its proposal in such a way that the Member States could grant tax relief for donations to the Foundation, thereby also promoting financing from private sources.

I come now to the seat of the Foundation. It is somewhat repellent to speak in the Community about the seat of a Foundation, institution or the like. I will not go into the matter too deeply; furthermore, it seems that it is Brussels, Berlin or North Italy which have been mentioned in this connection. We find any of these excellent, on the one express condition that the creation of the Foundation not be put off for a moment because of difficulties in connection with its location. The work is so important that a rapid decision by the Commission is appropriate.

Finally, we would thank the two rapporteurs for their extensive cooperation. We can in general support their suggestions, which we regard as improvements to the Commission's proposals. We would express the hope that Parliament will agree with these amendments and also that the Commission will adopt as many as possible of the proposals from the two parliamentary committees.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Wioldraaijer.** — (NL) Mr President, the proposal under discussion attempts to combine two initiatives. In itself this can do no harm. In view of the aims of the Foundation, the Socialist Group will certainly support these initiatives. The subjects are very important in themselves. We can therefore broadly give our agreement to this.

I should however like to support two of the observations made by Mr Van der Gun. I agree with what he said about the vague description of the subject and with his remarks on the nature of the activities.

I should now like to say a few words on the proposal made by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment in connection with the name of the Foundation. It is proposed that the word 'environmental' be included in it. I know that discussions took place between the rapporteurs of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Public Health and the Environment. Both rapporteurs agree to the amendments submitted by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment. I have no basic objection to the inclusion of the word 'environment' in the title.

One of the previous speakers said that 50% of the name should allude to the one aspect and 50% to the other. I should like to concentrate attention on an aspect which is very important for the Socialist Group, that we hope that studies on working conditions and surroundings receive the necessary priority. It is well known that working conditions and surroundings in large industrial enterprises and also in a number of other enterprises leave much to be desired.

In particular, work organization is in many cases dictated from above. Speaking on the environment, we as socialists find that what is wanted is a different approach to the working environment. It is precisely in respect of the working environment that changes are necessary.

I do not know the precise figures from other countries in the EEC on, for instance, days lost through sickness and the number of people who are retired early when factories are shut down. I do know the figures for my own country and can state that much time is lost through sickness and that when factories are shut down there, people over 50 are often not in a position to make a new start, as a result of what they have gone through.

**Wieldraaijer**

In the present production system huge amounts are invested in faster and more efficient working methods and in ideas for a new division of labour. I am well aware that this is a result of rising prosperity. The result is that our prosperity has again risen, but we have in part bought that prosperity by making work so drained and impoverished that very largely it no longer appeals to the whole potential of people at work. I consider this an important point, and I would very much urge those who wish to set up this Foundation to pay attention to it, since work has a very important place in the life of many people and is of great importance for their own happiness and that of their families. I wish to bring this out in connection with the change of name since I do wish the emphasis to be on working conditions and working surroundings. We can agree with the other amendments proposed by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment.

I should like to say a further word or two on the question of the seat. I agree with Mr Van der Gun that talks about the seat must not lead to a delay in setting up the Foundation. The rapporteur has said that Berlin would be a good place. In the other report Brussels is mentioned, and there is also talk of the Ruhr district and the Italian industrial triangle. I am also aware that Copenhagen is sometimes mentioned. I do not wish to speak for a particular seat. I think it is important for the decision-centre of the EEC to be located in one place, but we have not achieved even that yet.

Other institutions can well be distributed; it is not a good idea to concentrate everything at one point, since the danger then arises—as we at any rate in our country know—of so much being put side by side that large concentrations of population are created and bring with them all sorts of problems.

The Commission must be very clearly aware of its political responsibility for the proposals it is to submit in the area of the environment, working conditions, the working environment and living conditions. The Foundation must not, for instance, be used as a kind of ice-box in which particular problems can be put away under the pretext that they must first of all be discussed, while what are in fact needed are political decisions and the submission of political proposals. I should not like the Foundation to act as a sort of safety valve for the Commission and be used by it as an excuse not to do certain things.

I should like to make two observations on the administrative structure. Mr Van der Gun has already drawn attention to the composition of the Administrative Board. As far as that goes, I am

in agreement with him. We also spoke in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for the position that the Administrative Board should be made up of three employers' representatives, three workers' representatives and three representatives of the authorities, in this case, the Commission. I am hoping to hear the ideas of the member of the Commission on this.

Some final words, Mr President, on the composition of the Scientific and Technical Committee. We have proposed an amendment modifying the composition of this committee. The present proposal is: five employers' representatives, five workers' representatives and five representatives to be proposed by the Director of the Foundation. We should, however, like in the first place to review the parity principle, which is always automatically applied. We should like this to be ended. It is not important how far we wish to revise this principle; the figures mentioned in our amendment are naturally in some sense arbitrary.

Why do we now wish to break with the principle of parity? It will of course be clear to everyone that the number of workers is innumerable larger than the number of employers. In my opinion, workers ought to weigh heavier in the balance as regards their numbers.

A further point: in our industrial society employers have considerable influence over both the environment and working and living conditions through their investment decisions. This gives employers a certain position of power, whereby they can determine future developments more than workers. In this connection, too, I think that there is everything to be said for making the number of workers' representatives larger than the number of employers' representatives.

I should thus, Mr President, like to break the parity principle. I hope that Parliament will pay the necessary attention to this and will adopt our amendment.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I assume, Mr Wieldraaijer, that what you have just said was also in support of Amendment No 1.

**Mr Wieldraaijer.** — Yes, Mr President.

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr Wieldraaijer has imparted a certain political flavour to our discussion of this report. He has every right so to do. Why should he not?

**Mr Wieldraaijer.** — We are politicians!

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Indeed we are, and I thought that with your permission, Mr President, I would follow his line.

One of the things that has always amazed me is how those honourable gentlemen who are of socialist persuasion seem to think they are the only people who have the rights of the workers at heart. This is demonstrably untrue throughout the whole of Europe and certainly in my country. It is not only the Socialist Group which has these matters at heart, which deals with them and thinks deeply on them, as I hope I shall show in my intervention.

Taking up the honourable gentleman's last point, he wants a predominance of worker representatives on the membership of the Scientific and Technical Committee. The arguments that he put forward and those of his honourable Friends are extremely relevant. But I believe that we need a balance here, and I would not go along with his view. It would be much better that the Commission's proposals, as they have been welcomed by my honourable Friend Mr Jahn, should stand. I would not support the proposals put forward in Mr Wieldraaijer's amendment.

I do support him almost entirely, however, in what he said concerning the seat of the Foundation—that it is not a matter of great importance as long as it can be agreeably decided among us, provided there is no delay in the setting-up of the Foundation. I would not object whether it were in Brussels, Paris or any other place, even London, as long as it were established reasonably quickly.

I must take issue with Mr Jahn on the suggestion that Berlin should be the seat. I would have thought the one objection to it—although I am prepared to be persuaded on this—was that of the accessibility of Berlin at all times. I would have thought it most important that there should be easy communication between the Commission and the Foundation, wherever it is situated. There would perhaps be problems of accessibility if it were decided that the Foundation should be sited in Berlin. But I would be prepared to be persuaded on that issue if Mr Jahn could say that accessibility could be guaranteed.

In general, I welcome the setting-up of the Foundation. I do not intend to go into the details of all the work it should do. We can all make speeches, as Mr Wieldraaijer has just done, about the problems of poverty in our countries, the conditions of the workers and those who are underprivileged and who need to be helped,

and how this Foundation will undertake deep studies of their problems. We can all be very emotive on this subject and no doubt stir the hearts of those who will read what we have said. The emphasis of this Foundation should be on the living and working conditions of our people throughout the whole of the Community.

But may I suggest that there is perhaps another function which the Foundation could also encompass? The House knows that the Commissioner has set up a whole mass of advisory committees of outside experts, particularly in the environmental field. These committees have proliferated over the past year, during which I have had the honour to be a Member of this House, and we have heard of them in our committees. I do not know what is the exact count of the technical and expert committees which exist to advise, but they are certainly legion. I do not object to this, because obviously the Commissioner needs expert advice—and good luck to him.

In view of the way in which these committees have been set up, I should have thought that they needed some supervision. I suggest—I am not moving an amendment, Mr President, so the House need not become anxious—that the Commission ought to take the view that all these advisory committees should be put under the supervisory control of the Foundation. The co-ordination of the committees' work, the co-ordination of their advisory capacity in expert and technical fields, could well come under the Foundation, for there is to be a director, a deputy director and other officials. This would be an eminently reasonable and sensible solution to the problem posed by the number of committees which are in existence—and doubtless many others will be brought into being.

Several honourable Members have mentioned the technical aspect of the proposals which are being submitted by the Commission. Now is the time for us, through the Foundation, which can be the parent and supervisory body, to institute new procedures—not only in this House, but particularly here—to deal with these matters of a technical nature.

Where questions are of a purely technical nature, they could come forward under what we in the House of Commons call the negative procedure. In other words, technical matters from the expert committees could come before the House and after a lapse of, say, 20 days, 30 days or 40 days, unless they were objected to, they could be passed to the Council of Ministers for a final decision. Alternatively, where the Commission has the final decision, such matters could become law. Where they were substantive matters, of course, they could be objected to,

**Scott-Hopkins**

so that the Commission would have to propose them to the House in the usual way in a directive and then they could be considered here. This is a matter which the Commissioner should consider to see whether it is possible to speed up the work.

I believe that this is the right approach. I believe that the Foundation, when it is established—and I hope that will be soon—will symbolize the Community's efforts to safeguard the environment, will represent the Community at international gatherings, and will cooperate with international organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme and the Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

These are all worthy objectives, over and above what Mr Wieldraaijer was talking about, dealing with the living and working conditions of workers, a situation which also applies to those in my country.

Therefore, on behalf of my group I welcome the proposals and hope that there is a fair wind for the establishment of this Foundation.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Yeats.** — May I join other speakers in thanking the rapporteurs for their two excellent reports and Mr Jahn and Mr D'Angelosante for the helpful nature of their introductions.

There can, I think, be no doubt of the fundamental importance of the matters which will be studied by this new European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions.

It is, I suppose, a self-evident fact that we in the developed world have now realized a standard of living for our people that is higher than ever before in human history. Unfortunately, as we know too well, these great advances have been accompanied by the constant and ever-increasing destruction of the natural environment. We have created vast and overcrowded cities and been responsible for massive pollution of water and also of the atmosphere. Along with this we have created living and working conditions, especially in our cities, which are often inhuman.

The proposal by the Commission for the setting-up of a Foundation to study living and working conditions is therefore welcome, even though in itself it can do no more than scratch at the surface of the problem.

The Commission has listed an immensely long series of topics that it says will be dealt with by the new Foundation under the section for improvement of living conditions in general. It states that the Foundation can enquire into the long-term aspect of ecological problems, the distribution of human activity, the future of the city and the habitat, urban renewal and the preservation of Europe's aesthetic and historic heritage, the effects of the revolution in information, family and health problems and the problems of immigration and integrating the non-European population.

Under the heading of improvement of working conditions, we have the upgrading of men at work, the organization of work, the specific problems of certain sections of the labour force and problems outside the undertaking, such as transport to the place of work, leisure time, accommodation, etc.

This is an immense range for any institution or foundation to cover, yet, as is pointed out in Mr Marras' report, the Foundation will for the moment have only a very small staff—a director, a deputy director and five university staff. One wonders how an institution as small as that could possibly deal with the range of topics set out in the Commission's proposal. There is an obvious danger that the Foundation will in time become enmeshed in a flood of academic abstractions and that the ultimate result in terms of an improvement in living and working conditions may well be so small as to be negligible.

The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has suggested that, in order to ease the task of the Foundation, social problems should take precedence over the ecological—that is, as they put it, the latter should come under the Foundation's sphere of responsibility only in so far as they are strictly linked to the life of man as citizen and above all as worker.

I would agree wholeheartedly that if such a priority is necessary, that is the order in which precedence should be set. But I do not believe that any such priority is desirable or even possible. In discussing the improvement of the life of man as citizen and as worker, how can we ignore ecological problems, which are so closely bound up with the living conditions of all our peoples?

Rather than try to set up such artificial and unworkable priorities, it would surely be better to increase the staff and the funds available to the Foundation. This is a typical instance where, if too few resources are made available, essentially the whole project could be a waste of money. If results are expected, the necessary funds must be provided.

**Yeats**

At the same time the Foundation must avoid duplicating the work already in progress in either the Commission itself or other similar foundations. It should be ruthless in avoiding theoretical abstractions. We do not need another academic talking shop. We require severely practical advice on how we can improve living and working conditions throughout Europe.

Lastly, I should like to refer to the seat of the Foundation—a matter that the Commission has left to the Council of Ministers to decide. The report of the Committee on Social Affairs states that 'Brussels would be both a rational and efficient solution' on the grounds that coordination would thus be easier between the Foundation and the Commission and the trade union organizations.

On the contrary, I suggest that such a solution would be neither rational nor efficient. We are in constant danger in the European Communities from the strains engendered by excessive centralization. An administration wholly centred in one place inevitably becomes inefficient and top-heavy, besides becoming steadily further removed from the ordinary man in the street.

There is a lot to be said, where this is reasonably possible, for the dissipation throughout the various regions of the Community of at least some of its institutions. The health of the EEC must depend to a large extent on the amount of public interest and support that can be maintained. It will not be maintained if we constantly add to the already vast centralized bureaucracy in Brussels.

The success of the Foundation will depend to a large extent on its ability to enlist the support of public opinion. In Brussels the Foundation would sink from view amidst the many much larger EEC bodies which already exist in that city. In some other place its chances would be much greater of acquiring for itself some modest prestige and public recognition.

My group therefore welcomes this proposal by the Commission. We hope that there will be no delay in setting up the Foundation, and we look forward with interest to the first results of its programme of work.

**President.** — I would ask Mr Scarascia Mugnozza to put the Commission's view on the amendments adopted by the committee.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Mr President, I wish to thank Mr Jahn and put on record the keen interest with which he has for a long time been following environmental questions and in particular the matter of the

Foundation. May I also thank Mr Marras and Mr D'Angelosante, who deputized for him in presenting his report.

Mr President, (and I am pleased that you should be chairing this sitting, Mr Behrendt, since I remember your commitment as President of Parliament), after expressing my appreciation I feel bound nevertheless to draw attention to the difficulties created for the Assembly and the Commission by the submission of two reports dealing with the same subject: it would have been preferable, as has happened on other occasions, and more in keeping with the general need to streamline our work, for a single report or at least a single opinion to have been submitted.

From what Mr D'Angelosante has said I have the impression that the term 'Foundation' has given rise to some ambiguity due to misinterpretation or incorrect translation.

To begin with we had wanted to call it the Foundation for the Quality of Life, choosing the same name given in France to a ministry which concerns itself with a wide range of questions from the environment to working conditions. This designation was then set aside because it appeared too general and it seemed preferable to speak of living and working conditions. The Committee on Public Health and the Environment wants to add the words 'and environmental' It seems to me that if we use the designation 'living, working and environmental conditions' nothing is left out and I fail to understand why one of the committees of Parliament would like greater attention to be given to just one of these aspects.

May I also add a comment concerning the tasks of the Foundation since I have the impression—to judge from the debate—that some Members of Parliament have not clearly understood it.

Mr Scott-Hopkins, we do not have any superfluous working parties in the Commission. When the Commission has to submit proposals, it needs to know the opinion of national experts and also, where appropriate, of Community experts. There are also experts in the Council of Ministers who examine the problems after the Commission has put forward its proposals.

These groups of experts do not exist all the time; they are necessary when the Commission has to formulate its proposal which the Council of Ministers must then examine to take the final decision.

The Foundation has a quite different role. Our aim is not to establish a bureaucratic organization; we have already said that we shall not set up a body of officials. We need brains, and we



**Scarascia Mugnozza**

believe we shall obtain them either by employing in the Foundation persons who have completed thorough courses of study of the problems with which we are concerned here or by signing contracts with university institutes, with other foundations or bodies concerned with these questions.

We view this Foundation as a highly flexible and simple body which will not require a bureaucracy because there is no need whatever for a bureaucracy; it must be an organization of experts capable of forward-looking research with a view to guiding the Community bodies as to the choices which must be made. Our idea is that of a Europe looking always to the future. This Foundation must not therefore be represented in international organizations because—I repeat—it is a kind of working party responsible for assessing possible developments and possible consequences of our situation in the sector of employment and living conditions of citizens and also in that of the environment. I believe that this concept is also the most economical for the European Community since it will enable us to call upon suitable experts at the appropriate time, men who think and are able to illustrate the positive aspects and also the negative side of development. These experts will not be responsible for the legal formulation of the Commission's thinking; they will study and check the hypotheses to determine whether they are realistic and acceptable, whether they must be immediately implemented or delayed. The Foundation will therefore be in the nature of a study group and not of a bureaucratic apparatus.

Having said that, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to speak on the amendments submitted for discussion. Of these amendments I agree particularly with that presented by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment calling for the Foundation to benefit from tax advantages if it is given legacies and donations.

I shall not comment on the location of the Foundation because I do not think this is the right time to do so; I wish, however, to give an assurance that whatever the final location, its choice will not delay the operation of the Foundation. I would add that since the Foundation is to work—as a tight, unbureaucratic body—in close contact with the Community bodies, it must have its seat at a place as close as possible to that at which the Community institutions function.

Our intention, Mr President, is to set up a highly flexible and simple organization; a body which will be able—without going through the usual

procedures—to establish contacts with the world of science both within the Community and elsewhere; a body which is aware of the concerns of the present and possibilities for the future and is constantly aware of technological changes and through a whole series of informative papers, memoranda and guidelines will enable the European Community to take appropriate decisions at the right time so that the living conditions of our citizens do not suffer the consequences of the degradation of our planet or at least of our continent and so that the living conditions of our workers can always be maintained at the highest possible level.

(Applause)

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in Mr Jahn's report.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in Mr Marras' report.

On the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3 I have no amendments listed.

I put the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3 to the vote.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3 are adopted.

I have Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Wieldraaijer, Mr Adams and Mr Bermani and worded as follows:

After paragraph 3, insert a new paragraph worded as follows:

'3a. Requests that the Scientific and Technical Committee be composed of seven members appointed by the labour organizations, five members appointed by the employers' organizations and three co-opted members, to be chosen from the scientific community.'

Mr Wieldraaijer has already moved the amendment.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**D'Angelosante.** — The report already includes an observation to this effect. For my part, in my capacity as deputy rapporteur, I therefore agree to the amendment.

**President.** — I call Mr Alfred Bertrand.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**Mr Bertrand.** — (NL) Mr President, I would like to point out that this amendment has already been discussed by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, who rejected it.

I would also like to point out that in paragraph 3 of his motion for a resolution tabled on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, Mr Marras calls for adequate representation of the social partners on the Administration Board.

No amendment has been tabled on this paragraph. In order to avoid jeopardizing or delaying the discussion on the creation of this foundation I would urge Mr Wieldraaijer to withdraw his amendment. We are not so concerned at the present time with the question of the scientific and technical committee. I consider it more important for us to reach agreement on the Administration Board.

If Mr Wieldraaijer does not withdraw his amendment I would ask Parliament to take account of the position adopted by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and to reject the amendment.

**President.** — I call Mr Wieldraaijer.

**Mr Wieldraaijer.** — (NL) Mr President, I would like to point out that this amendment is not exactly the same as the amendment rejected in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. It is based on the same concept, i.e. the rejection of the principle of parity. In view of the importance I attach to this I am not willing to withdraw the amendment.

**President.** — I call Mr Yeats.

**Mr Yeats.** — I oppose the amendment. The work of the Scientific and Technical Committee bears no relation to politics. The amendment, if carried, would introduce political controversy, and it is totally unnecessary. Such an amendment, if accepted, would stultify the work of the committee from the start and would be altogether undesirable.

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

On paragraphs 4 to 9 I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put paragraphs 4 to 9 to the vote.

Paragraphs 4 to 9 are adopted.

I put the motion for the resolution to the vote

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Agenda for next sitting*

**President.** — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Thursday, 13 June 1974, with the following agenda:

*10.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m.:*

- Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Bousch on the economic situation in the Community;
- Oral Question with debate to the Commission on European technological cooperation;
- Joint debate on
  - report by Mr Krall on aid to the shipbuilding industry;
  - report by Miss Lulling on measures for persons employed in shipbuilding;
- Joint debate on
  - report by Mr Kater on the desulphurization of fuels;
  - report by Mr Rosati on the sulphur content of fuels;
- Report by Mr Vernaschi on the retail sale of pharmaceuticals;
- Oral Question with debate to the Commission on the harmonization of nationality laws.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 7 p.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

## SITTING OF THURSDAY, 13 JUNE 1974

### Contents

<p>1. Approval of the minutes ..... 154</p> <p>2. Economic situation in the Community — Debate on a motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Bousch on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (Doc. 129/74):</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Bousch, rapporteur ..... 155</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Artzinger, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Lange, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Sir Brandon Rhys Williams, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Leonardi, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Borschette, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Bousch .. 156</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Amendment No 1 to paragraph 4:</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">Lord Reay; Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs; Mr Borschette; Mr Bousch .. 163</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Withdrawal of Amendment No 1:</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">Mr Kirk ..... 165</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">Adoption of the resolution ..... 166</p> <p>3. Membership of committees ..... 166</p> <p>4. Oral Question with debate: European technological cooperation in specific industrial sectors (Doc. 11/74):</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Lord Bessborough; Mr Spinelli, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Bousch, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Leonardi, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Pounder; Mr Flämig; Mr Noè; Mr Normanton; Mr Spinelli; Lord Bessborough ..... 166</p> <p>5. Directive on aid to the shipbuilding industry — Commission Memorandum on procedures for action in the ship-</p>	<p style="padding-left: 2em;">building industry — Decision on assistance from the ESF for persons employed in the shipbuilding industry: Joint debate on a report by Mr Krall on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (Doc. 68/74) and a report by Miss Lulling on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment (Doc. 86/74):</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">Mr Krall, rapporteur ..... 175</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">Miss Lulling, rapporteur ..... 177</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Pêtre, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Alfred Bertrand, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Spinelli, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Lange, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Normanton, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Liogier, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr James Hill; Mr Pounder; Mr Spinelli; Mr Brøndlund Nielsen; Mr Lange; Mr Krall; Miss Lulling ..... 179</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Consideration of the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Krall ..... 194</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Amendment No 1 to paragraph 2:</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">Withdrawal of Amendment No 1:</p> <p style="padding-left: 6em;">Mr James Hill ..... 194</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Amendment No 2 to paragraph 3:</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">Mr James Hill; Mr Lange; Mr Normanton; Mr Alfred Bertrand; Mr Lange; Mr Krall ..... 195</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">Adoption of Amendment No 2 ..... 195</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Amendment No 3 to paragraph 4:</p> <p style="padding-left: 4em;">Mr James Hill; Mr Krall ..... 196</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Rejection of Amendment No 3 ..... 196</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Amendments Nos 4 and 5 to paragraph 6:</p>
--	---

<i>Mr Alfred Bertrand; Mr James Hill; Mr Lange; Mr Normanton</i> .....	197	<i>Adoption of the resolution contained in the report by Mr Kater</i> .....	206
<i>Withdrawal of Amendment No 4</i> ....	197	<i>Adoption of the resolution contained in the report by Mr Rosati</i> .....	206
<i>Adoption of Amendment No 5 as verbally amended</i> .....	197		
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> .....	197		
<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Miss Lulling</i> .....	197		
<i>Amendment No 1 to paragraph 8:</i>			
<i>Mr James Hill; Miss Lulling; Mr Lange; Mr James Hill</i> .....	198		
<i>Rejection of Amendment No 1</i> .....	198		
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> .....	198		
<i>Procedural motion:</i>			
<i>Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Broeks; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Broeks; Mr Scott-Hopkins</i> .....	198		
6. <i>Community measures for the desulphurization of fuels — Directive on the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels: Joint debate on a report by Mr Kater on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology (Doc. 22/74) and a report by Mr Rosati on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment (Doc. 103/74):</i>		7. <i>Directives on the activities of self-employed persons engaged in the retail sale of pharmaceuticals: Debate on a report by Mr Vernaschi on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee (Doc. 102/74):</i>	
<i>Mr Kater, rapporteur</i> .....	199	<i>Mr Vernaschi, rapporteur</i> .....	206
<i>Mr Rosati, rapporteur</i> .....	201	<i>Mr Walkhoff, draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment and on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Lord Mansfield, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Liogier, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Gundelach, Member of the Commission of the European Communities</i> .....	208
<i>Mr Gundelach, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Springorum; Mr Gundelach; Mr Springorum</i> .....	203	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> .....	211
		<i>Procedural motion:</i>	
		<i>Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Gundelach; Mr Liogier</i> .....	211
		8. <i>Oral Question with debate: Harmonization of nationality laws (Doc. 63/74):</i>	
		<i>Mr Brøndlund Nielsen, on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group; Mr Gundelach, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Lord O'Hagan; Miss Lulling; Mr Gundelach</i> .....	212
		9. <i>Agenda for the next sitting</i> .....	215

IN THE CHAIR: MR MARTENS

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10.05 a.m.)

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Economic situation in the Community*

**President.** — The first item on the agenda is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Bousch on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the economic situation in the Community (Doc. 129/74).

I call Mr Bousch, who has asked to present this motion.

**Mr Bousch, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has once more asked me to present a motion for a resolution containing firm and precisely-formulated recommendations which pursue the aim of ensuring the rapid suppression of the two principal scourges at present menacing the cohesion of our Communities—namely, inflation and the imbalance of payments in most Member States.

As we indicated in our resolution of 15 May last, the recommendations made on behalf of the Community by the Commission on the adaptation of economic measures for 1974 seemed to us to be little more than a slightly-modified reproduction of the policies and plans of the Member States. These plans seemed to us to be quite inadequate, for our Community is confronted with serious and important problems such as the restructuring of production following the energy crisis, problems of employment even within the framework of the envisaged retraining schemes, the danger of unwelcome movements of capital and, lastly, a general rise in prices both within the Community and outside. On that occasion, we proposed measures to avoid any threat to freedom of movement of goods. We insisted on the need for more coordinated measures to put the economy back on its feet by giving the Community institutions powers enabling them more effectively to encourage Member States to take measures and to coordinate these measures in order that Community recommendations concerning short-term economic policy should not become a dead letter or be postponed from one part-session to another.

Following these resolutions and recommendations, the Commission submitted quite recently to the Council a further series of proposals. We have not yet had an opportunity of examining these proposals in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, but because of their topicality I think it would be suitable to analyse them briefly here in order to see where we are.

The first of these proposals concerns measures to remedy balance-of-payments deficits by drawing on the resources of the European Monetary Cooperation Fund. This seems to accord with what we had asked for.

The second proposal is for a concerted floating of the EEC currencies by establishing monetary links between the countries of the European 'snake' and those countries whose currencies are at present floating freely *vis-à-vis* the dollar. These monetary links would, of course, presuppose one or more agreements on the level of interest rates—otherwise, the whole thing

would be impossible—and agreements on the control of capital movements.

Finally, the Commission has proposed new measures for promoting the struggle against inflation.

In our view, these proposals, taken as a whole, seem to be positive and to follow the general lines of the recommendations we had made previously. Nevertheless, we must not bury our heads in the sand; we are far from having reached our aim.

In order to assist those European countries that have been most affected by balance-of-payments difficulties, the monetary fund should be given adequate resources without delay. We are aware of the difficulties, and it is understandable that the country or countries—in any case, they are not numerous—capable of furnishing substantial financial aid should require that the countries liable to benefit from the resources of this Fund should first of all reduce their own economies to order.

But one may well ask whether this is not a vicious circle. The concerted floating of currencies presupposes analogous conditions. And here we come to the third panel in the triptych—that is to say, to the proposed directives concerning economic policy and the struggle against inflation.

In view of the rapid evolution of the economic process, your Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs was in some doubt whether there was any call at the moment for submitting a further motion for a resolution to this House. But considering the persistent tendency of Member States, despite the real advances made and the goodwill manifested in the recent past, to take unilateral economic measures without making the consultations required beforehand, and considering that these measures are liable to threaten what the Community has achieved so far, or at any rate to lead in the end to an undermining of the Community, your committee decided to launch, in this House today, a solemn appeal to Member States to take without delay, within the Community framework, measures calculated to restore economic equilibrium in its essentials.

Without underestimating the differences between the situations of the various countries concerned and mindful of the fact that the measures recommended cannot be identical, we must do all in our power to prevent the unequal courses pursued by our countries, first during the inflation and now in the struggle against inflation, from leading to a dislocation of the Community.

**Bousch**

Whatever else we may think of the situation, we must admit that the present structure of the Community is not designed to encourage the rapid taking of decisions when the situation requires them.

Sooner or later we shall have to agree on a working mechanism enabling us to adopt a genuinely common front *vis-à-vis* the situation. Naturally, if this mechanism is to work, we shall have to analyse the situation realistically and without hypocrisy. Any solutions envisaged must answer the needs of the moment and will require courageous decisions.

These, ladies and gentlemen, are the reasons why your committee has decided to lay before you the present motion for a resolution. We attach especial importance to it, and it is our wish that our national parliaments should attach the same importance to it in order to avoid further delaying that economic and monetary union to which all the countries of the Community have solemnly committed themselves in the eyes of public opinion. Otherwise, doubts may spread in the minds of the people of Europe, who are relying on this Parliament to ensure that the necessary decisions are taken and that the stages and time-limits laid down are observed for the realization of economic and monetary union.

Ladies and gentlemen, these are the recommendations concerning the economic situation which the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has asked me to present to this House; they are presented in concrete form in the motion for a resolution, which I would urge you to adopt. It was voted for unanimously by those members of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs who were present, after a long but extremely fruitful discussion. I have attempted to keep its presentation in accord with the realities of the moment. As requested by various colleagues in the course of the discussion, I have taken account of the progress achieved and of observations made during the course of that discussion. Moreover, its terms are such that they remain valid even after the decisions recently taken by the Council of Ministers. The recommendations made require the confirmation of this House if those measures are to be taken which are indispensable for enabling the Community to face a situation whose gravity is a secret for no one.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Artzinger to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Artzinger.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Christian-Demo-

cratic Group I should like to begin by warmly thanking Mr Bousch for his motion for a resolution and for the hard work he has put into it. I can state straight away that this resolution has the support of my group.

The background to this motion for a resolution is provided by the guidelines for the economic policy for the year 1974, revised but not as yet adopted, on which I should like to dwell for a moment. These guidelines differentiate between the two groups of countries which have unfortunately crystallized in our Community—namely, those countries that are suffering from a pronounced imbalance in their external payments and those which are not, or are not yet, in this position.

During the discussion which took place on 15 May in Luxembourg, Mr Haferkamp took the view that the committee was obviously overlooking the need to distinguish between the various countries and their economic situations. Without wishing to anticipate anything that the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs may wish to say, I may state that the committee has never overlooked this need. It goes without saying that we must begin by analysing the situation of each individual country and then assess it accordingly. There was never any doubt about this in the committee. The only question was whether the Commission could make more effective proposals for achieving greater convergence of the various national economies. That alone was our concern.

We hope that the new practice will be followed which has been made possible by the proposal, adopted by the Council on 18 February, to work for a greater degree of convergence. We are glad to see that the guidelines envisage not only resolutions but decisions by the Council. We hope that this will give greater effectiveness to the Commissions in the sphere of economic policy.

We are grateful that the Commission is not attempting to solve balance-of-payments difficulties by asking the Federal Republic to change its practice in the sphere of economic policy. Such a course is not inconceivable. In view of the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany achieved a surplus of about 18,000 million DM in the first four months of this year, one might well be prompted to consider whether this fact could not be used to help restore the balance of payments.

One of the classical methods of restoring the balance of payments is to change the monetary parity; and there are in fact those who would urge the Federal Republic to revalue its currency once again. Here I should like to quote

**Artzinger**

a few figures. The experience of the last few years makes it appear doubtful that this classical method would still be effective. Since its last revaluation, the value of the D-Mark has increased within 12 months by 20% in relation to the pound Sterling, by 23.5% in relation to the French franc and by 30% in relation to the Italian lira. Notwithstanding this, exports to Italy have increased by 36%, to Great Britain by 28% and to France by 23%.

From this it is evident that trade can no longer exclusively or even mainly be controlled by monetary parities. The question of revaluing the D-Mark once more should therefore be dropped, for it would be without effect.

The alternative would be to inflate the D-Mark at perhaps a moderate rate in order to keep step with the other partners.

But with floating rates of exchange this would tend to lead to a devaluation of the D-Mark and so also fail to achieve the desired effect; for a reduction in the value of the D-Mark would lead to a further and even greater foreign trade surplus than before.

In my view, therefore, the Commission was well advised to leave these questions well alone in the revised guidelines and to direct all member countries on to the road of stability. In the end that is, indeed, the only possible solution.

I am also grateful to the Commission for stressing that in all the Western countries there is a pronounced fall in the rate of economic growth. This, in connection with the worsening of the terms of trade, will mean losses in non-monetary terms which economic policy will have to take account of. For a while, of course, this can be countered by means of loans, but in real-value terms the situation is that the losses occur today and will inevitably make themselves felt later. The later this is, the more difficult it will be. We are all, I think, aware that if it is not to become too difficult credit machinery will be required. But we must be clear in our minds about what is going on in real-value terms behind the veil of monetary calculations.

All these matters are only dealt with very much in passing in the motion for a resolution we are now considering. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs will doubtless present the House with further details on the situation with regard to economic policy. For the moment, however, we take the view that the important thing is not to undertake a review of this entire situation but to concentrate our attention on the central point, which concerns the institutions. For this reason, the motion for a resolution points unambiguously to the need for making a

start at long last with the institutional reforms. We shall not achieve a real equilibrium, a harmonization of economic policy, until the Commission is given more prerogatives than it has at the moment. We are grateful to the rapporteur and to the committee for making this point the essential feature of the motion for a resolution. Our view accords, we consider, with that put forward in Luxembourg by Vice-President Haferkamp when he said that what we had to do was not to analyse isolated questions but to bring out clearly the fundamental problem in this crisis. In view of the symptoms of disintegration which, in our view, have by no means been removed as yet, we consider that the essential thing now is *to strengthen the political link between Member States. This political link can only be the Commission.* In our view, therefore, with the situation as it is, the present motion for a resolution hits the nail on the head.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, we are glad that Mr Bousch, as rapporteur, has explained the motives of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in putting forward this motion for a resolution. Otherwise, the House might have expected to be debating the present economic situation. That we did four weeks ago in Luxembourg, albeit in the absence of the German Members, who at that time had to elect their Federal president. However that might be, it has been done.

In the Socialist Group's view, too, it is only right to point out the Community's present weaknesses and to offer no more than a cautious welcome to the developments of the last few weeks at two meetings of the Council, the meeting of foreign ministers and that of ministers of finance. Even if in the Member States the view is spreading that one country on its own can no longer escape any difficulties without the help of the others, I am by no means convinced that the corollary to this, namely, that problems must be solved in common on a Community basis, is also gaining ground. If any attempt to do this is announced, then deeds must follow words. And until this happens, the Socialist Group is not prepared, in an official resolution of this Parliament, to acknowledge that the Council is developing the political resolve in certain matters to set a Community course.

For this reason we are also unable to give our support to the amendment tabled by Mr Kirk and Lord Reay on behalf of the European Con-

**Lange**

servative Group. This amendment would signify a complete reversal of the tendency which is expressed in the motion for a resolution of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and which is reaffirmed by the Socialist Group. This reversal would mean that we were acknowledging the Council's political resolve to achieve better things. By agreeing to this, we should be binding the Commission to its present position, despite the fact that we attach importance to appropriate structural changes; that is to say, we should be denying the Commission all additional means of taking those measures which are absolutely necessary *vis-à-vis* the Member States. However strict may be the stability measures which they have taken, the Member States must not ignore the consultations to which they have committed themselves through decisions of the Council. Measures to cope with, for example, employment problems or welfare problems, however well meant they may be, would only lead to difficulties in other Member countries of the Community if they were carried out in each state in isolation and not brought into line with Community policy, even if the Commission approved them subsequently—which is not what I should call 'co-ordinated with Community policy'. Such measures would not only create additional employment and welfare problems in other Member States, but would aggravate problems in the Community as a whole.

In our view, therefore, the Member States must be prepared without any qualification to give the Commission, as the quasi-executive, *via* the Council, the powers necessary to enforce the application of a decision—as is now proposed in the Council with regard to these revised guidelines.

We have in the Community one member who is healthy (although it is, of course, disputable what health is; at any rate this member is healthy in comparison with those that are sick); that is, we have at least one that is a complete exception in relation to the rest. In addition, there are another two or three member countries which are in a similar condition but which are encountering certain difficulties, in particular with regard to employment. For the rest, the state of affairs is often wretched.

The individual member countries must now, of course, summon up the courage to take certain measures on their own account which can then be supplemented by appropriate measures by the Community. We are, after all, more or less committed to this kind of solidarity. And this solidarity means that those who are in a position to do so must give the stragglers a helping hand—that is, they must try to alleviate balance-of-

payments and monetary problems with appropriate credits. It is, however, doubtful whether these problems can be solved before we reach an international agreement in this sphere, since the prices of primary commodities lie beyond the control of the Community and of the industrialized nations.

Community measures must therefore be supplemented by an international agreement. For the rest, only the lending of gold reserves might temporarily help to overcome certain difficulties and alleviate the accompanying welfare and employment problems.

I am in complete sympathy with the standpoint of the trade unions active in the Community, namely, that stability must not be achieved at the expense of the masses of small and medium wage-earners but must be based for the most part on the contribution of those with the necessary strength and resources. But if such a stability policy is pursued, one must appreciate that, however courageous a domestic-policy measure it may be in the eyes of the Vice-President, it may have an injurious effect on employment and public welfare in the other countries, whose products, so far as trade within the Community is concerned, would be put to a disadvantage.

This means that the Community—in this case, the Commission—when assessing the measures taken by individual states must, in my view and that of my group, pay especial attention to the effects of these measures on employment and inflation in other parts of the Community. If such courageous steps are taken in one country, this may be acceptable provided that comparable courageous steps are also taken in the other countries.

What I want to say, ladies and gentlemen, is that it is urgently necessary to get away from isolated attempts to cope with grave economic problems. The Community must act in concert, although naturally the measures to be taken must be specified and specialized because of the different course of developments in each country of the Community. That is quite clear. And these measures must be such that no further negative effects occur. That is the essential thing.

If that were achieved, we should have made some real progress; and I should like to hope that the gleam of light generated by the Council will grow into a flame, a lamp to light the Europeans' way back to integration and unity. When this happens, we shall be delighted to give the Council and also the governments of the Member States credit for it.

In these revised guidelines, the Commission has, of course, also made some observations con-



**Lange**

cerning economic measures necessary in the medium term, that is, restructuring or structural policy; and these ideas the Commission will then be in a position to apply in practice. When it does that, it can count on the support of this Parliament and of the Socialist Group.

But apart from constantly stressing certain necessities, it is high time for the Commission to put up stronger resistance to the egoism of national states than has been apparent in the last few months. Vice-President Haferkamp has, I am sure, said a few plain words; but the attitude of the Commission as a whole towards the Council has not appeared to give these words the necessary emphasis.

In this sense the Commission itself must have the will to extricate itself from the position imposed on it by the Council and by developments in the Council and take up the position which is its by right, which is permitted by the Treaties and which we for our part wish to strengthen in the interest of the quasi-executive, in order that we may cope with the Community's economic and social problems, put a stop to its disintegration and resume the road to integration. For none of the European countries in the Community is in a position to live outside the Community; they all depend on one another. *(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Sir Brandon Rhys Williams to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Sir Brandon Rhys Williams.** — In rising to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group, I am not personally proposing the amendment which appears in the names of some of my colleagues, but I wish to give my general support to the motion for a resolution which has been put before us by our friend Mr Bousch.

Since I have had the honour to be a Member of this Parliament, and indeed when I was a member of the Council of Europe for some years before that, the major preoccupation of all our debates on economic affairs has been with inflation. While inflation was proceeding in some countries at the rate of 2 or 3% and in others at perhaps 4 or 5%, the differences which were apparent in the values of our currencies in the Community were not such as to create incurable headaches for the national political and banking authorities.

Now, however, inflation is proceeding in some parts of the Community at rates so wild—and indeed at rates which are unacceptable in all parts of the Community—that it is endangering the whole concept of an economic community.

We are losing all confidence in money and all certainty of the direction in which our economy is tending. The whole structure of our relationships is endangered. Perhaps it is unwise to go as far as to say, as Mr Bousch does in paragraph 4 of his motion for a resolution, that a 'process of disintegration' is visible. But certainly we are going through a time of rapid change, and we must all stress the urgency of the situation.

As we approach midsummer, many people are making plans for their holidays. Perhaps some colleagues may feel they can safely go away when they have made their speeches and that we can resume our discussions on the economic situation in due course after the holidays, imagining that perhaps things will not have changed too much. But events are now taking charge and we have no time to lose. We must not allow our governments or central banks to think they can work their way through the coming weeks in profitless exchanges, in the expectation that the situation will still be much the same when we come back in the autumn. The crisis is gathering, and politicians, bankers and members of executives throughout the Community—and indeed throughout the Western world—have an urgent responsibility to work together to find solutions and above all to restore confidence to the business community.

There are many reasons why this year is a year of monetary crisis. They include the break-up of the 'snake', when finally France was obliged to withdraw from the arrangement, and the oil crisis and its consequences for the Eurodollar market. The fact is that the Arabs are now drawing much more money from the Community and the West as a whole, and while this money is indeed being returned, it is not being returned in the form that we all want; for it is coming back as floods of money for short-term investment, when what we need are reliable funds on which we can depend for long-term development. Then we have crises in the developing countries, particularly India. Goodness knows how India is to maintain her present rate of development and trade with the industrial countries.

Similarly, all of us, not only our Italian friends, are concerned about the crisis which has blown up over the Italian balance of payments and the measures which the Italian Government has felt it necessary to impose.

All over the world we read of markets in doubt and of governments anxious to restrict imports and expand their exports. All these sums do not add up. There must be some hope, perhaps, of a relief in the form of a fall in commodity prices as a result of the lessening rate of activity

**Rhys Williams**

in the Western world; and some signs of this have been seen. But a fall in commodity prices, even if it affects oil prices, which is not impossible, will not be a real relief, because, when people have less money to spend, we have less capacity to sell goods to them, and we all suffer in the end.

What does the Western world do? Yesterday Mr Kenneth Rush, newly appointed as Economic Counsellor to the American President, made an important speech explaining his policy. It is summarized quite well today in a phrase which I will take from him: 'We will fight the inflation on monetary and fiscal lines, no matter how long it takes.'

This is a statement of bull-headed determination. I wonder if it is really wise. Monetary restraint, when it is taken to the point that we see at present, with record interest rates beyond the expectations of even the most prudent bankers and economic forecasters two or three years ago, is breaking our monetary institutions and destroying confidence without curbing the inflation, which is still going on at an insane rate.

We shall serve no purpose if we destroy our monetary institutions by using the monetary weapon too far and too hard. If interest rates are pushed up still further by the action of the American authorities, they will bring disaster to themselves and to the Western world.

As to fiscal restraints, of course we believe that governments should, in general, balance their budgets and that governments must not act irresponsibly to create volumes of money without any corresponding growth in production. However, strong fiscal restraint can work against the whole object of a capitalist economy, because it limits markets, cuts consumption, reduces the will to invest, and takes away the profit from investment.

What else is the Western world to do? This week the International Monetary Fund is having one of its final meetings of the Group of Twenty, preparatory to its great conference which is to take place in October. It is a tragic irony that, after years of work to replace gold as the centre of the monetary system with the SDRs—the new paper gold, as they are sometimes called—in the very week that the Group of Twenty is coming together to put the final touches to its arrangements to launch SDRs as the solution of the world's monetary problems, the Group of Ten has to decide that gold must be brought back, because loss of confidence in paper currencies has gone so far that gold reserves must be mobilized once again to help meet the crisis.

This is not a very happy augury for the SDR, which is the quintessence of a paper currency. It is a paper currency related in value by a most complicated formula to all the other paper currencies of the leading trading countries. If we have lost confidence in those paper currencies, what confidence can we have in the new SDR?

I am afraid I cannot at this moment look to the International Monetary Fund to solve our problems. Europe must take positive action on its own account to restore confidence. We must take the lead in the gathering crisis. No individual country can solve its problems in the West. No individual central bank can set a course which will protect its people altogether from the consequences of the break-down of confidence.

We see that the Japanese are now in deep recession. I am not too confident that even the United States—the world's giant economy—will be able to solve its problems simply on its own.

One thinks here of Germany, which has had this marvellous triumph since the war and has emerged as the capitalist economy *par excellence*; yet Germany, too, must be in danger through its enormous dependence on exports stability if the other Community countries, Japan, the United States, the developing countries—all the markets for German goods—are having to close because of the shortage of the wherewithal to pay. No individual country in Europe can act on its own. We must act together as Mr Lange said in his very pertinent remarks at this point.

There are many points on which one could make specific recommendations. I will touch on them only very briefly. We must settle the gold price question, at any rate by a formula which will apply in the Community. There must be no further uncertainty and doubt about the question of the gold price, at any rate where inter-bank relationships are concerned.

Next, we must act together in bringing some sort of order and regulation to the Eurodollar market. I know that British opinion has been particularly hostile in the past to any idea of intervention in the absolute freedom of the Eurodollar market; but now I think the time has come when we have to recognize that central banks should apply some code of practice in the interests of all the institutions that are working in that sphere.

We are, I think, right to have a concerted policy for our trade with the OPEC countries—what might be called the Euro-Arab dialogue. Perhaps we should try to encourage the oil-exporting countries to think more in terms of

**Rhys Williams**

purchasing goods and services of the sort we can supply, rather than looking for short-term investments in our money markets. I should like to see 100 dozen Gezira schemes being launched by our industries in the Middle East. The sheikhs should be buying goods and services, not stocks and shares.

In particular we must look again towards institutional development in the Community. Here I wish to place especial emphasis on paragraph 3 of Mr Bousch's motion for a resolution, where he states that we consider that 'the solution to the grave economic problems facing the Community requires the establishment of more effective Community decision-making structures in economic and monetary matters'. I want to give that my warmest support.

I have often in the past spoken about the development of the European Fund for Monetary Cooperation and the European Investment Bank, and I think it is not necessary for me to say again how important a future there is for those bodies if we act together and make use of what we have already done in setting them up. These institutions, if they are to exercise real authority in the Community, must work transparently. Their authority must be based on democratic consent.

The European voter, the European worker and the European consumer are all the same person, and what we as politicians have to do is to reconcile the apparent conflicts which have grown up between consumers, workers and voters. We must show that there is one common interest for us all, and these institutions which we have set up must reconcile all these conflicts in an open way.

I believe it is part of history that worker participation has come to the fore in the Community just at this time as a subject for active political study. We must reconcile universal suffrage with economic realities. It is a political problem that we face, because much of our inflation is due not to monetary mismanagement or fiscal extravagance but to the fact that the trade unions are working to give effect to the 'revolution of rising expectations.' We have not taught our trade unions to act within the framework of what is required for a stable, developing European economy. This is a political problem, and as politicians it is up to us to solve it.

As Mr Lange said, we all depend now on each other. At all costs we must stay together in the boat as the storms threaten. We have built this boat for ourselves: let us stay in it and let us not delude ourselves that we can jump into the water and swim to land when in fact there is no land in sight.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Leonardi.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as the rapporteur has already pointed out, this is nothing but a continuation of the debate held in Luxembourg on the same subject, and so we have no alternative but to repeat briefly what we have already said.

In our view, the present crisis springs from the very principles which lie at the foundation of our Community, which today is no longer capable of fulfilling the objective need for the integration of the Member States. The problem we have to tackle is therefore one of radical reform and not of getting old mechanisms to work again.

After passing through an easy period of development favoured by external forces such as the low price of energy, our Community is no longer capable of controlling the very forces it has set in motion, as may be seen from the typical case of energy. Hence it is no longer in a position to control the forces of disintegration, which are becoming increasingly marked and which are based on the structural differences between our countries.

The economic reactions of member countries are simply the outward expression of profound differences regarding which the Community has neither the political resolve nor the means to intervene; and unfortunately the individual countries, at any rate the weaker ones, do not have this resolve either. As regards Italy, for example, I would not say that it was impossible, but certainly it is difficult to deal simultaneously with problems of restructuring and those concerning the pronounced imbalance of payments due to the deterioration in the exchange situation, which weigh on her particularly heavily; she therefore needs assistance from outside, and this is either not possible or at least possible only on conditions which a large part of the Italian population, including my party, could not accept.

The situation is extremely difficult, and we drew attention to this in Luxembourg when speaking of the recent measures taken by the Italian Government—which, incidentally, we are far from wishing to defend, since we consider it singularly unfitted to conduct our country's affairs. The fundamental problems remain. Thus, our country, though it is the poorest of all in the Community, is a net contributor to the one common policy which the Community has actually applied, that is to say, the Common Agricultural Policy; it is the country most exposed to the regional differences which ever since the creation of our Community have defied

**Leonardi**

all attempts at diminishing them, thus retaining unchanged a relationship of five to one.

In Luxembourg, I recalled in this connection that the average yield of Lombardy, the richest region of Italy, is lower than the average yield for the Community as a whole. Moreover, Italy, as the poorest country, has need of more powerful investments than the rest, whereas in fact it registers a smaller rate of investment; and, unfortunately, this is a process which is tending not to resolve itself, but, on the contrary, to become aggravated. In this situation—I could cite other cases of this kind—the impossibility, already demonstrated, of drawing up common policies capable of controlling the structural differences which are constantly increasing is the real reason for the crisis in which we now find ourselves. Hence, as I said in Luxembourg, it is not true to say that the Community is encountering difficulties in recovering itself and pursuing its own construction because the national governments are unstable; on the contrary, the governments are unstable because they have failed to find the solution to their national problems at the Community level. And since these national problems are not soluble at the national level and a Community solution is also wanting, all our countries have unstable governments, that is, structurally unstable. This problem concerns rich and poor alike. Consequently, our criticism is radical, as it has always been in moments of crisis. On the other hand, we are as anxious as ever to try and help meet these objective prerequisites for the integration of our countries, the lack of which means the Community's inability to acquire any identity *vis-à-vis* the outside world or to tackle the great problems which are now presenting themselves on a world-wide scale.

In order to achieve this fundamental examination, we have on several occasions called for collaboration between the Parliament and the Commission. It seems to me that Mr Bousch, in paragraph 5 of his motion for a resolution, demands something of this kind. It must be stressed that these demands of ours have never been satisfied, as a result of which the Commission will now have to undertake this examination at least as regards Great Britain, that is, as regards the enlargement of the Community. If this examination is undertaken, it will reveal the necessity of extending it to the whole of the Community in order to see what has been achieved and what can still be done.

In these circumstances, we cannot accept the motion for a resolution, which, in the ultimate analysis, calls for more efficient Community structures and decisions and for the taking of steps at institutional level which will make it possible to guarantee the normal operation and

development of the Common Market, as if it were a matter of returning to the Golden Age, as if it were a matter of solving a problem of efficiency. In fact, the problem is not one of efficiency but a profoundly political problem which demands a great effort of political will by, among others, those who in the past have contributed little or nothing—or have even been opposed—to the construction of the Community.

The moment has come to ensure that all the popular forces can participate in this construction; but to this end we shall have to reexamine the very principles on which the Community has been built up in order, on this basis, to reform the institutions and set in motion a process of integration corresponding to the objective need for such integration.

We fail to find any trace of this approach in the motion for a resolution under discussion. But we are convinced that it will come one day. Let us hope, therefore, that it will come as soon as possible in order that we may avoid the damage that every delay entails; but let us not imagine that it will come as a result of resolutions like the present one. We are therefore opposed to this motion, which we consider totally inadequate to the gravely critical situation in which we find ourselves.

**President.** — I call Mr Borschette.

**Mr Borschette, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission wishes to express its thanks to the Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and to its rapporteur Mr Bousch, for taking the initiative in tabling this motion for a resolution. In the Commission's view, it comes as a warning in the face of the Community's stagnation and the paralysis of its decision-making institutions, in particular the Council.

Permit me first of all to give you one or two details concerning the meeting held by the Council at Luxembourg on 6 June. On this occasion, the Council approved the draft decision adjusting the economic policy guidelines for 1974: I say 'draft decision', and Mr Artzinger is right in emphasizing that we are now concerned with Council decisions and no longer with recommendations.

Secondly, as regards the programme of urgent measures on which Mr Bousch commented very briefly, the Council has agreed to the draft timetable submitted to it by the Commission. On the other hand, it has obviously not yet expressed any opinion on the fundamental proposals which the Commission has yet to submit to it and which will concern, in particular, the recycling of capital and the concerted floating of currencies.

**Borschette**

Generally speaking, the atmosphere at this Council meeting showed an improvement: the approach shown was a more positive one. But, as Mr Lange remarked just now, from the creation of an appropriate atmosphere to action and the taking of decisions is a big step, and this step has not yet been taken.

The Commission gives the motion for a resolution its support and shares the recommendations contained in it.

Finally, I should like to say to Mr Lange that, in this sphere as in others, the Commission makes the proposals that are incumbent on it and not those demanded by the Member States.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Borschette.

I call Mr Bousch.

**Mr Bousch, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking all those colleagues who have taken part in this debate, in particular Mr Artzinger and Mr Lange, who have been kind enough to give the motion their support. I should like to tell Sir Brandon Rhys Williams that I am gratified to find that although he began by expressing some reservations as to the initial text he is in a position to subscribe to it in its essential features. Whatever reservations Mr Leonardi may have, a very large majority of the House appears to be in favour of adopting this text.

Mr Borschette has corroborated the analysis I gave when introducing the motion. He confirmed that some progress had been made, that the atmosphere had improved. These welcome facts must be noted; but, as the Commissioner said, from establishing an atmosphere of good intentions to taking action is a big step. And that is why, while noting this improvement in the atmosphere, this declared intention to halt the disintegration of the Community and to find a means of achieving further progress, we cannot agree to drop this motion for a resolution. That would be tantamount to saying that the aim had already been achieved. In fact, it has not been achieved, although we are aware that it is not always easy to achieve one's aims.

And so I would ask the House to accept the motion for a resolution as it has been tabled.

As for the amendment tabled by Mr Kirk and Lord Reay on behalf of the European Conservative Group, I share the feeling of gratification at the positive developments recorded during recent Council meetings. But I do not think that this would justify any omission on our part to encourage the Commission to go beyond the strict limits of its powers and submit proposals

opening up the possibility of further developments in the Community. If we were to ask the Commission to confine itself strictly to its terms of reference, this would mean that it could no longer take the lead. While admitting that we share the sentiments expressed, I would therefore ask our honourable colleagues from the European Conservative Group to withdraw their amendment and leave the motion as it stands.

If after a while we find that the good intentions noted are being carried into effect, the Parliament can take note of the fact and draw the attention of public opinion to it. But for the moment let us abide by the very firm decisions we have taken in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and give our support to the Commission in order that it may press ahead.

In this spirit, Mr President, I ask the House to adopt this motion in the form in which it has been submitted.

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak? The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

On the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3, I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put these texts to the vote.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3 are adopted.

On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Kirk and Lord Reay on behalf of the European Conservative Group and worded as follows:

'Paragraph 4

This paragraph should read as follows:

"4. While welcoming the more positive developments in recent meetings of the Council, nevertheless requests

(a) the Commission to take all the steps within its competence to assist in the restoration of the normal operation and development of the Community;

(b) the Council and the Governments of the Member States to support, in a Community spirit, any action taken by the Commission in this sector;"'

I call Lord Reay to move this amendment.

**Lord Reay.** — There is an anomaly, which perhaps I should explain, in my moving this amendment as a member of the committee which is recommending the resolution to this House.

**Lord Reay**

In the committee I raised objection to the original draft resolution presented by Mr Bousch on the ground that it was out of date in the sense that it paid no regard to various political developments that had taken place in the Community since the imposition of the Italian import measures. I had in mind the subsequent co-operation of the Italian authorities with the Commission, the alleviation of their original scheme in the beef sector, the highly important and perhaps historic change brought about by the change of governments in Germany and France—particularly in France—and the markedly more constructive approach by the British Foreign Secretary in Luxembourg on 4 June. I considered that it was wrong for Parliament to pass resolutions which ignored the possibilities of a change in climate indicated by these events.

There was some support for this view in the committee. One distinguished member of the Socialist Group proposed an additional paragraph acknowledging and welcoming the change in approach that had been shown at the latest Council meetings. In turn, I supported that proposal.

Mr Bousch, after listening to and taking account of the various opinions expressed—not all in the same sense—produced with remarkable speed and virtuosity an extempore revision of the motion for a resolution which met a number of the points raised, although it fell short of making an explicit reference to more favourable developments in the Council. As this matter was debated in our committee on 6 June, we were at that time unable to take account of events in subsequent Council meetings, particularly the Council meeting on economic and financial matters on 6 June, which in some quarters has been described as marking a turning-point.

For this reason, and on hearing and reading subsequent criticisms of the resolution as it stands, I believe that, even if it would have been a mistake then to include a reference to more favourable developments, it would be a mistake not to do so now. I appreciate that Mr Bousch has done this in his speech, but I think that we should do it in the resolution itself.

This Parliament needs to be, and needs to show itself to be, responsive to Community events. I suggest that it should provide a sensitive reflection of the sum of Community opinion at any given moment to those national elements looking to find out what Community opinion is. If this Parliament ploughs on expressing its impatience and issuing its warnings without regard to subtle changes in the political climate, then in the end even those warnings will lose their value.

This amendment keeps most of the substance of paragraph 4(a) in the original motion for a resolution and leaves paragraph 4(b) unchanged, but by its introductory clause, and by omitting the words 'the process of disintegration', which in this context suggest that the process is still continuing, we have tried to introduce some recognition of the recent more positive developments without destroying Mr Bousch's basic intention.

It would not be right to say that the effect of our amendment is to limit the scope of the Commission's activities. We have left out the words 'at institutional level', not for reasons of principle but because we do not understand what was meant by them. We have changed the term 'Common Market' into 'Community' because we see no reason why the word 'Community' used in the first paragraph should not be used in this one.

We hope this amendment will be supported by this House. We are not asserting that the Community has now readopted the path of unity and progress. I would suggest in reply to Mr Lange that the amendment does not represent a reversal of the opinion and attitudes that this Parliament has taken before.

We are asking simply for a suspension of unrelieved criticism of the state and direction of the Community in order to give a chance for this change of climate to prove itself to be a turn of the tide. We believe that in this attitude we reflect a majority of feeling in the Community and we hope also in this House.

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, by way of continuing the account of developments in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I should like to tell Lord Reay that we agreed in committee that during the debate the groups should assess the results of the meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers and the Council of Ministers of Finance, since, on the basis of the experience that we have had with Council decisions and agreements, it was clear to all of us that, to put it in the terms of the proverb, one shouldn't count one's chickens before they are hatched.

I should much prefer it if we knew now that the governments of Member States were acting as desired, and the agreement we came to was that, when this so happens, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs would recognize the fact without qualification. For the moment,

**Lange**

however, no one in all conscience could claim that the process of disintegration which has been going on has been halted as a result of these Council meetings.

To that extent the formulation, as it stands in the German text at any rate, is quite correct. We accord, as I have already said, a cautious welcome to the signs of goodwill which the Council has given at its two meetings. It would be foolish on our part—and this we should be forced to admit afterwards—to think that developments in the Community had already reached a turning-point.

Not only that, Lord Reay; the central feature of the paragraph is, in your version, totally unsatisfactory, and this has already been pointed out by Mr Bousch. You would leave the Commission no more than its present terms of reference, whereas we in fact want to extend these terms of reference. It was these two considerations that prompted the committee not to incorporate either your own views or those of Mr Schachtschabel, who wanted to meet you half-way, in the motion for a resolution but to leave them to be presented orally in plenary sitting.

Since you have remarked that Mr Bousch revised his text with remarkable virtuosity, I must break a lance for Mr Bousch and repeat what I have already said in committee. Before we began the discussion on his motion for a resolution, Mr Bousch submitted a revised version to the chairman, and because of the shortage of time this could not be made available to the other members before the discussion began. This revised version was therefore a result, not of the discussion, but of conclusions which Mr Bousch had drawn from the current situation.

I want to resist the false impression that Mr Bousch made use of a pretext to indulge in unfair practices. That is not the case. The matter was dealt with in all fairness and frankness before this item on the agenda was reached. I have also informed other members of the committee of this. It is, of course, quite possible that during the discussion not everything came over in the course of interpretation. But I would sincerely ask you, Lord Reay, to accept this account of the matter as correct.

**President.** — I call Mr Borschette.

**Mr Borschette, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, I should like to add a word on the subject of the Commission's rôle in this affair.

If the Commission is to assume the rôle which this Parliament—including, if I am not mistaken,

the European Conservative Group—would wish to give it, I fail to see how one can say that the Commission should take all the steps within its competence. We are here moving in a sphere which essentially is not totally outside the Treaties but a stage further than the Treaties. To confine the Commission to the rôle attributed to it by the Treaties would be to impose a singular limit on its mission.

I would therefore ask the European Conservative Group to delete this phrase.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Borschette.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Bousch, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, I have nothing to add to the remarks made by Mr Lange. They have been corroborated by Mr Borschette, who would like to see the Commission encouraged by this text to go beyond the limits allowed by a strict interpretation of its terms of reference.

I am opposed to any modification of the proposed text. As for noting the progress that has been made, this has been done and I have taken it into account. I am obliged to Mr Chairman Lange for confirming this. I have taken account of developments occurring between the moment when the text of the motion was drawn up and the beginning of the discussion in committee, and have adapted the wording accordingly.

In my oral introduction, I complied with the wish expressed by our committee and referred to last week's meeting of the Council of Ministers, paying tribute to the steps that had been taken and to their authors.

In my view, this introduction to our debate should be capable of satisfying the European Conservative Group. Any attempt to clarify our attitude further by means of an amendment to the proposed text appears to me superfluous.

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — Mr President, I think that Lord Reay and I were quite justified in tabling this amendment to draw attention to important events that have taken place of which necessarily the committee could not be aware at the time it drafted its resolution. It is equally clear that we shall not be able to agree this morning on a text satisfactory to everyone. However, I think that we have made the point sufficiently and, in the light of what the Commissioner has said, I beg to ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

**President.** — Amendment No 1 is accordingly withdrawn.

I put paragraph 4 to the vote.

Paragraph 4 is adopted.

On paragraphs 5 to 8, I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put these texts to the vote.

Paragraphs 5 to 8 are adopted.

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution as a whole is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

### 3. Membership of committees

**President.** — I have received from the Christian-Democratic Group a request for the appointment of

- Mr Vandewiele as member of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, the Committee on External Economic Relations and the Delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Greece Association;
- Mr De Keersmaecker as member of the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on Agriculture;
- Mr Deschamps as member of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth and the Parliamentary Conference of the EEC-AASM Association;
- Mr Van der Sanden as member of the Parliamentary Conference of the EEC-AASM Association to replace Mr Jahn.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

### 4. Oral Question with debate: European Technological cooperation in specific industrial sectors

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is Oral Question, with debate, by Lord Bessborough on behalf of the European Conservative Group to the Commission of the European Communities on European technological cooperation in specific industrial sectors (Doc. 11/74).

The question is worded as follows:

The Commission is asked what progress has been made in increasing European technological cooperation in specific industrial sectors (apart from the Commission's computer programme) since the publication of the Spinelli and Dahrendorf reports of 7 May 1973 and 25 July 1973 and the resolutions adopted in the part-session on 15 November 1973 on the Flämig and Bessborough reports.<sup>1</sup>

I call Lord Bessborough to speak to this question.

**Lord Bessborough.** — Mr President, I am very glad to have the opportunity of asking this question today and I greatly appreciate the courtesy of the Commissioner in coming to answer it.

As you will recall, when we had our earlier debate last November on reports by Mr Flämig and myself we started very late in the evening—so late, indeed, that Mr Dahrendorf quoted Hegel in saying that the owl of Minerva begins to fly only when dusk falls. I am glad that on this occasion we have, if not a dawn chorus, at least a few day birds in the air.

Ideally, in line with Mr Flämig's suggestion last November, we should have separate debates on the different industrial sectors, but we all know how pressed we are for parliamentary time. Hence I raise this omnibus question.

I want to say at the outset how glad I am to know that two of the recommendations which I made in my report in November have been implemented—that is, the Commission has now completed its first inventory of research and development resources within the Community, and the Federation of European Industrial Cooperative Research Organizations has also been established. I am certain, too, that the Commission must have been giving considerable thought to the whole question of priorities.

Meanwhile, I shall be particularly interested to know what progress has been made at meetings of the new European Committee on Research and Development—ECRD, as it is called. It seems to me that, whatever political and economic difficulties the Community may be facing today, that is no reason why we should not press ahead with our aim of achieving closer concertation of our scientific, technological and industrial efforts in order to develop the so-called single industrial base of which we have all spoken, especially Commissioner Spinelli.

For example, I hope that the Commissioner can tell us to what extent development contracts

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 108, 10 December 1973, pp. 58 and 60.



**Lord Bessborough**

have been used by the Commission and also—if I am not overloading him—to what extent the Commission proposals relating to aerospace, mechanical and electronic engineering equipment, and the textile and paper industries have progressed.

As I say, I do not want to place too great a burden upon the Commissioner, but if he is also able to say anything regarding technological cooperation in rail transport and telecommunications I am sure that we shall listen to him with interest.

I recognize that the responsibility for such cooperation must rest largely with the firms themselves and the nationalized industries concerned, but I think that the Commission has a rôle to play in encouraging and facilitating this cooperation.

I have left out shipbuilding from the list, since I hope that we shall be having a separate discussion on that subject. I have also left out data-processing, because I hope that we shall have a separate debate on the Commission's proposals regarding a data-processing policy for the Community. I am omitting any reference to uranium enrichment, a question which we have debated so often in the past.

One subject in which I am especially interested and to which I referred in my speech last November is underwater technology, particularly the possibility of Community funds being made available for more advanced underwater research on oil drilling in much deeper waters than has so far been done. The cost of this research and development will be so heavy that I think there is a good case for its being shared by Member States. I hope that the Commission have been giving this matter serious thought and that some kind of cooperative project will be launched. I know that it has some influential support.

Lastly I wish to refer to the Joint Research Centre at Ispra, which certain colleagues and I visited quite recently. The Commissioner probably knows that several members of our committee are very much concerned at the unhappy situation there. We all hope that the new Director, Mr Dinkspeiler, will be able to solve some of the serious staffing problems which have arisen.

I must admit that the somewhat unhappy history of this Research Centre has made me feel that Community research can be undertaken more effectively in recognized national research establishments within Member States than by multinational centres, that is to say, by so-called 'indirect action' programmes such as the Com-

munity's thermo-nuclear fusion programme. In this way, Community funds go to support recognized national establishments which acknowledge that the Commission can play a useful informative and coordinating role in ensuring that there is no undue overlapping or duplication of research effort. The fusion programme seems to me to be the model on which R and D programmes in other disciplines and industrial sectors might be based.

However, I should be misleading Parliament if I did not confess that some of my friends consider that the Joint Research Centre should be closed down altogether, as it will be spending over the four-year period 1973-77 some 250 million units of account—£100 million—to what seems little effect and employing some 2,000 persons in all four establishments. I realize that other countries may well not agree to that, and I recognize the existence of the Euratom Treaty. However, I am glad to note that certain programmes have been closed down, such as the Ispra No 1 reactor and other somewhat esoteric pieces of research, including the waste-processing and storage work on self-burying capsules.

Perhaps Petten presents even graver problems. It seems to me questionable whether Petten, another of the four establishments, should continue its work on the Customs Chemical Laboratory, even if one might accept its work on coal.

Above all, we would strongly endorse what has been the French attitude—which, I would judge, is very much ours also and that of other countries—that research programmes should be for clearly identifiable customers.

I recognize that there may be a case for saying that the JRC has done good work on nuclear safeguards and on hydrogen research, but this is not enough. A great deal of hard thinking about the future of these establishments still needs to be done.

I am glad that qualified experts from Member States, including Britain, have been paying a series of visits to the four establishments and that, in the case of nuclear safeguards, experts from Ispra have been studying advanced research work which has been undertaken in Member States, and especially at Harwell.

I am also glad to learn—and I believe this was very much a British initiative taken after we entered the Community—that the principle of an annual review of the work would be accepted. This was an important decision.

While I hope that some of the JRC's problems will be resolved, I cannot conceal my disquiet,

**Lord Bessborough**

especially about morale at Ispra. This is largely due to fears of redundancy. I have thought a great deal about this matter, and my feeling is that the only option open to governments and the Centre at present is to keep staff membership at or, preferably, below the levels agreed in 1973, while accepting that there will be a reduction on some programmes if, very reluctantly, there is an increase on certain others.

I am not happy about the situation, and I look forward to the Commissioner's comments. I am grateful to him for attending this debate.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Mr President, after thanking Lord Bessborough for his question, I shall reply in the first place to points raised in connection with research policy, for which my colleague Mr Dahrendorf is responsible. The ECRD (European Committee on Research and Development) has had five meetings since it was set up. During these meetings, it examined in particular research proposals drawn up by the Commission in the spheres of data-processing, medical science, energy, primary resources and long-term forecasts.

For research into energy, this committee has set up a subgroup, which has drawn up a 'first programme of research and development' for the European Community in the sector of energy. Another sub-group has examined the Commission's project 'Europe + 30'.

The Committee on Scientific and Technological Research (CREST), which has taken the place of the PREST group, has met four times since it was set up at the beginning of this year.

Apart from having discussed the question of the most appropriate information, consultation and concertation procedure for carrying out its task, the committee has set up *ad hoc* working groups, including the 'CREST—energy' sub-committee, which has met twice. This group is collaborating with the services of the Commission on the drawing up of a list of R and D projects at present being carried out by Member States in the energy sector. In addition, it is considering those sectors for which a Community R and D programme might be proposed: one opinion has already been drawn up for the sectors of energy economy, geothermal energy, solar energy, hydrogen and modelling systems. This preparatory work, in addition to that conducted within the framework of the ECRD, is designed to assist the Commission, which, in the field of energy research and development, intends to propose a

large-scale Community effort in line with the final goals of the new energy policy recently submitted to the Council.

As regards research into the protection of the environment, this House is acquainted with the first series of direct and indirect Community projects decided on by the Council in 1973.

In the meantime, some interesting results have been obtained by the JRC, in particular on the multi-detection of inorganic micro-pollutants, on the tele-detection or remote sensing of atmospheric pollution and on the institution of a data-bank on chemical products likely to contaminate the environment.

About 250 research projects to be carried out in the Member States have been proposed. Of these, 62 have already received a favourable opinion from the Consultative Committee. These projects will result in research contracts for a further 4.5 million units of account, of which 50% will be borne by the Community.

As regards underwater technology, the Commission has already received a number of proposals, which it is studying.

Further, a report on oceanographic research is approaching completion by CREST, and this may contain interesting proposals for this sector.

Lord Bessborough referred to the situation at Ispra and to the difficulties and tensions among the staff there. I, too, hope that the new director will succeed in coping with the serious problems at the centre, but I should like to point out that the main cause of these reactions is the Council's failure to approve the proposals submitted by the Commission more than three years ago for reforming the Staff Regulations.

As regards the difficulties at the centre which do not concern its staff, I should like to draw Lord Bessborough's attention to the fact that analogous difficulties have often been encountered at the level of the national centres, for whenever it is a matter of changing the course of research and developing it in a new direction certain inertias will obviously make themselves felt, resulting in long periods of crisis. If the crisis at the Joint Research Centre is protracted, this is due solely to the relative inefficiency of the criteria for arriving at Community decisions: this comment is directed, not at the Joint Research Centre, but at the methods of decision-making employed in the Community. The current programme at Ispra will run for four years and, as Lord Bessborough has pointed out, is subject to annual revision; it seems to me that it would be premature to draw conclusions now on the need for extending this programme, reducing it or maintaining it.

**Spinelli**

We agree with what has been said on the success of the Community's thermo-nuclear fusion programme, based on collaboration among the various national centres under a joint programme organized and in part financed by the Commission. This is why the Commission has proposed, *mutatis mutandis*, an analogous method for the Community development contracts of which Lord Bessborough rather over-optimistically expects the Commission to have made use. Mr President, the proposal made by the Commission two years ago is still before the Council, and the obstacles to be overcome at the political level are still considerable, since among the representatives of the various governments there is strong opposition to the idea of a fund based on supra-national criteria.

This brings us to the sector of industrial technology, with regard to which the developments that have taken place since the Council's approval of the action programme are by no means encouraging. Apart from the development contracts, I would point out the following:

- in the aero-engineering sector, a programme of research into the development of silent and non-pollutant aero-engines, presented by the Community's major designers and proposed by the Commission, is yet to be examined by the Committee of National Experts (CREST);
- as regards road transport, discussions are in progress with all European firms concerned in the development of the linear motor, for the purpose of preparing a Community research programme. When this work is completed, the Commission should be in a position to present a proposal for this sector constituting part of a wider programme for coordinating activities connected with the new technologies of high-speed road transport;
- in the field of tele-communications, the preparatory work has scarcely begun. One of the subjects discussed at the first meeting held with responsible officials of the postal authorities was how to improve the coordination of development programmes for future systems. Since, in this field, the Commission has no means of its own for facilitating common initiatives and therefore has no alternative but to encourage the national authorities to get together, everything for the moment depends on the open-mindedness of these authorities;
- as regards the nuclear sector, the Commission submitted to the Council in April a research and training programme for EURATOM on the recycling of plutonium in light-water reactors.

As regards textile problems, the Commission will present a proposal concerning three themes of operational research connected with fibre-processing, while in the paper-making and food industries we are still in the stage of registering the research projects now in progress in order to determine which of these may be of interest for the Community.

The Commission has studied closely and encouraged the exertions of circles interested in promoting cooperation among the various professional research centres existing in countries of the Community. The difficulties encountered after the meetings at Rotterdam and Brussels, which aimed at creating a federation at Community level of national associations of bodies pursuing cooperative research, show how the present uncertain political situation directly affects even the simplest and most constructive projects.

Lord Bessborough referred in his speech to the Business Cooperation Centre, which we call the 'matrimonial agency'. In this connection, I may state that the Centre has so far received about 2,000 requests for information and requests to find possible partners for transnational cooperation. Only a small part of these requests—between 5 and 10%—concern technological cooperation. It is as yet too early to draw any conclusions on the value of what is only a very recent initiative.

Mr President, from the picture I have attempted to give of the present situation, it follows that the progress made in the sector of European technological cooperation is modest. The fundamental reasons for this are political. It is no good pretending that technological and scientific transformation will take place—by a miracle, as it were—at the European level if we fail to make progress on the largest possible scale with economic and monetary union, which is the very foundation of a common industrial and technological policy.

If progress is to be made in all other sectors of the life of the Community, economic and monetary union must be boosted and the institutions of the Community given effective powers, in such a way that this Parliament too will be enabled to keep track of what is done and not only of the good intentions of others.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Bousch.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy that Lord Bessborough's

**Bousch**

oral question on European technical cooperation in certain industrial sectors should give us this morning an opportunity of exchanging views with the Commission on a problem which we consider to be particularly important, for the ability to keep abreast of technical progress is an essential condition of competitiveness in all sectors of industry and a guarantee of all independence.

The suppression of customs barriers has admittedly made possible a remarkable development in European trade, but economic structures continue to be partitioned off by national boundaries and enterprises—or at least most of them—are not organized in such a way as to meet the needs of an enlarged market or prepare the way for the progress needed in the sectors of advanced technology, whose development at the purely national level is extremely difficult.

It is therefore necessary to lay down the goals and map out the development of a common policy in the scientific and technical sphere.

This policy implies the coordination, within the institutions of the Community, of national policies and the joint execution of projects which are of Community importance. The emphasis must be placed on the need for transnational cooperation, in order that the rationalization of national programmes and the pooling of resources shall enable our industries—particularly those in the sectors of advanced technology such as aeronautics, tele-communications, data-processing, nuclear energy, computers, transport—to have some chance of measuring up against the industries of America or Japan. Unfortunately, the present lack of any Community policy and of political resolve in this sphere and the vicious habit of Member States of reserving public markets to national undertakings hamper the research capacities and limit the financial means of the industries concerned. National markets are too limited to allow of the birth of undertakings that shall be competitive on an international scale. Admittedly, most Member States, in the course of the last few years, have multiplied their efforts with regard to research and development, but have not really passed beyond the framework of national frontiers; the result is that parallel research is carried on in several Member States, constituting a duplication which is unwelcome and, moreover, often fruitless.

It is therefore necessary not only to work for the creation of a single market—the free movement of goods is not an end in itself—but also to effectuate a restructuring of European industry. The creation of a single market must supply undertakings with a market large enough to enable them to make use of modern methods

of production and management and to assure them of a good chance of competing with the industrial giants I have just mentioned, countries such as the United States and Japan.

In fact, however, certain trammels still exist, discrepancies among national regulations imposed on industry for reasons of security, public health or protection of the environment, discrepancies between the technical norms and specifications applied to industry in the different countries. Technical regulations should be harmonized, and at the same time the public markets must be opened up. Recently, the Commission proposed the adoption of a concerted policy of public purchases covering all sectors of industry and extending from simple persuasion, by the regular publication of statistics, to joint purchases. As regards the advanced technology industries, joint public purchases, possibly accompanied by Community research and development contracts, might serve as a basis for the formation of large-scale transnational industrial groups.

Restructuring European industry means creating a unified environment by harmonizing systems of taxation and the rights of undertakings; it also means promoting transnational cooperation by encouraging industrial integration across national frontiers.

Among the measures envisaged by the Commission, how many have been brought to a successful conclusion? While we can congratulate ourselves on the establishment of the European Business Cooperation Centre, on the approaching completion of the statute for a joint undertaking and the setting up of a European Committee on Research and Development composed of independent experts to advise the Community authorities, some questions still have to be answered. What has been done about extending economic interest groups to the Community as a whole? What is the situation with regard to the European Investment Bank's possible part in a policy for restructuring undertakings? What has happened since they were authorized, about the common agreements on research and development or the specialization of undertakings whose sales total less than 10% of the market or 200 million units of account?

Even in the sphere of technological cooperation, which is expressly provided for in the Treaties, more specifically the Euratom Treaty, we are unfortunately obliged to admit that the results are not satisfactory. Mr Spinelli has admitted that these results are very modest, while expressing the hope that in the sector of energy some progress might shortly be achieved. He was also good enough to add that all progress depends

**Bousch**

on the realization of economic and monetary union. He will not be surprised if I express approval of what he said, since it corresponds to the conclusion of the speech I made on the economic situation in the Community.

These are the few observations I wanted to make on behalf of my group in the debate provoked by the very important question tabled by our colleague Lord Bessborough.

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

**Mr Leonardi.** — *(I)* I should like to say to Lord Bessborough that I support his call for collaboration in certain sectors and, I should like to add, not only in those sectors but also in the traditional ones. This point can never be over-emphasized. In agriculture, too, for example, the Community still has much to achieve.

On the other hand, I have reservations with regard to Lord Bessborough's attitude on the Joint Research Centre. Here I would point out that our Community, strictly speaking, was brought into existence by a problem of energy, that the first instrument of a Community character which it attempted to put into motion to resolve this problem was Euratom and that the crisis springs not from the instruments used but from the fact that we have failed to produce an energy policy. We are now paying the grave consequences.

If we fail to bear these things in mind, the operational difficulties encountered by the JRC will obviously become insuperable, and in the end attempts to resolve them will only reduce or even actually destroy this Community instrument which we consider to be essential.

To abolish the Joint Research Centre or reduce the scale of its activities would, in fact, mean abandoning an instrument of Community character, a multinational type of public enterprise which, in our opinion, is indispensable. It would also mean leaving the solution of Community problems to big private groups, for the most part alien to the Community.

We do not agree that the Joint Research Centre should carry on a part of its work by maintaining external relations with public or private centres: precisely for this reason, its activities should be developed and not reduced.

Whoever is acquainted with the Joint Research Centre is aware that a large part of its operating difficulties are caused by the situation of its staff, to which we have drawn the House's attention on several occasions and which is now being attended to. Fundamentally, this situation

derives from the lack of programmes, the lack of political decisions, the lack of a common energy policy.

I wish to conclude by stressing that destroying such instruments because we are incapable of using them is really the last thing we should do. Rather we should learn to use them. I consider that the Joint Research Centre could be an essential instrument for the development of our Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Pounder.

**Mr Pounder.** — In supporting the remarks made by my noble Friend, Lord Bessborough, when opening this discussion, I make no claims whatsoever to the expert knowledge and technical expertise which he possesses and with which he has impressed this House today. My interest stems from the visit which some of us paid to Ispra a month ago. During the course of that visit one had an opportunity of seeing some of the installations, and certain thoughts immediately came to mind; and the more one has reflected on them, the more they have developed. This may apply to other centres, too.

I am trying to look at the problem purely and simply in financial terms. Is there an overlap of work at Ispra and other research centres—work which is already being undertaken by national research institutions? This overlap may be necessary, but certain questions arise. Is there an overlap? Is it justified? Perhaps most important of all, what cost arises from this overlap? Therefore, I entirely agree with Lord Bessborough when he talks of the need for a Joint Research Centre to work for known and definable customers.

I realize that when one is considering the very complex field of technological research it is extremely difficult to establish criteria for cost effectiveness. I accept all that. But there must be some guidelines somewhere for ascertaining the costs involved. I should be grateful if the Commissioner could give us some idea of the guidelines which are used in determining cost effectiveness. One cannot, of course, use the same criteria for judging value for money when one is talking of research as when one makes a purchase in a supermarket, but there must be guidelines and they must be observed, because we are talking of very considerable sums of money.

I do not want anyone in this Chamber to get the idea that I am advocating the closure of the Joint Research Centre at Ispra or those elsewhere. All I am seeking is information to set

**Pounder**

at rest one's anxieties about these very costly operations for which there must be some justification. What is that justification? I understand that an examination is now in progress relating to the technological attainments at the Centre and the value of the work being undertaken. I hope that this investigation will be continued and will be completed as speedily as possible.

In any case, I should be most grateful if we could be given some idea of the way in which costings are developed in the Joint Research Centre because, as Lord Bessborough has said, we are talking in terms of 250 million units of account over four years, which is a very great deal of money. The Assembly should be told how it is spent and what checks and balances operate.

**President.** — I call Mr Flämig.

**Mr Flämig.** — (*D*) Mr President, I should like to thank Lord Bessborough for his question, for I too was a victim of that somewhat inglorious debate on technology that was held late at night. It is typical of our parliaments—not only of this one—that technological questions are often not given the priority which is properly their due. I regret that the Rules of Procedure do not allow us to resume the debate on technology now, which would be a very opportune occasion, and that I must therefore confine myself to a few remarks.

In his reply, Mr Spinelli actually touched on two series of problems. The first concerns co-operation in the sphere of research, pure and applied, while the other could perhaps be described as relating to cooperation in the sphere of 'innovation', i.e., transforming theoretical knowledge into economic practice.

We are told that preparatory work is in progress; we are told that *ad hoc* working groups have been set up; but we have also been given the honest admission that everything that has been achieved so far is not very encouraging.

This, I think, is typical. For it must sometimes be very discouraging for the Commission, and for a member of the Commission, to stand by while narrow-minded points of view are advanced and national egoism flourishes in such an important field, where cooperation is more important than in many other sectors.

But we must not allow ourselves to be discouraged; rather we must, as a Parliament, stress one thing more than anything else—namely, the connection between all these technological questions and the economic and monetary policy taken as a whole. Those who spoke before me

have already drawn attention to this, and I should merely like to add: what we are discussing here—unfortunately, very briefly and within the framework of question and answer—concerns more than just technological questions; it concerns the dismantling of technical obstacles to trade. It goes so far as to concern European company law, it even concerns European patents law. We need European industrial norms in order to build up a more or less effective European economic policy.

What is the real issue, then? The real need is not to build up something for the sake of technology itself, but to make the European economy and European industry more capable of competing with the big industrial groups in the USA, Japan and elsewhere.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the not-too-distant future we shall be examining the Commission's action programme, point for point, in the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. On that occasion, we shall have to return to the question of Ispra—and not only Ispra, but all establishments of the Joint Research Centre.

We are convinced that every Member of this House needs a modicum of technical knowledge in order to make the necessary political decisions.

Mr President, I should like to conclude with an appeal, and this appeal is not addressed solely to the Commission, for I often have the feeling that the Commission does what it can. So far as the Commission is concerned, I would merely ask it to cooperate a little more closely with this Parliament. My appeal is primarily addressed to the Council and to the national governments, for they must take technological problems more seriously. We simply can no longer afford in Europe to be ignorant of these problems. It is difficult, I know, to arouse interest in these important questions in the national parliaments, but it is worth the effort. This problem too—and this is my last sentence—will not be solved without economic and monetary union.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Noè.

**Mr Noè.** — (*I*) Mr President, I thank Lord Bessborough for the opportunity he has given us to have an exchange of ideas with Commissioner Spinelli, even though only in passing, since the matter is so vast that we shall have to take it up again in the autumn more exhaustively and after some preparation. Meanwhile, it is still a good thing to be able to have such an exchange of views.

Noè

I should like to touch on a number of matters which seem to me to merit especial mention; unfortunately, I shall not be able to deal with them systematically, but after all the present occasion is only, so to speak, a passing encounter.

Lord Bessborough has raised the problem of underwater drilling for oil and natural gas, and Mr Spinelli has stated that proposals for research have been made. This is a subject to which we should devote all our enthusiasm and attention, as the Americans have done with regard to their space programmes and are doing now in this very field. We should bear in mind that if we go down to a depth of 3,000 metres, the sedimentary beds of the Community, plus the marine zones to a depth of 200 metres, the whole, that is, of this area will be increased by 50%, and this increase will consist of virginal zones which have so far been only the subject of geoseismic research. All this offers very considerable possibilities, especially after everything that has taken place in the North Sea, where results have been obtained that were un hoped-for up to 5 years ago. It would therefore be worth while devoting continued attention and perhaps a major effort to research covering the whole of this marine zone, once the appropriate instruments have been developed—and here lies the difficulty.

As regards the Joint Research Centre, which was also referred to by Lord Bessborough, I listened with interest to what Commissioner Spinelli had to say on the activities of the ECRD and on CREST, which are without doubt of importance. I should, however, like to point out that in such establishments there are highly-qualified people who meet every now and then to discuss problems and then depart, leaving the officials to carry on the work. But the establishments of the Joint Research Centre should in fact make a definite contribution as bodies bringing together intellectuals representing various disciplines, which, in addition to their task of carrying out research into precise programmes, could organize more frequent colloquia without essential structural changes—a larger technical secretariat would no doubt be sufficient—and so could serve as centres for elaborating interdisciplinary problems of the kind that is none too numerous in our Community. We are, in fact, raising the problem of interdisciplinary cooperation.

I am convinced that if the Commissioners concerned (and there are at least three of them) were to combine their efforts—as they are already doing—to draw up future plans for the research establishments and so enable them to conduct background research, this would help,

on the one hand—without any extra expense—to improve the morale of members of the staff, who would find themselves playing a more important part than they do at the moment, and, on the other hand, it would provide a very valuable form of assistance.

I should like to give an example. About two months ago, on the initiative of the Interparliamentary Union, the conference of Mediterranean countries was held in Rome. None of the technical staff from Ispra had been invited, and I took the initiative of telephoning to Ispra to ask for a specialist to be sent. Here it is clear that, for example, the setting up of a mathematical model for certain areas of the Mediterranean could have been a task for the computer centre at Ispra. By giving it this task, we should have been killing two birds with one stone: we should have completed a job that was useful to us and we should have given a modern cultural boost to all the countries of the Mediterranean basin.

In conclusion, I have a question to ask. We have spoken, for example, of research into the recycling of plutonium and I should like to address a question to Commissioner Spinelli. With the object of linking the research centres up with industrial reality, has any attempt been made to seek collaboration with UNIPEDE, which has begun since 1965 to be active in the field of the recycling of plutonium and which recently carried out a detailed study of this problem covering the period up to the year 2010? I should like to know, that is, whether this welcome research is related to the practical aspect of the problem. I have also heard that there is a programme for reducing the noise of aero-engines—a subject on which I tabled a question in this House last year. Since the relevant companies in the countries of the Community are members of IATA and since this organization is at present pursuing important research in this field which will be going on for at least two-and-a-half years, I should like to ask whether any liaison has been established which would enable us to avoid duplication in this field also.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Normanton.

**Mr Normanton.** — Mr President, may I first thank my noble Friend Lord Bessborough for raising this question, for it has enabled this House to have a brief insight into a matter of considerable public importance, namely, the state of the research sector of industry.

May I also express special thanks to Commissioner Spinelli for the content of his reply and for the way in which he replied to Lord Bess-

**Normanton**

borough's question? I want in particular to thank Commissioner Spinelli for using this debate as an occasion for announcing his intention to prepare proposals for submission to the Council of Ministers, presumably under Article 235, of three specific research projects in the field of textiles and to place these projects in the care of existing cooperative industrial research associations.

Perhaps it is not necessary to mention that under the list of industrial cooperative research associations in textiles there are two with which I have had a very long and deep personal connection, namely, the Shirley Institute, which is based in Manchester, and the Woollen Industry Research Association of the United Kingdom. Both these agencies have a long-standing reputation in the world. I earnestly hope that the wealth of experience which these agencies can contribute in textiles will be recognized in the allotment and funding of the projects by the Commission to which Commissioner Spinelli referred.

May I place on the record of this House that I was privileged to attend the meeting in Brussels on 22 May at which FEICRO—the Federation of European Industrial Cooperative Research Organizations—was established? The House should recognize the deep debt which it owes to all who worked over a long time to achieve the establishment of this agency.

This agency having been established, I would earnestly impress upon the Commission and my colleagues in this House that we must use FEICRO to the full and use it as an agency for the rationalization and integration on a Community-wide basis of the vast number of widely diverse industrial and national research agencies which exist over the length and breadth of Europe.

Here may I declare my own abiding and long-standing belief that the greatest possible cost effectiveness in the expenditure of Community funds will be achieved, not by the setting up of new Community research associations, or indeed, as some of us may be tempted to say occasionally, by the continual pouring of funds into existing Community research establishments, but by the injection of funds, with specific requirements for the investigation of stated projects, into the industrial cooperative agencies which exist and which are recognized to be leaders in their spheres.

I believe that by pursuing this policy of funding specific research projects we shall ultimately be influencing the development and creation of genuinely Community research associations based on an independent and integrated indus-

try, which in my opinion is the best medium through which research should be promoted.

I therefore believe that in the policy announced by Commissioner Spinelli, and his proposal to obtain the Council of Ministers' approval for three specific projects for funding of research, we may well be seeing the beginning of a move towards the establishment of a truly Community research institution based on, and working in the closest possible relationship with, industry. *(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(I)* Mr President, I shall be brief, because many of the observations that have been made agree with what I have already said. The Commission will take account of the suggestions that have been made regarding a better exploitation of the research done at Ispra and the possibility of developing cooperation with FEICRO and with research agencies.

I should merely like to dwell on a few points which seem to me to deserve clarification. Research into the 'recycling' of plutonium is being carried on in cooperation—as Mr Noè urged—with UNIPEDE; as regards reduced noise of aero-engines, it is as yet a little early to say anything about the results of cooperation with IATA. We must not, in fact, confuse proposals made by the Commission with decisions, and no decision has as yet been made by the competent authority on this problem of reducing the noise of aero-engines. As I have said, the problem is being discussed by a committee of high-placed functionaries of the various states, and I cannot say when it will arrive at a conclusion or what this conclusion will be.

The idea—supported by many in this House, principally by Lord Bessborough—that it would be useful to make funds available for working in conjunction with the research centres that already exist in the various states, thus extending the method successfully applied to research in the field of thermo-nuclear fusion, is a good one in so far as a research policy is impossible without this important instrument. In fact, we are still in the initial stages. Except for research into the fusion of hydrogen, we have not yet succeeded in receiving a single contribution. Only for research in the field of energy have we received a certain sum: here, something is being done.

I should further like to point out that with regard to development contracts the discussions going on in organs of the Council concern the



**Spinelli**

questions whether we should or should not have these contracts, whether the sums involved should be reduced to a figure that would in fact be laughable, and finally whether these contracts should be decided upon by the Commission (by methods which we have proposed and which Parliament has discussed) or the Council.

As you see, everything is in a state of flux. I hope that the Parliament will now support the Commission in the battle it is fighting to obtain an adequate decision from the Council.

Finally, I should like to reply to the question that has been put to me about the criteria followed for the sharing of the cost of research done at the Joint Research Centre.

This question puts me in a slightly embarrassing position, for while it is perfectly easy to calculate the costs and profits of any other type of activity or of industrial production, it is a much more difficult matter with regard to research: it is possible to conduct a most expensive piece of research and in the end to find that one has got no further.

This is, in fact, the characteristic feature of research: it is never clear beforehand how to go about it. Just to give an example, how can it be decided whether the researches conducted today on the utilization of hydrogen will produce even the smallest result? If a positive result is achieved, then the costs will have been largely covered; but if the final result should show that there are no serious possibilities of these researches' bearing fruit, the money will have been invested for nothing.

In the field of research, there is only one way of going about things: a worthwhile aim is selected; a certain sum of money is made available; things are organized in the best way possible, and then work is begun in the hope that something will be obtained.

I think I have now replied to the various questions that have been put to me.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Spinelli.

I call Lord Bessborough.

**Lord Bessborough.** — I should like to thank Commissioner Spinelli for the great trouble that he has taken in answering our numerous questions. We have had a most useful interim survey of activities in different areas. It is a useful progress report and I, too, hope that we may have a more detailed debate on another occasion.

I recognize with Commissioner Spinelli that national establishments sometimes have prob-

lems somewhat similar to those of the Joint Research Centre. I do not want to be unduly critical. I hope that Dr Dinkspeiler will be able to solve some of those problems. He was an admirable Director of the European Space Research Organization, where he made a great contribution in resolving some of its problems.

I am glad that CREST is now meeting regularly, even if it is not always reaching decisions. Some work is clearly going on and modest progress is being made, although obviously there are many obstacles still in the way, not least being the questions of sovereignty.

Again, I thank Commissioner Spinelli and others who have spoken in this extremely interesting debate.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I have no motion for a resolution on this debate.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The debate is closed.

*5. Directive on aid to the shipbuilding industry - Commission Memorandum on procedures for action in the shipbuilding industry - Decision on assistance from the ESF for persons employed in the shipbuilding industry*

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

— report drawn up by Mr Krall on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on

I. the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on aid to the shipbuilding industry, and

II. the Memorandum from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on procedures for action in the shipbuilding industry (Doc. 68/74) and

— report drawn up by Miss Lulling on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a decision on assistance from the European Social Fund to persons employed in the shipbuilding industry (Doc. 86/74)

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

**Mr Krall, rapporteur.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the proposal from the Commis-

**Krall**

sion for a third directive on aid to the shipbuilding industry was originally supposed to replace the second directive on 1 January 1974. Owing to the delayed submission of this proposal and the difficulties encountered by Member States' governments in reaching an agreement, the Council decided to extend the validity of the second directive until the end of June this year.

The content of this third directive differs from the provisions hitherto valid in two spheres.

First, the Commission recommends—and this has the support of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs—that within the framework of industrial policy a more active policy should be pursued in the sector of shipbuilding in order that European shipyards may in time be able to compete on the international market without assistance.

In addition, the Commission's proposal appears to pursue the aim of expanding as rapidly as possible the capacity of European shipyards. I shall return to this aspect later.

The Commission's proposals regarding industrial policy include, *inter alia*, market analyses, research and development and the expansion of cooperation between individual shipyards and between the two sides of industry.

Secondly, the Commission's proposal deals with the competition aspect from two different points of view. The one concerns direct aids for the building and the sale of ships, the other investment aids granted by Member States. As regards the direct aids, a lowering of the ceiling is proposed. A new feature, on the other hand, is the intention of Member States to grant the shipbuilding industry investment aids which must first have the Commission's approval if they exceed 4 millions units of account.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs entirely agrees that investment aids granted by Member States should also be included in the Community policy, but for the long term prefers another solution, to which I shall return later.

The Committee on Monetary and Economic Affairs also agrees that in future greater importance should be attached to investment aids than to aids to production.

Mr President, I should like to make some observations on developments in the shipbuilding sector. In 1960, Europe's share in launchings amounted to 50%, and that of Japan to 20%. In 1973, the situation was reversed: Europe accounted for 22% and Japan for 50% of the ships built. While Europe's shipyard capacity may be expected to increase by nearly 2.5 mil-

lion gross tons between 1971-72 and 1975, we must reckon with the possibility that that of Japan will increase by 6 million gross tons. That means an exact reversal of the situation that has obtained hitherto.

A comparison of these prognoses of the production of new ships with the probable development of the demand points, in the Commission's view, to a clear danger that there will be a substantial over-capacity of production towards the end of the decade. Naturally, it is very difficult to judge this opinion, particularly for us, for we have already had experience of how developments on this market may take a completely different course and even undergo rapid changes. Personally, with things as they are, I think it would be very rash to accept these prognoses without reservation, since we do not know, for example, when the Suez Canal will be re-opened or what effects the changed supply situation will have. On the other hand, it is clear that, in as much as European shipbuilding is uncompetitive—this does not, of course, apply to all countries—a substantial excess of supply over demand on the world shipbuilding market will probably hit the European shipyards particularly hard.

Mr President, I should like to dwell for a moment on certain differences of view which crystallized during the discussion between the Commission and your committee. The Commission appears to be championing an increase in investments in European shipbuilding as a whole, whereas the committee attaches great importance to an attempt to agree on certain points with Japan in order, by means of international cooperation, to avoid a possible over-capacity at which the Commission has also hinted. In other words, the committee takes the view that preference should be given to investments aimed at enhancing rationalization and efficiency rather than to investments which are primarily designed to increase the capacities of European shipyards.

Another question which has played an important part in the committee's deliberations was the co-ordination of the various Community policies, in particular, the revival of industrial, regional and social policy. The committee has not yet reached a final conclusion in this matter, but it is clear that the policies I have just mentioned should be so designed as to achieve coherence. In its report, the committee asks the Commission to submit a plan showing the principles on which this coordination should be based.

Without wishing to belittle the initiatives, contained in the Commission's proposal, regarding industrial policy, we devoted particular attention during deliberations in the committee to

**Krall**

questions of competition and competitiveness. We regarded as a step forward that national aids for investment are now to be approved by the Commission. In the long term, however, it would be preferable if these aids could only be granted in accordance with Community provisions. When it is a matter of developing an industrial policy for a backward sector, the Community's reaction should not be to approve or even, perhaps, to encourage the adoption of dissimilar national regulations for investment aids.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs therefore took the view that investment aids in the shipbuilding sector should be subject to Community regulations and that the Commission should have produced a structural directive for shipbuilding covering the interrelationship of regional, social and industrial policy. An obligation should be imposed on the individual Member States to provide investment aids only in those cases, in the manner and to the extent laid down in the future structural directive.

We discussed these questions in detail with the Commission, in fact with Mr Spinelli, who gave a clear warning that the entry into force of the new third directive should not be delayed. We were gratified to find that the Commission showed understanding for the committee's point of view, although it attaches primary importance to ensuring that proposed national measures for granting aid must first be approved by the Commission. We also understood that Mr Spinelli at that time saw no possibility of reaching agreement on more extensive Community provisions than those contained in the Commission's proposal.

Against this background—and this is my conclusion—the committee unanimously proposes to Commission and Council that the third directive should enter into force on 1 July but for a period extending no further than the end of 1975. By that time the results of the OECD negotiations on international regulations for the period following 1975 will, we hope, be available and the Commission will, in the intervening period, have time to elaborate the structural directive on shipbuilding which the committee has recommended.

Mr President, I hardly need here to go through the committee's motion for a resolution paragraph by paragraph. The motion is short. Its terms make it clear that our essential recommendations are as follows:

First, the long-term objective should be the abolition, in the spirit of the Rome Treaty, of the different forms of aid which distort competition; this should also be the attitude of the

Community in the coming international negotiations within the OECD. We do not say so in so many words, but the explanatory statement implies that the Commission should, in our view, build up as strong as possible a basis for negotiation in the forthcoming talks with Japan.

Secondly, the various forms of aid should be granted only in accordance with Community rules; we therefore suggest that the Commission develop a specific structural directive imposing specific obligations on the member countries.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, I feel bound to state that all the questions connected with the third directive and the possible modes of procedure for taking action in the shipbuilding sector were thoroughly discussed by the committee with the Commission, whereby our respective points of view sometimes differed considerably. The fact that we nevertheless finally reached an agreement, for which we sincerely thank Mr Spinelli, is due to the Commission's willingness to submit at the earliest opportunity a structural directive on shipbuilding.

Mr President, I should like to recommend the adoption of the motion for a resolution with one final remark. Bearing in mind that we are conducting a joint debate on my own report and that of Miss Lulling on the proposal from the Commission for a decision on assistance from the European Social Fund to persons employed in the shipbuilding industry, may I state on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs that this committee supports the Commission's proposal? I should like to draw attention to the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, which is attached to Miss Lulling's report. Thank you.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Miss Lulling, who has asked to present her report.

**Miss Lulling, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, I should like to begin by stressing the positive aspect of this joint debate on Mr Krall's report and that by myself, which concerns a decision on assistance from the European Social Fund to persons employed in the shipbuilding industry.

You are well aware that your rapporteur on the European Social Fund and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment have always insisted on a judicious employment of the limited financial means at the disposal of this Fund. You are also aware of the persistence with which we have fought the policy of *juste retour* pursued under the old European Social Fund. Finally, you are aware that, although I have not always been properly understood, I have

### Lulling

tried to gain recognition for the fact that the European Social Fund must not be expected to finance measures which should be financed by national, regional or local authorities.

The Community cannot be expected to fork out in every sphere where national or regional authorities have defaulted during the last few decades. It is time, I think, to accept this elementary truth.

That is why, Mr President, I have continually insisted, throughout all my numerous reports on the European Social Fund, on the absolute necessity of confining the activities of this fund to joint measures or policies drawn up at Community level—particularly in view of the inadequate means at its disposal—in order to give the Commission a valid criterion when selecting from the innumerable requests for aid presented to it by the Member States.

Mr President, assistance from the fund to persons employed in the shipbuilding industry may, in our view, provide an example of this strategy—on condition, of course, that it forms part of a global plan for restructuring shipyards in order to enable them to compete on the world market. This obviously implies a recourse to all the instruments at the Community's disposal—namely, industrial policy, regional policy, the European Investment Bank and the European Social Fund.

We therefore consider, Mr President, that assistance by the Social Fund on the basis of Article 4 of the proposed Council decision which is the subject of my report provides a typical example of the way in which the new Social Fund should work.

Without wishing to encroach too much on Mr Krall's ground, I must nevertheless stress that the purpose of the joint operation in favour of the shipyards must be the effective and harmonious restructuring of this sector in order that it may have its proper place in the world shipbuilding industry. This should be given clear priority over the abolition of all kinds of aid, which others appear to be striving for.

In view of the regional importance of the Community's shipbuilding industry, we consider that Community measures should be aimed at the survival of the shipyards and not at their progressive abandonment.

It is therefore important to avoid encouraging, by means of assistance from the European Social Fund, the desultory departure of skilled workers, which would compromise this sector's future as much as the over-hasty abolition of certain forms of aid, particularly as our Japanese

and American competitors and also those from the so-called socialist countries continue to create distortions of competition, whether through aid or through dumping salaries. It may also be pointed out, Mr President, that the Commission's proposals unfortunately lack all indication of the probable number of workers affected by the envisaged restructuring measures. We are also left in the dark on the amount of the assistance proposed from the Fund to persons employed in the shipbuilding industry.

We are aware of the difficulty of making such estimates; they cannot be calculated to within one unit of account. But in order to establish the budget of the European Social Fund, we should nevertheless have some idea of the scale of expenditure entailed by the proposals put before us.

As rapporteur, I must stress another aspect of the problem—namely, the lot of workers in neighbouring sectors who depend on shipbuilding. Your committee has been considering whether assistance from the European Social Fund should not be extended to persons who, without being directly employed in shipbuilding, are nevertheless dependent on it and will inevitably feel the negative effects of restructuring in this sector.

In France, for example, the workers employed in shipyards number 25,000; but if account is taken of the neighbouring sectors, this number is doubled. This example shows, I think, the importance of our request, which is expressed in paragraph 10 of the motion for a resolution which we are asking the House to adopt.

In conclusion, Mr President, I take the liberty of insisting, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, that within the framework of a common policy aimed at the development of a dynamic and competitive Community shipbuilding industry the decisions found necessary shall be taken in good time and that all, from the Council of Ministers to the smallest public or private undertaking, should be aware of the situation and ready to act. It is a matter not merely of saving but also of developing the shipbuilding industry and of guaranteeing within this industry the full and also the most appropriate employment of a working force whose importance, seen from the regional point of view, is a secret to no one.

Mr President, it is on the basis of these observations that, in the name of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, I ask the House to adopt our motion for a resolution.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Pêtre to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Pêtre.** — (*F*) Very briefly, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in view of the high quality of Miss Lulling's report, I should like, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, to convey our support for this report and express our favourable opinion on the Commission's proposal concerning assistance from the European Social Fund to persons employed in the shipbuilding industry.

As Miss Lulling has pointed out so clearly, the structural modifications which are being progressively introduced into the shipbuilding sector inevitably have social repercussions on the workers employed in these undertakings. This is true, not only on the qualitative, but also on the quantitative plane, that is to say, with regard to security of employment. As correctly foreseen by the Commission, assistance from the Social Fund in this sphere will safeguard the interests of workers who will be faced not only by the need to change their jobs but also by problems of restructuring and readaptation.

On this subject, for the benefit of members of the Commission, I should like to echo, not a criticism, but an observation made by Miss Lulling when she regretted that the Commission had failed to convey sufficient information on the number, however approximate, of workers affected by the measures envisaged and on the number of persons likely to benefit from this Fund. I want to draw the Commission's attention to this question.

However that may be, Mr President, the Christian-Democratic Group, like the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, cannot but approve the proposal of the Commission, whom we would thank for this excellent initiative.

This proposal must obviously form part of a restructuring and investments policy coordinated at the Community level. At the same time, the aims of the regional policy and the sectors related to shipbuilding must not be forgotten.

Apart from the problems concerning the restructuring and adaptation of our shipbuilding yards, the Commission must try to ensure the maintenance of employment in this important sector if it intends, as we hope it does, to help Europe's shipbuilding industry to become dynamic and competitive.

You see, Mr President, I haven't taken long. In conclusion, I should like to congratulate Miss Lulling once more on her excellent report, to which the Christian-Democratic Group gives its support.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Alfred Bertrand to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr Alfred Bertrand.** — (*NL*) Mr President, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group I should like to develop a few ideas in connection with the report drawn up by Mr Krall on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. In the first place, I should like to congratulate him on having succeeded in giving on the basis of the proposal and the communication from the Commission a very clear picture of the development of shipbuilding on the world and European scales.

When studying this problem, one finds that the decline of the European share in world shipbuilding is particularly disquieting. In 1960, 50% of all ships were built in Europe and 22% in Japan. In 12 years these figures have been reversed: 23-24% is now built in Europe and more than 50% in Japan. This indicates a structural reorganization in Japan, where a modern form of shipbuilding has been successfully developed, making it possible to build competitively. The shipbuilders of Europe have not been able to cope with this, and Japan is therefore now in a position to take over the world shipbuilding market.

In my opinion, the Commission has done well to take account of this situation, especially in view of the fact that shipbuilding is gradually approaching saturation point. We should reach that point within the next 5-10 years. A second point is that the competitive position of a number of European shipyards is regularly declining, in consequence of the fact that production costs in Europe are rising faster than in Japan.

This is the reason for this effort by the Commission to arrive at Community-wide regulations and to lay down political guidelines for the restructuring of European shipbuilding.

I am thoroughly convinced that the European shipbuilding problem can no longer be solved without Community initiative. The separate Member States are no longer able to solve this problem with their own resources.

I therefore wish the Commission good luck in its attempt to take advantage of the extension of the directive to the end of 1975 to make a beginning with a genuine industrial policy.

In my view, however, the Commission has not made full use of the opportunities offered. It has been too vacillatory. Its aims and means are too vaguely formulated in the proposal, so that no clear line on which shipbuilders could base a more or less justified investment policy can be extracted from it.

**Bertrand**

I understand that it is not possible for European yards to be able to compete with Japanese shipbuilders in all types of ship in the next 5-6 years. We too know that this is out of the question. In the Commission's proposal, however, no satisfactory answer is given to the question of the direction in which the shipbuilding industry must be stimulated as regards the type of ship which we ought to try to build competitively in the future.

This seems to me to be a flaw which may have very serious consequences for the general outcome of present tensions and for the industrial structural policy to be followed in this sector. On the other hand, however, I am of the view that the lack of a general structural policy at Community level naturally makes it very difficult for the Commission to achieve a structural policy in one particular sector. It is not easy to lay down general principles concerning thorough coordination between the European Investment Bank, the possible Regional Fund and the European Social Fund in a single sector as long as there is no general structural policy worked out at Community level into which the sectors could be fitted and adapted according to developments.

It is for this reason that the Christian-Democratic Group can hardly accept the amendments put forward by the European Conservative Group. We can certainly accept these amendments in principle in the light of our general structural policy, but we think that for this one sector they have been put forward too soon. This can only cause confusion and difficulties. I can therefore declare my agreement in principle with the amendments, but I do not think that they should be introduced into the draft resolution under discussion on this occasion. I think it would be better to deal with these amendments when the Commission submits its proposals for a general structural policy.

The Christian-Democratic Group will therefore, notwithstanding the fact that we are in basic agreement with the tenor of these four amendments, not support them at present. We are of the opinion that the Commission should, now that the amendments have been put forward, take them into account. We shall await the Commission's answer in order to see if it takes sufficient account of the thinking behind the amendments from the European Conservative Group. It is in this spirit that the Christian-Democratic Group agrees with Mr Krall's draft resolution.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p.m. and resumed at 3.05 p.m.)*

### IN THE CHAIR LORD BESSBOROUGH

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed. We now continue with the joint debate on the report drawn up by Mr Krall on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on aid to the shipbuilding industry and the report by Miss Lulling on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on assistance to persons employed in the shipbuilding industry.

I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli**, *Member of the Commission of the European Communities.* — (I) Mr President, first of all, I should like to thank Mr Krall and Miss Lulling for their reports and the committees which prepared them. As Mr Krall pointed out this morning, I myself attended one of these committees—the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs—and noticed that the discussion on the problems which arose in connection with shipbuilding policy was very detailed.

I should first like to talk about Mr Krall's report, then I shall turn to Miss Lulling's.

In relation to the report on industrial policy and competition in the field of shipbuilding, I should, like Mr Krall, like to point out that the aims of a Community shipbuilding policy are competitiveness and balance. In this sector, competitiveness means being capable of holding one's own in the face of strong international competition without public assistance, which has been granted by almost all the Member States for some decades.

Balance requires developing the shipyards in such a way that investment grows in step with demand so that crises of overproduction do not occur.

The Commission basically suggests four means of effecting the structural changes. Firstly, aid policy should aim at further reducing the subsidization of working costs but maintain aids to investment, provided that the investment meets certain criteria of desirable industrial and regional developments; secondly, there is aid from the European Investment Bank; thirdly, aid from the Social Fund, and, lastly, coordination of research.

We are fully aware of the importance of the question of international negotiations, particularly with Japan, but we did not dwell on the topic because it is not possible to consider the negotiations from the point of view of shipbuild-

**Spinelli**

ing alone, and all attempts to do so show the truth of this point. The Community needs to conduct complete trade negotiations with Japan, dealing with all economic relations. They could include a specific chapter on shipyards, but only to the extent to which we have been able to make a common European policy a reality in this sector. This is why we stressed the need to achieve such a policy at the Community level.

This, I hope, makes it clear that I have no objection to including in the motion for a resolution a reference to the need to open specific negotiations with Japan, which is the leading producer of ships in the world today.

For the first time, the Commission's proposals give common objectives and define a framework in which a common policy might develop. These proposals are based on instruments which already exist on the national and Community level.

The Commission first suggests making permanent arrangements to provide information and establish the general lines of policy, so that the Commission, industry and the various states could define indicative aims in the medium- and long-term, consulting the various parties concerned: producers, employees, shipbuilders and national administrations.

Secondly, the Commission proposes demanding prior notification of programmes providing aid and assistance to investment. This requirement is of crucial importance because it would make it possible really to find out what was going on in the sector of shipbuilding policy.

Thirdly, we wish to be made competent to decide whether other aids are compatible, particularly in the light of the criteria of assessment and co-ordination indicated in our Memorandum.

This would enable the Commission to use the instruments available to encourage a development of productive capacity so that, in the medium term, the Community shipbuilding industry would no longer depend on systematic support.

Your committee does not seem to have been satisfied with the measures proposed by the Commission, and invites us to propose a directive on the structure of the sector. I should, therefore, like to explain briefly why the Commission did not follow this path.

We feel that if, using existing instruments and with the help of the main parties concerned, we realize our present objectives, it will, at a later date, be possible to draw up a coherent scheme of Community policy in this sector which would then have a good chance of being adopted.

We concluded that if, on the other hand, we tried to draw up this common directive, including a structural plan for the whole of the sector (which we shall soon start agitating for), we should not be able to be any more precise about the criteria which we have arrived at.

A directive would require a decision by the Council, and why should we transfer responsibility in this field to the Council, when, at present, the Commission can act on its own initiative and decide on which criteria to base the acceptance or rejection of aids?

There is the possibility of obtaining a precise commitment from Member States on aid. But such a plan would never emerge from the inter-governmental discussions which would have to be opened to adopt it. It is not only scepticism about the productivity of intergovernmental debates which leads me to say this, but also the fact that national shipyard policies are too dissimilar at present and are difficult to coordinate. In the initial stage, the Commission must, therefore, clearly indicating the criteria it intends to follow, make good use of its existing powers to encourage the states to bring their national aid policies closer together, thus moving to a second stage in which the methods suggested by your committee may be adopted. I think that this is all the more true in that, if we are being realistic, we must admit that the main stumbling-block to industrial policy in this sector will be not so much the adoption of a directive containing a plan of structural reforms as making the Member States give prior notification of the aid which they grant. If the overall plan was not accepted in the Council, it must be remembered that the Commission would in effect be helpless because it could not in practice exercise any control over aid that had already been agreed upon.

I therefore urge you not to insist that we present a directive on structure in the near future, as requested in the motion for a resolution. It is simply not feasible and might even hinder the birth of the joint action now proposed by the Commission, which would be particularly unfortunate when the aims of this action find almost unanimous support from all the interested parties.

I shall now briefly expound the second part of the Commission's proposal, which considers aid to shipbuilding from the point of view of eliminating distortion of competition. The Commission's and Council's measures have, in the past, always tended to reduce so-called direct aid—i.e., subsidization of operating costs—in view of the fact that such aid, by definition, tends to distort competition. A result of this effort was

**Spinelli**

that, in the second directive, direct aid was limited to a maximum of 4% of the price of the contract. This is certainly a significant achievement if it is remembered that some states were previously granting aid of up to 30% of the contract price. This third directive proposes to reduce such aid further. It takes account of the efforts made by the OECD in this field; in particular, it lays down more restrictive conditions for granting export credit, and is designed to eliminate all the other types of aid referred to in the OECD general agreement. The Commission's proposal therefore fixes a schedule for completely abolishing such aid.

I have nothing more to say about aid to investment, having already talked about it.

There is another point upon which your committee does not agree with the Commission, *viz.*, the term of application of the directive. Your rapporteur suggested that the directive should remain in force only until 31 December 1975. I cannot agree with this suggestion. It is obviously a good idea to draw up a timetable for the abolition of aids, but a period of at least four years is needed to give industry time to make the effort needed to become competitive. After this period has elapsed, reorganization should be complete, or at least have reached a fairly advanced stage. The directive must, therefore, remain in force for as long a period as this effort requires, during which time particular checks will be conducted on what aid is granted. The undertakings need a reasonable length of time to become acquainted with the system to be applied to them as far as aid is concerned, and less than four years simply does not seem compatible with this requirement. This is why I think a term of four years should be maintained for the directive. Obviously, if, during the negotiations with the OECD, agreements were reached which went beyond the measures provided in this directive, the directive would automatically be amended.

I should like now to make a few brief comments on Miss Lulling's report. The purpose of the proposal is to direct assistance from the European Social Fund to persons employed in the shipbuilding industry so that it meets the definite need for qualifications in a sector which, in the future, may have to undergo far-reaching structural changes which will affect employment.

It will only be possible to restructure and modernize this industry if employment in shipyards is reduced. There is, therefore, a need for assistance from the Social Fund to effect the necessary transfers. I should like to make it quite clear that there can be no question of

structurally renovating the shipbuilding industry without reducing employment. On the basis of Article 5 of the Council's decision of 1 February 1971 on the reform of the European Social Fund, the Fund may provide assistance to support measures in this sector which are designed to eliminate unemployment and under-employment or provide training for highly-qualified manpower. The Fund's assistance on this basis is not, however, large enough to support all the training measures needed to put the sector right while safeguarding the interests of all those involved.

This is why the proposal under consideration is based on Article 4, rather than Article 5, of the above decision. This article links the Fund's assistance either to special measures adopted by the Council implementing Community policies or to measures decided upon in common to facilitate the achievement of Community aims. In this way, the Fund's assistance will be provided in advance and may make it possible to resolve in good time the manpower problems raised by the restructuring of the sector. It would be given to all employees irrespective of their level of qualification and future destiny—in other words, irrespective of whether it was a question of improving existing qualifications or complete retraining for activities inside or outside the sector. It would link training measures to sectional and regional operations in the framework of a definite programme, so that the action taken was internally consistent. All the measures included in the list drawn up by the Council would be applicable. The Fund's assistance as such would cover a four-year period, which seems reasonable, at the end of which the Council, acting on a proposal from the Commission, would consider the advisability of maintaining all or part of such assistance.

Here I come to the two points on which Miss Lulling's report departs from the Commission's proposal. The motion for a resolution drawn up by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment regrets the lack of information on the probable number of workers affected by the reorganization and the number of persons likely to be granted aid from the Fund. It is feared that the fact that the financial implications of the aid granted are unknown will give rise to difficulties in the Council and exaggerate the budgetary problems with which the Fund is already confronted as a result of the inadequate resources available.

Indeed, we are also concerned about these matters, but it must be remembered that any data collected on the number of persons likely to be granted aid from the Fund must be extremely provisional. As is stressed in the proposal for a



**Spinelli**

decision which we have submitted, Community shipyard's order-books are relatively full at the moment, so that there is little incentive for contractors to plan ahead, provide figures and modernize or reorganize their yards of their own accord.

In addition, most Community countries do not apply planning measures in this sector.

Finally, the nature of the desired reorganization is still to be established through initiatives at the state level and Community action. As a result, any estimates, even those provided for your rapporteur by the Commission's services, should be taken with a pinch of salt.

However, I do not think that figures are basically what it is all about. This is an essentially political problem. If the Council considers that the Commission's proposals may help to create a situation in which the shipbuilding industry will develop harmoniously, it will be necessary to provide the Social Fund with the means needed to encourage the necessary shift of personnel.

As to the second objection, I agree with your rapporteur that the reference to the world-wide basis in Article 2 should be deleted.

The motion for a resolution of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment also invites the Commission to extend the Fund's assistance to persons employed in sectors which are directly dependent on shipbuilding and would also be affected by the repercussions of reorganization. The Commission did not think it advisable to extend the field of application of its proposal, considering that these workers could obtain assistance from the Fund on the basis of Article 5 of the Council's decision. We nevertheless note your committee's proposal and, if the Parliament approves it, we can assure you that the Commission will give it due attention.

(Applause)

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Spinelli.

I call Mr Lange to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, honourable colleagues, to listen to Mr Spinelli's remarks one might think that there had never been consultations in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in which Mr Spinelli had participated and agreed with the committee on certain compromises.

Today again he is arguing—whatever his reasons—against a structural directive on the shipbuilding sector that is supposed to be part of a general industrial and economic structural

policy. Once again he takes a directive on aid and tries practically to turn it into a directive on structure. He says, however, that the Commission cannot and does not want to propose structural directives. I find this a strange way of tackling the subject, to put it mildly. I know how difficult it is to make the views of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs clear to the members of the Commission responsible for these matters—and not only the Commissioner with special responsibility.

This was obvious in discussions with those responsible—which lasted over two hours. After Mr Spinelli's statement I am tempted to say that it would have been better if we had rejected this directive as we wanted to do. For, Mr Spinelli, the second directive originally lapsed on 31 December 1973 having come into force 20 July 1972. You were asked then to examine the question of a structural policy for the shipbuilding sector. The Council has extended the validity of the directive by half a year for a definite purpose, because it wants to do more than simply harmonize aid.

If we want to harmonize conditions of competition in the Community it is not simply a question of harmonizing or standardizing aid; it is not simply a question of a Community system for such aid, but rather a Community system for many different spheres, including the social sphere. There is the industrial-policy aspect, the commercial aspect, the external economic aspect, the social aspect. All these must, of course, be incorporated in a directive which promotes the productivity and competitive power of the European shipbuilding industry.

This cannot be achieved by a directive on aid. We have no objection, and that is why we agreed to a compromise—I say that on behalf of the Socialist Group—we have no objection to aid being coordinated to some extent by a Community system and an attempt, at least, made eventually to achieve uniform terms of competition in the Community. That cannot be done by this directive alone, but only by a structural directive.

I therefore earnestly appeal to the Commission and to Mr Spinelli to think about this. To be honest, I got the impression just now—we can speak quite openly and amicably about this—that the Commission is trying to take up a position *vis-à-vis* the Parliament not unlike that of the Council. Up to now the Commission had always appealed for the Parliament's support. If the Commission wants the Parliament's support, then it must be prepared at least to listen to the Parliament's point of view and not merely listen, but really consider how the Parliament's wishes might be met; the Commission cannot

**Lange**

claim a monopoly of wisdom. In one of the Commission's answers—at least in the interpretation I heard—it sounded as if the Commission thinks it knows the answers and the Parliament does not. I am very sorry, but surely we can't continue like that.

Personally I believe, and I am speaking also unreservedly on behalf of the Socialist Group, that as long as aid is still being paid somewhere in the world for shipbuilding we will have to pay aid too. That is the first point that has to be clearly understood.

Secondly, we ask the Commission to make every effort to promote world-wide action in this matter and where possible to negotiate in agreements of this kind. I have nothing against a comprehensive agreement with Japan covering shipbuilding among other matters. This is perfectly in order if the full range of economic issues can be included in this way and Japan conforms to the GATT regulations and renounces certain kinds of aggressive external economic policy. The Commission should arrange such an agreement. As long ago as 20 July 1972 it had the time and opportunity to take such action—and in fact it was instructed to do so. Now it wants to drag the whole thing out for a further four years until the end of 1977 with a new directive.

However, we want to put pressure on the Commission and maintain that this directive must expire by 31 December 1975, and then be replaced by an appropriate structural directive in which all factors are taken into account, for example those included in the proposals of the European Conservative Group. This is how these things should be dealt with, and not in this directive on aid, which is being quite wrongly treated as a structural directive without our being able to influence structural policy as we would wish. If it is only the Commission that is going to decide what is to happen in the various spheres, as Mr Spinelli has suggested—at least that is what I understood from the interpretation—, this seems to me a procedure Parliament simply cannot agree to.

It is quite clear that in any reorganization the social security of the workers must be safeguarded. But it is equally clear that no particular job can be guaranteed, only employment of some kind. This means that reorganization raises a whole mass of questions of a social nature. That is indisputable; we were all agreed about that and the Socialist Group unreservedly supports what Miss Lulling says in her report. We therefore think that this motion for a resolution as well as that of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs should be adopted.

If I may anticipate the discussion on the amendments proposed by the European Conservative Group, I think there is no difference of opinion here. The only question is where to include these matters; in a directive on the organization of shipbuilding or a directive on aid. And it is our view that all these things—this was clear in the discussion in the Committee on Economic Affairs—should be dealt with in the structural directive.

The Commission should really begin immediately to assemble all the necessary data for the structural directive. As I have said, it should have done that after 20 July 1972. The Commission cannot go on telling us: 'We are not yet in a position to do that; we haven't collected the necessary data; we need more information, etc., etc.' We should therefore appreciate it if the Commission would get down to this work seriously—and seriously does not mean with fine talk. This needs saying, for the answers we have been given to all the searching questions from the rapporteur and other colleagues in committee have always been eloquent enough, but hardly satisfactory.

While I am speaking for the Socialist Group, I hope the House will also allow me to speak—though not easily, for I cannot quite cut myself in two—as Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and confirm my support for the rapporteur, to make sure that certain questions are not omitted from the debate, but clarified, and the committee's intentions too. I therefore repeat our view: the House should adopt those resolutions unamended and reserve the amendments proposed by the European Conservative Group for the structural directive.

I shall just say one more thing. I think I can do that with a clear conscience, since the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has already been active in promoting various directives. I am thinking of the directive on stability and growth and the directive on full employment—even though they have not turned out exactly as the committee hoped. For structural policy too the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs will prepare proposals covering these questions.

No one can get up and say that the Socialist Group, on the one hand, and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the other, wish to create unemployment by their proposals for reorganizing and reviving a branch of industry. On the contrary: our political intention is to secure the social and economic conditions of the workers. And these aims must be embodied in the structural directive.

**Lange**

Mr Scott-Hopkins, it is no use shaking your head—that is the view of the committee and our group. If I were to deny that, I should be distorting the truth. Your Amendment No 1—I assume this is an oversight—refers to the Regional Development Fund, which in fact does not exist yet. If you bring this non-existent Fund into this, you are invalidating the whole thing, and your own position, too. Therefore this does not seem to me quite the right way to tackle the matter, although certainly the Regional Development Fund and the European Social Fund, and perhaps the European Investment Bank, and so on, would eventually have to be brought into this, and partly to support the Member States' own action—I stress: the Member States' own action, for the Member States cannot be relieved of all responsibility here: we certainly do not want the Community to take over their responsibility.

I should just like to give you one example. My own country has, for years, struggled to work out an appropriate structural policy. Our *Länder*—you know what the *Länder* are in my country: their relationship to the *Bund* is similar to that of the Member States of the EEC to the Community—our *Länder* produced request after request. The *Bund* and the *Bundestag* were prepared to accede to such requests, but only on condition that the *Länder* contributed their own efforts. After many years' work this has now been achieved.

I do not think there is any alternative solution for the Community. The Member States must make a certain contribution to structural policy so that the Community can also act with a clear conscience.

That, Mr President and honourable colleagues, is our position.

Once again, let me make it clear that we recommend the adoption of both committee's resolutions, without amendment.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Normanton to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Mr Normanton.** — On behalf of the European Conservative Group I would like to comment on the two papers before us today, one in the name of Miss Lulling, the second in the name of Mr Krall. I shall take Miss Lulling's paper first, because it is appropriate to do so before we change the line of approach, which I see as fundamental if we are to arrive at any constructive contribution in the course of this debate.

I shall quote two remarks made by Miss Lulling in presenting her paper. First, she said we must not allow this industry to collapse. We, the European Conservative Group, strongly support and endorse that attitude of mind. It must not be allowed to collapse. Secondly, I hope that Miss Lulling will allow me to paraphrase the words she chose when I say that her comments ran like this: all who work in the shipbuilding industry should not be exposed to a devil-take-the-hindmost attitude on the part of Member States in general or the Community in particular.

The process of change should not be left to an attitude of sinking or swimming. We of the European Conservative Group strongly support the stand which Miss Lulling has taken in her paper; but, equally, I submit to this House that we must not pursue a Community policy of insulating in perpetuity any industry from the urgent and continuing necessity for industrial change. I said 'any industry' and that includes shipbuilding, the subject of our discussion.

But the reference in Miss Lulling's report to a particular way of dealing with the situation is liable to the interpretation that in her report she is recommending the provision of a permanent cushion or mattress for management and men to sleep on, in a condition where change is unnecessary. I am certain that that is not in her mind and I hope it will not be the lesson drawn by this Parliament from the paper and proposals she has submitted to us.

To deal in that way with the shipbuilding industry, or with any industry, would be a complete negation of everything for which this Parliament stands. We want change. We want positive and constructive proposals to be considered and eventually promulgated by the Commission and the Council of Ministers. At this point I would particularly endorse the inference I draw from Mr Lange's comments when he clearly placed importance on restructuring rather than on cushioning or insulating. That is a constructive view which in principle the European Conservative Group would support.

This brings me to the Krall proposals, which we are also discussing. They are, in effect, but the other side of one and the same coin. The proposals put forward by Miss Lulling form but a part of an overall approach to dealing with the problem of this old industry, and I hope that we shall draw lessons which are appropriate and applicable to other industries, too.

The object of the Krall report, and undoubtedly the Commission's objective in the paper we are considering and upon which Mr Krall is

### Normanton

commenting, is clear. It is the establishment of a viable, competitive industry able to compete in the markets of the world. That is the only standard by which we should judge the words 'competitive capability': it is the ability within these vast world markets for the shipbuilding industry of the Community to compete, to win orders and to produce at a competitive price.

Therefore, we must approach the criteria which we believe should apply to the industry on a global basis and not restrict our view to what obtains within the confines of the Member States of the Community. For example, we should not ignore the fact that there have to be discussions in international terms, within the framework of international institutions such as the OECD. Bearing in mind that there is an expansion of the shipbuilding industry in parts of the world which are not members of existing institutions—I refer to South Korea, and I think that Poland may well be one such case—we must have it clearly in our minds that no solution to the problem can be found unless we can obtain acceptance of common rules of competition or guidelines, effectively established on a world basis.

I come to what I believe is probably the crunch. It is contained in the proposals in the amendments. I believe that there is a great danger of interpreting the Krall report, and indeed the Commission's proposals, as if almost unilaterally we had to end this stupidity of perpetuating subsidies and internal distortions in the shipbuilding industry. If indeed that is the objective—certainly the Commission's proposals and the Krall report suggest that it is an objective, with a deadline attached to it of 1975 or shortly thereafter—it is a totally unrealistic approach for one part of a world manufacturing industry.

We must consider five areas in which decisions and judgments have to be made, and all five approaches must converge before we can say with complete justification: 'There shall be no distortions by one Member State or another giving special advantages with a view to gaining some competitive edge over its neighbour.' I will list these five briefly.

First, we must establish a Community regional policy. That must be backed by a regional fund—and not by way of establishing a feather bed upon which this or any other sector of European industry can rest. It must be used as one of the instruments to be brought into operation to help, to stimulate and to cushion, over a short period, the whole process of restructuring. Until we have a Community regional policy, backed by an appropriate fund and directed by a Commission with clear objectives to pursue, we believe that it will not be possible to end the

payment of subsidies of one kind or another to this sector, or indeed to many other sectors, of European industry.

Secondly, I want to place it firmly on the record of this House that the members of the European Conservative Group believe that the role of the Community as regards industrial change is two-fold. It is, first, to draft overall broad policies of a political nature, at Council or Commission level. However, the implementation of those proposals must be left in the hands of industry itself. Any proposals which might be interpreted as the laying down by political institutions of detailed structural changes to be imposed upon any sector of industry are doomed to disaster.

The role of the Commission is, therefore, to create the kind of economic climate in which industry—and I use the word in a broad sense; that is, the employees and the trade union component part of industry—can take positive and constructive measures towards restructuring the Community industry of shipbuilding, and can do so unfettered by national frontiers or distortions introduced by party political attitudes.

Thirdly, we should be very ill-advised were we in this House to ignore, when discussing the shipbuilding industry, the fact that we are talking of an industry which not only builds merchant ships but also undertakes naval and defence projects, whether these be battleships or any other product of the industry with which many of us are familiar.

This industry is therefore influenced and distorted by two areas of policy—the first, industrial policy for the Community and the second, defence policy. We should be very irresponsible if we did not see, therefore, when discussing the shipbuilding industry, the interdependence of industrial policy and defence policy.

I would emphasize that Parliament—the Community as a whole—cannot deal effectively and comprehensively with this industry or, indeed, any sector of industry in Europe, without taking within its purview responsibility for defence. I know that this is a highly controversial point, but I think it is appropriate to make it when discussing the restructuring of any major sector of the Community industry.

Fourthly, international agreements are essential if we are to create the international climate in which the restructured shipbuilding industry of Europe can be competitive. It is no good trying to restructure or to institute measures for restructuring in isolation from the realities of the world in which our industry would have to compete with others.

**Normanton**

Lastly, I suggest that we shall be dealing with one facet only of this extremely important problem of restructuring the shipbuilding industry if we ignore the distortions which operate in the world at large regarding the products of the industry. I refer to shipping in the international sphere.

Having posed a far wider range of problems than I believe the Commission may have covered in their document, I still feel that there are considerable justifications for stressing the importance of the objective and the means of achieving that objective. The objective is, and must be, an industry able to stand firmly on its own feet and to be competitive in world markets, the corollary to which is the ending of subsidies of all kinds, since they create a distortion in the operation of this or, indeed, of any industry.

However, until all other aspects of the distortions in the world as a whole, and all the other aspects of the problems to which I have referred on behalf of my group, are taken fully into account, it would in our judgment be irresponsible to prescribe the precise intention of ending subsidies and aid to this industry—as, indeed, to others—and attaching a deadline to it, without coupling with it the crucial necessity to take all these aspects of the problem into account at the same time. In those terms, and with those qualifications, the European Conservative Group gives a qualified welcome to the Krall report and a full endorsement to the Lulling report.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Liogier.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we approve of the Commission's objective, which is to make the Community's shipbuilding industry competitive on a world-wide basis.

This objective can only be attained if the industry does not come up against more or less artificial competition from third countries. The shipbuilding market has, however, been marked by more rapid expansion of the means of production over the last ten years, particularly where Japan is concerned.

The fact that this expansion is continuing, both in Japan and in other third countries, indicates that there is no likelihood of a return to normal market conditions in the near future. For this reason we endorse the hope expressed by the committee and the rapporteur, Mr Krall (whom

we congratulate on his excellent report), that a common shipbuilding policy can be evolved, based on precise objectives and joint consultation between the Commission, the national governments and the shipbuilders. These objectives could be the basis for measures allowing the Community shipbuilding industry to continue its operations normally.

The Commission has proposed replacing the present system of operational aids by investment aids. We regard this as a good economic strategy. We agree with the rapporteur that it fits into a specific industrial policy and clearly-defined objectives.

We endorse Mr Bersani's remark that the Commission must draw up a structural directive with more detailed rules and covering a longer period of time.

We think, in fact, that the four-year period initially stipulated by the Commission for the application of this new system is insufficient, because of the time needed to decide on and raise the investments and derive the maximum benefit from them.

Investment is essential if the Community shipbuilding industry is to stand up to competition from third countries. These countries have extensive financing facilities which enable them to carry out a huge investment programme and thereby increase their productivity.

It seems contradictory to be thinking of investments at a time when a period of recession seems probable. But in the Community it is more a case of compensating for the comparative inadequacy of the objectives than trying to increase production in a systematic manner.

In the structural directive that the Commission is to submit to us, it will have to show an original approach. It will also have to tackle the problem in depth, in particular defining the optimal economic criteria for allocating investment aid on the basis of the qualitative and quantitative objectives of each shipyard, without resorting to economic *dirigisme*.

We would ask the Commission to do the same with regard to aid from the Social Fund.

In her excellent report, Miss Lulling approves the proposals from the Commission based on Article 4 of the Council decision on the Social Fund, but expresses strong reservations about the amount of aid and its objectives, rightly considering that the funds should be directed towards ensuring the survival of the shipyards and not hastening their closure.

It is only by being integrated with other European policies that the Social Fund can ensure

**Liogier**

improved employment for the workers, not by subsidizing their transfer to other industries or promoting their redundancy or premature retirement.

Thus, we support the proposal but urge the Commission to provide us with further information on the employment situation, for, as my colleagues said a short time ago, it has not given any figures on the amount of aid required or the number of workers affected, and this is likely to cause difficulties for the Commission and exacerbate the Fund's budgetary problems, for its resources for 1974 are, as you will have appreciated, extremely small.

As for the gradual abolition of operational aid, which is the Commission's object, we are quite willing to accept this. However, it must be undertaken in the light of the present economic situation, because we know that there is likely to be an imbalance between supply and demand in the second half of the present decade, and this might lead to an escalation of aid in certain countries which had to sustain the expansion of their shipyards whatever the cost.

If, therefore, we accept the replacement of operational aid by investment aid, we must point out that factors such as this must be taken into consideration and the period over which the change is to take place should permit a gradual adjustment of objectives.

As regards the ceiling for aid, we accept this in principle, but would point out that it is incompatible with a system in which the financial implications cannot, by definition, be foreseen and are the outcome of factors over which the shipbuilders have no control. Seen from this point of view, the ceiling should not be applied to the implications of the scheme for insurance against economic risks, which it would be advantageous to apply throughout the Community. It should also be pointed out that recently, in the absence of such a scheme, the governments of certain Member States and third countries had to provide huge sums of aid to subsidize their shipyards, whose existence was threatened by rising costs.

To conclude, Mr President, the system proposed for credit facilities seems very complex and likely to cause problems of allocation so far as the proposed terms for investment aid are concerned, in view of the considerable differences in the way the capital market operates in the various Member States. In any case, the period originally stipulated in the document for the introduction of this aid is clearly too short, and furthermore it seems that these measures will not be sufficient, so far as the Community shipyards are concerned, to counteract the present

distortions of competition on the international market, which are likely to increase in the future, in view of the growth of surplus production capacity.

For this reason, we join with the rapporteur in urging the Commission to submit a carefully worked-out structural directive without delay, taking into account observations put forward in the course of this debate.

**President.** — I call Mr James Hill.

**Mr James Hill.** — We heard the Commissioner at the beginning of the debate, and frankly some of his remarks depressed me, particularly when he was talking about Japan. It is also significant that the whole of Mr Krall's report concentrates on world capacity in shipbuilding and suggests that we must negotiate with Japan to correct any imbalance in our shipbuilding capacity.

The Commissioner said that there was not much chance of getting the balance right unless it was in a thoroughly thought-out commercial plan with the Japanese industrial force. I think that is right. I cannot imagine any major industrial country such as Japan being willing to renegotiate or, indeed, to reduce its shipbuilding capacity, in which we know it is extremely skilled, simply because the Community wishes to rationalize its own shipbuilding capacity. That was the first depressing point that the Commissioner made.

The second point was that we must have a coherent Community policy. That is obvious to all of us. Some of the Member States are not reliant on shipbuilding, ship repairing or, indeed, any other form of capacity concerned with the sea. Therefore, the task falls on the shoulders of those Member States which are particularly committed to a shipbuilding export market. The United Kingdom could be termed as one of those countries that relies to a great extent on its shipbuilding export market.

The two reports clash inasmuch as one is saying that we shall have rationalization in shipbuilding and the other is saying that when rationalization takes place we shall use this diminutive Social Fund to help with unemployment problems.

Miss Lulling is spreading her bread and fish so far that the 90 million units of account, which I believe are already committed in part to the handicapped and the disabled, will now also go to support not only the changeover period in the rationalization of the Community's shipbuilding industry but also the ancillary workers

**James Hill**

of the shipbuilding industry. Anyone who has the least idea of how a ship is built knows that there may be as many as one thousand sub-contractors engaged in building the normal large tanker. Consequently, we are dealing not with a few hundred or a few thousand workers, but perhaps, throughout the Community, with a quarter of a million workers. I am particularly concerned, as was Mr Lange, that these jobs should not be put in jeopardy by too hasty a decision.

What the amendments suggest is only too obvious. The British shipbuilding industry is fully committed. We have a total order book, excluding naval work, of about £1,300 million. The vast majority is for export. Only last year we had an order book of 839,000 gross tons. This year it is five times that figure.

The British shipbuilding industry has been made more efficient because the government have pressed vast amounts of national aid into the technical progress and research development of the shipyards. In areas such as the Clyde, this aid has been used almost as a social fund to create jobs and to keep people in employment. It is easy for people to say that we shall have retraining programmes. However, it is difficult to retrain a middle-aged boilermaker—a man used to working with heavy sheet metal and perhaps limited in the direction in which his brain can go—in a finer art. Consequently, we have a retraining problem that is far more severe than in agriculture.

In amendments that we shall be discussing, we ask the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to have a world-wide look at the problem rather than look at it only within the OECD. In a world-wide look I include even countries behind the Iron Curtain. The countries of the world must agree on world capacity, otherwise there will be vast unemployment in some regions.

The whole scenario changes, perhaps, once a Member State depends on its balance of payments for its foreign currency. A country such as the United Kingdom, which has to import so much, is certainly very much at hazard if it loses any part of the foreign currency it can get from exporting through the shipbuilding industry.

Certainly the larger shipbuilding centres are in areas in which historically there is a high percentage of unemployment, so that the shipbuilding industry is already starting at a disadvantage. One can take the North of England—for example Barrow-in-Furness and the River Mersey—as well as Belfast, which offers another grave social problem.

The British government have ploughed in many millions of pounds in national aid, perhaps solely to give continuity of work. It is said that idle hands are the Devil's playthings, and the government realized how essential it was to modernize a great yard, such as Harland and Wolff, to keep the workers working and the unemployment percentage at a very low level. There are, therefore, more problems than are apparent.

If national aid is to be phased out—and I am sure the Community is determined to do it—it must be done in as humane a way as possible. Certainly there must be no time lag between the ending of national aid and the introduction of Community support.

Reference was made to the Regional Development Fund. This is a disappointing side of the Community. That fund, if it works in isolation, may well be working against the Community policy on shipbuilding capacity because one of its provisions is that a reason for giving aid from the fund is a 20% unemployment level in one of the declining industrial sectors and a rate of unemployment at least 20% above the national average. Net outward migration of at least 10% of the population over a long period is another reason why the Regional Development Fund could assist.

This will react against a Community shipbuilding policy which is too harsh in the phasing period. The Social Fund is inadequate to deal with this problem. If we are seriously intent on rationalizing the shipbuilding industry, for heaven's sake let us increase the Social Fund so that it can play an effective part in the difficult times ahead.

I am not putting in a plea for the United Kingdom. We have modernized. We have full order books and are prepared to match our efficiency and now our delivery dates against most of the nations of the world. Nevertheless, there is a problem. Some yards will be asked to lower their production levels. Some workers will be asked to retrain. There will be unemployment. We as a responsible Parliament must look forward to the day when we shall help the Community not by creating unemployment but by showing the workers that we shall safeguard their jobs.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Pounder.

**Mr Pounder.** — It is fortuitous that I am following directly my friend and colleague, Mr Hill, for there is little or nothing in what he said from which I would in any degree dissent. Of course I acknowledge, as I believe we

**Pounder**

all do, that it is a cornerstone of Community policy that wherever possible distortions in competition should be eliminated. It is right that that should be so. I accept that policy. It is reasonable and common sense.

But with great respect to Mr Krall's report, the first sentence in paragraph 4 greatly disturbed me when I read it for the first time, and it has kept me awake at night ever since. It reads: 'Requests the Commission to draw up a timetable for the abolition of the various aids, including investment aid.' I realize that when Mr Krall introduced his report today, he did not hint along those lines, and I am deeply grateful to him for that, but it is right that there should be a shipbuilding policy.

Anyone who has any knowledge or experience of the shipbuilding industry in any of the Member States knows only too well that over the years it has required massive injections of public funds, in the main for modernization.

It can be no secret to anyone in this House that coming, as I do, from Belfast, I think in terms of shipyards, not least because my father worked in one for 50 years. But that is beside the point. The fact is that, wherever one looks in the Community, shipbuilding in the main is centred in areas where there is little or no alternative employment. That is certainly true of the United Kingdom and France. So far as I know, it is true also of Italy, and it is probably true of all the other Member States.

It is nonsensical to imagine that what are known in the trade as 'the black squads'—the boilermakers, the riveters, the welders, and so on—can be moved from one job to another. They cannot. Electricians and joiners can be moved, but there are many trades in shipbuilding which cannot be adapted to alternative forms of employment. I know that it is true in Belfast, and it is probably true to make this statement as a generalization, that for every person engaged in manufacturing industry there are five others who live off that person so employed, in the service trades and so on.

Let me be specific, because this is the best way to illustrate my point. Belfast is a city of 400,000 people, 10,000 of whom work in the shipyards. Therefore, 50,000 people in that city alone are dependent upon shipbuilding. The same is true of many other parts of the United Kingdom. It is also true of St-Nazaire.

Let us therefore be realistic. Although it is right that distortions in competition should be eliminated, it is wholly wrong to argue that a programme of investment aid to the shipbuilding industry can be cut off. If it is replaced by Community aid, that is fine and makes sense.

That is a proposal I look forward to seeing as part of the Regional Fund when it is developed.

We must remember that there are many forms of hidden subsidy provided in the shipbuilding industry which must be eliminated. With that I agree. The two-tier pricing structure for steel is one of the more outrageous and yet more skilfully hidden subsidies frequently provided in shipbuilding communities. The Japanese are a classic case in point.

I agree with the second half of paragraph 4 of Mr Krall's report. We must try to get a world shipbuilding policy put together in such a way that there is not outrageous and distorted competition between shipbuilders in one country and shipbuilders in another—between Japan, Poland, East Germany and the Member States of the Community.

But to talk at this moment of eliminating or substantially reducing aid to the shipbuilding industry is nonsense. The shipbuilding industry is a vital industry in the Community. Indeed, it is probably one of the most important of the industries that exist.

Nearly all the Community countries are maritime powers. With all the sincerity at my command, I beg Members of the House to think very carefully indeed before they espouse a policy of reducing or terminating aid to this industry.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli** *Member of the Commission of the European Communities.* — (1) I should like to reply to some of the remarks which have been made. First of all I should like to read you the text of Article 7 of the second directive, which Mr Lange cited in order to show that the Commission had not done what it ought to have done.

The article stipulates:

'This directive shall remain in force until 31 December 1973. As soon as possible, the Commission shall study the development of supply and demand on the international shipbuilding market and the effect of all aids and measures which have a significant direct or indirect effect on the conditions of competition and trade in these markets in the Community.'

We were therefore instructed to conduct a study, not to present a programme.

Article 7 continues: 'The Commission shall submit to the Council proposals based on the results



**Spinelli**

of these studies, and the Council shall consider them before the end of 1973.'

We think that the Commission's proposals should only indicate the criteria on which the conduct of a certain policy will be based and that there is no obligation to issue a directive. The Commission has the power to assess the aids, and a directive can only be drafted when we are by and large agreed on shipping policy.

This debate and the differences of opinion which have emerged show that any attempt to issue a directive would be an act of political insensitivity and would be a dead letter from the start. The Commission should indicate the criteria and requirements which must be taken into account in circumstances which are difficult and continually changing.

The essential purpose of the criteria suggested is to ensure that aids to investment are not distributed at random but, as far as possible, fall within an overall sectoral or regional plan so that difficult regional or sectoral situations which may change can be taken into account.

We have not suggested that the Commission draft these regional plans all alone—such a request would be ridiculous. The plans must obviously be drawn up by the various governments in agreement with the Commission, because, particularly under present circumstances, it would hardly be realistic to treat the Community as if it were an ultra-centralized state which draws up programmes for others.

I therefore think that these proposals might give us instruments which take account of certain difficulties. I also think it is clear that aids must be eliminated step by step. This is why we have asked you not to insist on the term of a year-and-a-half.

I am not sure that there has not been a misunderstanding in this matter. If I remember correctly, when we spoke of this matter at a meeting of your committee, I never said that the Commission was willing to present a directive in the very near future, only that it was prepared to keep Parliament informed of developments in the situation so that the Assembly could decide if, at a certain moment, the situation warranted a directive.

This Assembly can certainly decide that a directive is warranted, and if you did so I should certainly forward your view to the Commission to see whether or not it could accept it. However, I do not recommend this line of action, because I am sure that, if we draw up a proposal for a directive, it will be pigeon-holed by Coreper for the next four or five years if we have not first prepared the ground by bringing

national shipbuilding policies into line with one another. Today, these national policies differ a great deal, and we should try to avoid the clashes which would be inevitable if we attempted to reconcile the irreconcilable by means of a directive. If, on the other hand, a Council directive in this matter simply repeated the same general indications which we have made in our Memorandum, I can frankly tell you that I should not accept it but would suggest that the Commission apply to the Court of Justice, because, in that case, the Council would be infringing on the Commission's prerogatives. It is not for the Council to establish general criteria, and I feel that the Commission has acted correctly and fulfilled its obligations.

I should like to say a few words about Japan. The most important thing is that we must keep in touch with reality and not be blinded by figures. It is said, even in our documents, that Europe's share in ship production has fallen from 60% to 25%. The Japanese, by contrast, who earlier accounted for a very small share, now produce over 50%. This might give the impression that the European industry was collapsing. In fact, however, in absolute terms, the production of ships in the Community has increased. In other words, some people have gone further forward than we have, but this does not mean that we have gone backwards. Where is the law which rules that Europe must maintain its share of 56%? What possible grounds could there be for believing that there is any need to do so? The only possible justification is a certain pride which is quite understandable in any producer always trying to corner a larger share of the market.

This is why we think that a policy, if there is to be one, should not attempt to keep the yards as they are but give them a chance of becoming more competitive. To this end, we must pursue a policy based on investment, modernization and increased research in the social field, and also carry out a certain degree of concentration.

We can certainly not expect to get all the results at once, unless all we want is to leave everything as it is in the sector and, when it becomes even less competitive, issue a sort of Navigation Act stipulating that all our goods must be transported on our ships. I rather doubt whether this would be a very intelligent policy.

A relevant aspect of the highly competitive Japanese industry is its greater efficiency and the modernity of its structures. We should certainly take this factor into account, but, if we follow a sensible policy, I am sure that Japan has no other advantages—she certainly is not intrinsically more capable.

**Spinelli**

For some time, the undervaluation of the yen has given the Japanese certain advantages in this and in other fields. Now, however, they have had to pay for this by revaluing their currency several times, so that I now feel that the Japanese threat is largely a thing of the past and we may consider the matter more calmly. However, thinking of it from the Japanese point of view, it is quite obvious that if we suggested splitting the market with them they, considering themselves stronger and therefore hoping to increase their production further, would refuse the offer. This does not exclude the possibility of arranging certain rules of the game, codes of correct behaviour, but such general rules lie outside the specific question under discussion today. It should also be stated that the Commission has never yet pursued a policy of dividing markets, so it seems extremely unlikely that it should first do so in a case where the other partner is relatively uninterested.

I have nothing more to say, other than once more pointing out to anyone worried about the effects of a radical change that the Commission's proposal is designed to introduce a flexible instrument so that the existing differences in the shipbuilding sector may be gradually eliminated.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Spinelli.

I call Mr Brøndlund Nielsen.

**Mr Brøndlund Nielsen.** — *(DK)* Mr President, I should briefly like to express and justify my appreciation of the reports by Miss Lulling and Mr Krall, which seem to me to be in a spirit that is likely to carry the Community forward. A number of speakers have warned against aiming Community policy at the creation of more liberal conditions in the shipbuilding industry.

There are two main reasons for Western Europe's industrial and economic strength. Firstly, a free economy in which initiative and competition have been allowed to develop; secondly, good social conditions and security for industrial employees founded on state support.

I believe the Commission understands the need to continue along these lines, and Miss Lulling's and Mr Krall's reports emphasize the fact that we must make rapid progress.

We have also discussed today the economic problems facing us owing to recent developments on the world market in raw materials. It will clearly be difficult to maintain the current rate of development and living standards in Western Europe. I find it absolutely neces-

sary that we bear in mind the two factors I have just mentioned if we wish to ensure our continued development. I therefore firmly believe it is most important in the shipbuilding sector that we ensure sound competition and avoid the distortions, and the lack of technical innovation and development, which may result from too much passive support from public funds. It is extremely important to continue liberalization.

I also believe it is important to give welfare support to those workers who may have to leave the industry, in order to safeguard the free movement of labour. Without these principles in the Community, developments in this sector would aggravate the difficulties facing us in the long run if we are to maintain current standards in our part of the world. Thus I would stress that we must support the tendency towards liberal development founded on social ideals as expressed, for example, in Miss Lulling's report, where it is stated in paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution that we consider 'that the objective of the Community's coordinated social, industrial and regional policy measures in favour of shipbuilding should be to ensure the development of a dynamic and competitive industry in the Community'. This is surely the right course.

As I said, the same feeling is expressed in Mr Krall's report, and I would strongly recommend we follow this line.

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — *(D)* Mr President, honourable colleagues, I wish to speak again to clarify a few points.

We do really seem to be speaking at cross-purposes. Part of Mr Spinelli's argument in his second speech quite blatantly sidetracked the issue.

There are two main points in the motion for a resolution of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. Under Point 6, the Parliament requests 'the Commission to submit without delay a proposal for a structural directive on the shipbuilding sector', and under point 7 it instructs 'its Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to request details on the subject from the Commission'. If these two points are adopted, I promise you, Mr Spinelli, we shall discuss the matter further with you on 3 and 4 July. We shall also then discuss the tricky legal questions which you have brought up already in committee; at this time, as we said, we could only take note of your legal interpretation. Our own view is different. However, we had no

**Lange**

opportunity to thrash out this legal argument and examine the different legal interpretations in an effort to reconcile them. This must be done. If you maintain that this would be encroaching on the Commission's sphere of competence, we should have to consider whether that is so; we have already agreed to that. But just because you accept a particular interpretation which is diametrically opposed to that of the Parliament, so far as its Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs is concerned, that should not prevent you from responding appropriately to the Parliament's wishes. We have to discuss things with each other and not say, 'We are not going to do anything'.

One last point: formally speaking, you are of course quite right to say that point 7 of the directive of 20 June 1972 does not commit you definitely in connection with this policy. But indeed I never said it did. I said you were required to deal with these matters directly or indirectly and prepare, not a new directive, but far-reaching proposals on industrial and structural policy. We shall pursue this matter too, Mr Spinelli, on 3 and 4 July in the committee.

I don't think we should let this argument drop. I should be glad if the Commission would study the argument which could then be brought up in the committee, especially regarding the possible threat to the Commission's power if a structural directive on shipbuilding were issued. What is more, we must really try to make ourselves understood so that we don't talk at cross-purposes. That would make things easier in this House too. I therefore ask you to agree to our continuing this discussion in a smaller group, that is, in the committee. We do not intend to let the Commission evade its responsibilities.

**President.** — I call Mr Krall.

**Mr Krall, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I am glad of this chance to add a few final remarks. I thank all Members who have contributed to the debate on behalf of their groups or on their own behalf. They have shown how important shipbuilding is, for and in the Community. On the whole, I support what has been said and do not intend to repeat it.

However, I should like to stress again that we are concerned, here, first with reducing distortion of competition within the Community and, secondly, as has been said, with increasing the capacity of the shipbuilding industry of the Community countries to compete on the world market.

The question is, how are we to achieve this. We know what our aims are, but conflicting views

have emerged as to the means to adopt, as for instance in Mr Spinelli's speeches, the first part of which I agree with entirely, the second part of which, however, diverges once more from the common basis we had recently established in the committee. This seems to me most regrettable.

Of course, while we are discussing this matter today in the House we intend to continue the discussion in committee and return to it at a later date in the House. We are therefore requesting, in point 7, that the discussions be continued. One might argue that the phrase 'without delay' should not be used in point 6; I am open to persuasion on that.

It is my view that our common aim can only be attained by a sensible structural policy which will include reorganization. All the speakers have said that. It cannot be in the Community's interests to keep an ailing industry alive, wherever it might be, by artificial means; it is a question of strengthening those that are healthy and, where this is not possible, of creating new jobs in other sectors by reorganization or a suitable regional policy and so solving the social problems. If we had not diversified industry in the Saar District, we would have had God knows how many unemployed today. And Mr Lange has told us how difficult it has been to get a structural policy off the ground in Germany.

Mr Pounder, I feel great sympathy with regard to the situation in Dublin which you have described. But we shall find some means of preventing any vast unemployment problem and ensuring that those who cannot be retained in the shipbuilding industry are found proper alternative employment. We, at least, have to some extent got over that problem.

It is not true, indeed, that the German shipbuilding industry is generally ailing. On the contrary, some of our shipyards are flourishing. It is not necessarily a case of expanding capacity. What is required is a sensible policy that provides the necessary safeguards.

As regards predictions of development in Japan, I said earlier that we need be careful here. Mr Spinelli has just said so, too. The situation in Japan is no longer what it was in earlier years. In many fields Japan, in my opinion, is no longer Europe's big competitor, because a great deal has changed there.

In conclusion, I should like to ask the House to vote for the resolution. As for the proposed amendments, one has, I believe, been withdrawn. They do not represent material modifications to the proposals, but rather additions, some of which—as the chairman of the committee has pointed out—should really be included in a structural directive.

**Krall**

I therefore ask the House, once again, to adopt the resolution. Miss Lulling, I said before that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs fully endorses your report; and I want to thank you for including some aspects of shipbuilding policy in it.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Miss Lulling.

**Miss Lulling, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, I should like to thank all those who have taken part in this debate. If, as a Member of Parliament, I had to give an account to a minister responsible to Parliament I should try to extract the essential points from the Commissioner's flood of well-chosen words. But I should have great difficulty, because apart from a few impressions and high-flown phrases, I have to say that unfortunately his speech was not very enlightening. During these exchanges, particularly the last one, I felt rather as though what Parliament and the Commission were saying to each other was falling on deaf ears, especially where the future of the shipyards and shipyard workers is concerned.

In his first speech, Mr Spinelli admitted quite candidly that many workers would have to leave. Later, he said that he did not have the figures that we asked for.

In view of all this, Mr President, I can only endorse what Mr Lange said—that we are waiting for the Commission to take resolute action and produce a directive on structures in this sector, and that the operations financed by the European Social Fund must fit into the framework of this directive. But with the present lack of ideas we are not going to be able to ensure the survival and development of the Community's shipbuilding industry in the medium term.

Mr President, I may sound disillusioned, but I think the Parliament will agree with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment that the shipbuilding industry in the Community should be developed and we should not be too hasty about abolishing or harmonizing aid. If this is what we want, we are going the right way about it, and we can quite reasonably spend the small sum made available to us for the purpose of ensuring the survival and development of this industry which is so important from a regional point of view.

(Applause)

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Krall.

On the preamble and paragraph 1, I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put these texts to the vote.

The preamble and paragraph 1 are adopted.

On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr James Hill, Mr Normanton and Mr Pounder on behalf of the European Conservative Group and worded as follows:

"This paragraph should read as follows:

"2. Takes the view that, as regards the industrial aspects of the shipbuilding policy, the Commission should lay stress on the establishment of the soundest possible basis for decisions regarding investments in the shipbuilding industry and give the optimum help in providing credit and support through the European Investment Bank, the Regional Development Fund and the European Social Fund."

I call Mr James Hill to move this amendment.

**Mr James Hill.** — The idea of this amendment was to clarify the amount of aid that we think would have been helpful to increase investment in the shipbuilding industry. The wording of paragraph 2 of the motion for a resolution adds: 'if need be, help to provide the necessary credit.'

At the time, the European Conservative Group felt that this should be made a little clearer. I think that it has come out very fully in debate today that providing optimum help in obtaining credit through the normal Community aids will be well and truly in the mind of the Commission. Therefore, I withdraw Amendment No 1.

**President.** — Amendment No 1 is withdrawn.

I put paragraph 2 to the vote.

Paragraph 2 is adopted.

On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 2 tabled by Mr James Hill, Mr Normanton and Mr Pounder on behalf of the European Conservative Group and worded as follows:

"This paragraph should read as follows:

"3. Welcomes that part of the proposal dealing with industrial policy as an initial practical step towards a true industrial policy at Community level; expects the Community institutions to work towards a uniform shipbuilding policy, while providing the necessary safeguards for the shipbuilding industry in Member States who will suffer most during this period of change."

I call Mr James Hill to move this amendment.

**Mr James Hill.** — The purpose of this amendment is to safeguard those who enjoy employment in the shipbuilding industry. We felt that there should be safeguards during this period of change between national aids and Community aid, and we felt that this should be underlined to the extent of putting forward this amendment. Paragraph 3 seems to be helped by this addition, and I am sure that it lines up with what Mr Lange said during the debate. I am sure all of us would like to know that our work-force is safeguarded during a period of change. Therefore, I formally move Amendment No 2.

**President.** — What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Lange.** — (D) If, as committee chairman deputizing for the rapporteur, I have to express an opinion, I must point out that this formulation is not unambiguous. We must clarify the idea 'safeguards'. I should, in fact, be glad if this question were postponed until we come to the structural directive for the shipbuilding sector.

If 'safeguards' merely means financial outlays, it doesn't get to the heart of the matter.

If this could be clarified, we might reach an agreement on the proposed amendment; but so far no one has said anything about this technical term 'safeguards'.

**President.** — I call Mr Normanton.

**Mr Normanton.** — May I be allowed to reply to the point put to the House on the definition of the word 'safeguard'? Among the various areas to be covered by the term we would certainly want to include international negotiations and agreements in the international field and, indeed, in all areas in which failure to arrive at satisfactory developments would result in the process of change of the Community industry being acutely, chronically unbalanced.

I should like Mr Lange to note that we are not using the word 'safeguard' strictly as involving financial contributions alone. It covers them, but it also includes retraining and the establishment of industries which will absorb surplus labour. We are concerned about the whole process of the restructuring of the industry so as to ensure that there is the minimum—indeed the elimination—of undue suffering caused to the industry. I hope that he will accept the definition in the broadest terms. That was certainly in our mind when we tabled the amendment.

**President.** — I call Mr Alfred Bertrand.

**Mr Alfred Bertrand.** — (NL) Mr President, in view of the manner in which the debate is now

developing, I fear we shall become involved in endless and needless discussions if we are going to ask for more precise definitions of expressions such as 'safeguard'.

For the sake of clarity, I should like to observe first and foremost that the amendment proposed by our Conservative friends should normally belong in the directives on structural policy in shipbuilding. This amendment would be more at home there. On the other hand, I am certainly in favour of accepting it at the moment, since what is at issue here is the attempt at a uniform policy for shipbuilding as part of the industrial policy as expressed in the directives. I have no objection if in the transitional period, which is to last till the end of 1975, shipyards in the most difficult position in Member States are offered the necessary guarantees. This seems to me justified as part of the efforts at a uniform shipbuilding policy. We can therefore accept the amendment.

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, we are not engaging in an endless debate, we are clarifying a point.

Personally, I can accept Mr Normanton's explanation. The explanation is necessary because this proposed amendment is to be incorporated in a resolution which deals exclusively with a directive on aids. But this amendment contains a new element, and that must be clarified. We are now going in the direction we wanted.

I can therefore say that on the interpretation offered we can vote for the proposed amendment.

**President.** — I call Mr Krall.

**Mr Krall, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I should like to supplement what Mr Lange said.

Mr Normanton, the elements you have brought up—regional policy, social policy—go beyond what is actually contained in this directive and have their proper place in a structural directive.

On the basis of this interpretation, and now that we have established that we are aiming at the same thing, I have no objections to raise against this amendment.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote. Amendment No 2 is adopted.

I put paragraph 3 so amended to the vote. Paragraph 3 is adopted.

**President**

On Paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 3 tabled by Mr James Hill, Mr Normanton and Mr Pounder on behalf of the European Conservative Group and worded as follows:

"This paragraph should read as follows:

"4. Requests the Commission to:

- (a) identify all national aids as a first step to drawing up a viable timetable for progressively substituting Community aids for national aids in a manner which will not result in unemployment in those Member States with a shipbuilding sector;
- (b) insist that in the 1975 OECD negotiations (which must be extended to include non-OECD countries with a shipbuilding capacity), before agreement is sought on the progressive reduction of national aid, agreements must be reached with Japan and other countries ensuring that no world surplus production capacity arises."

I call Mr James Hill to move this amendment.

**Mr James Hill.** — This amendment is designed to give further force to paragraph 4 as drawn up by the committee. There must be a phasing or substitution of Community aid for national aids in a way which will not cause unemployment in Member States which have a shipbuilding industry.

As an added safeguard, we should like to insist that the 1975 OECD negotiations should include non-OECD countries with a shipbuilding capacity—I am thinking particularly of those other than Japan—and that agreements must be reached before the drastic reduction of national aids. In other words, we want to protect, once again, the workers in the shipbuilding industry against any—as the Commissioner put it—brutality in a shipbuilding policy.

**President.** — What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Krall, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr Hill, perhaps the wording as it stands is liable to be misunderstood. The idea is not that we should abolish the aids completely in the course of these directives but only gradually and that the OECD conference, which is not due to begin until 1975, should provide a worldwide common basis on which to dismantle these aids. There has definitely been a misunderstanding. Perhaps I expressed myself wrongly this morning when introducing my report. The idea is not that all aids should be dismantled between now and 1975, but that they should be reduced by a few degrees and unified. National aids would continue.

We want first to ask the Commission, in the 1975 OECD negotiations, to reach a common

basis for dismantling aids so that we can have the same chances in competition.

I really don't see why we should vote for this amendment: what it is aiming at is, in my view, clearly contained in the explanatory statement.

I ask for paragraph 4 to be adopted as it stands in the report.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put paragraph 4 to the vote.

Paragraph 4 is adopted.

I call Mr James Hill on a point of order.

**Mr James Hill.** — I have a small point of order.

Mr Krall said that he accepted the amendment and then voted against it. I am rather confused. I wonder whether there was a mistake in his voting pattern?

**President.** — Mr Krall, do you wish to reply?

**Mr Krall, rapporteur.** — (D) I said in conclusion that I was for retaining the original wording contained in my report.

**President.** — On paragraph 5, I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put paragraph 5 to the vote.

Paragraph 5 is adopted.

On paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 4 tabled by Mr James Hill, Mr Normanton and Mr Pounder on behalf of the European Conservative Group, and Amendment No 5 tabled by Mr Alfred Bertrand on behalf of the Christian-Democrat Group. We can deal with these two amendments jointly.

Amendment No 4 is worded as follows:

"This paragraph should read as follows:

- "6. Requests the Commission to submit, after full consultation with the industry, a proposal for a structural directive on the shipbuilding sector."

Amendment No 5 is worded as follows:

"This paragraph should read as follows:

- "6. Requests the Commission to submit, after full consultation with both sides of industry in the sector concerned, a proposal for a structural directive on the shipbuilding sector."

I call Mr Alfred Bertrand to move Amendment No 5.

**Mr Alfred Bertrand.** — (NL) Mr President, I am, of course, in agreement with the contents of the amendment put forward by our Conservative friends, but if the text is adopted in its present form, it may give rise to discussion since the phrase 'after full consultation with the industry' is used here. I have therefore put forward an amendment to clarify the situation, using the phrase 'after full consultation with both sides of industry in the sector concerned'. At Mr Lange's insistence, however, I should like to add something to that, so that it would read: 'after full consultation with both sides of industry in the sector concerned and related sectors'. This would also include the supply sectors in the consultation, since they may also be affected by the possible restructuring.

**President.** — I call Mr James Hill to move Amendment No 4.

**Mr James Hill.** — I feel that our amendment and that tabled by the Christian-Democratic Group are so close as not to require a great deal of debate.

We will, of course, assume that 'both sides of industry' are not the political sides of industry but management and the work-force on the shop floor.

Having expressed that sentiment, I should like to withdraw Amendment No 4 and accept Mr Bertrand's Amendment No 5.

**President.** — I assume you mean that you accept Amendment No 5 as amended verbally by Mr Bertrand when he moved it.

I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, it was I who suggested this addition in the course of conversations. I should nevertheless like to make it clear—and I hope we agree on this—that this does not mean that the further procedure referred to in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs should be postponed until all consultations with both sides of industry had been completed: the two should proceed concurrently.

**President.** — I call Mr Normanton.

**Mr Normanton.** — I should like on behalf of the European Conservative Group to make a brief comment on the amendment tabled by Mr Hill, Mr Pounder and myself.

Surely the whole purpose of the formulation of policy on any industrial sector in the Com-

munity is to ensure that there is the fullest possible participation in the formulation of that policy by all who are to be affected by it.

As long as we add such emphasis as we can to that as a fundamental principle—not only for shipbuilding but for all industrial sectors—we shall give this paragraph our support.

**President.** — Amendment No 4 has been withdrawn.

I put Amendment No 5 to the vote as amended in the following manner:

'6. Requests the Commission to submit, after full consultation with both sides of industry in the sector concerned, as well as in the adjacent sectors, a proposal for a structural directive on the shipbuilding sector.'

Amendment No 5 so amended verbally is adopted.

I put paragraph 6 so amended to the vote.

Paragraph 6 is adopted.

On paragraphs 7 and 8 I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put these texts to the vote.

Paragraphs 7 and 8 are adopted.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole incorporating the various amendments that have been adopted.

The resolution so amended is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

We now come to the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Miss Lulling.

On the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 7, I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put these texts to the vote.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 7 are adopted.

On paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr James Hill, Mr Normanton and Mr Pounder on behalf of the European Conservative Group and worded as follows:

"This paragraph should read as follows:

"8. Believes that, although there is no shortage of orders in European shipyards at present, coordinated industrial, regional and social policies should be devised and implemented without delay to promote the reorganization of European shipbuilding and thus assure it of an appropriate position in the world shipbuilding industry, which must hinge on production and other agreements with other countries such as Japan."

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**President**

I call Mr James Hill to move this amendment.

**Mr James Hill.** — The amendment is intended to highlight the earlier discussions we have had, namely, that whatever policies are devised and implemented, the world position of the shipbuilding industry must hinge on these agreements with other countries. I mention Japan in particular in this case.

I can therefore see no difficulty in the rapporteur accepting this amendment.

I move Amendment No 1.

**President.** — What is the rapporteur's position?

**Miss Lulling, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, I proposed that this paragraph 8 should be incorporated in the resolution because I think that, although the shipyards have plenty of orders at present, the Commission and the Council should be reminded of the urgent need to take coordinated industrial, regional and social policy measures at the same time and without delay.

In our report we did not wish to discuss these measures in detail and do not think the text proposed by Mr Hill, Mr Normanton and Mr Pounder should be incorporated in my report, because a detailed summary of the measures to be taken, in particular the agreements, is given in point 4 of Mr Krall's report.

I could say, of course, Mr President, that superfluity is a necessity; it may be in other aspects of life, but I do not think this is true where resolutions are concerned.

I have not been able to consult the Committee on Social Affairs, but I wished to state that we feel the Commission and the Council must be alerted to the situation and urged to take action as soon as possible. However, I stress that we had no intention of trespassing on Mr Krall's territory, and he has set all this out in his report.

The amendment is therefore superfluous.

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, I would ask the authors to withdraw their amendment, for the idea is expressed in so many words in the Krall report. I have my doubts whether it is really necessary, when two resolutions follow one another, the one dealing with the social aspect and the other with the economic aspects, to bring the economic problem that is dealt with in the economic resolution into the social one as well.

I should therefore be glad if the European Conservative Group were to recognize that this

demand is contained in the Krall resolution and consequently should be omitted here.

**President.** — I call Mr James Hill.

**Mr James Hill.** — I fully understand that this is contained in the Krall report, but Miss Lulling's report has wording which reads 'without delay to promote the reorganization of European shipbuilding and thus assure it of an appropriate position in the world shipbuilding industry.'

Miss Lulling has included a proportion of Mr Krall's report in her own report. Consequently, if, as Mr Lange and Miss Lulling say, this amendment is a repetition, it is a fairly harmless amendment to accept. It entails only a few additional words in the six languages.

We must, I think, take this amendment to the vote.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I put paragraph 8 to the vote.

Paragraph 8 is adopted.

On paragraphs 9 to 12 I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put paragraphs 9 to 12 to the vote.

Paragraphs 9 to 12 are adopted.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — On a point of order, Mr President, I seek your guidance. I did not raise this point of order during the debates because I did not wish to stop them or to stop the voting.

You will recall that a few moments ago, during the voting on the last amendment to the Krall report, you, in your wisdom, accepted an oral amendment. May I have your assurance that this is not setting a precedent? As I understand it, the Rules of Procedure of this House say that amendments must be in writing and that there must be a chance for Members to consider them. I draw the attention of yourself and the House to the fact that this is a practice which must not creep into our affairs and that it must not set a precedent.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.



**Scott-Hopkins**

I should like you to underline that point, Mr President.

**President.** — I accepted the amendment because it seemed to me to be a lucid and very simple one. There are many precedents for accepting verbal amendments in this House. If this is a matter which you, Mr Scott-Hopkins, feel should be raised in the Bureau as a matter of principle, I should be happy to raise it.

I call Mr Broeks.

**Mr Broeks.** — (NL) Mr President, formally speaking, what the spokesman for the European Conservative Group has brought out is correct. But if this House has no objections to an amendment's being amplified—in other words, if Parliament is in agreement to the amplifications' being added—the President of the Assembly is in my view fully justified in accepting the amendment. This cannot, however, be the case if this House raises objections. In that case, the President would have to reject such an oral amendment.

I am therefore of the opinion, Mr President, that you have acted completely correctly. If Mr Scott-Hopkins had objections to the amendment, he should have said so. I assume, however, that he did not, since I know him well enough to know that as soon as he has objections to something he will stand on his head to make that objection felt.

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Further to my point of order, Mr President, I am very grateful to Mr Broeks for the kind words he has just used. However, he does not seem to have gathered what was my point of order. We do not want to argue it now on the floor of the House, for it would be wasting time unnecessarily. I was trying to establish exactly what is considered to be an objection by the House to an oral amendment.

May I suggest, Mr President, that you raise this matter in the Bureau so as to obtain a definitive ruling on exactly what is an objection. If one honourable Member objects, does that mean that you cannot accept an oral amendment? We do not want to debate it now. I suggest that your earlier remarks be put in writing and submitted to the Bureau.

**President.** — I call Mr Broeks.

**Mr Broeks.** — (NL) Mr President, I really think this is not necessary. If one Member of Parlia-

ment stands up and says, 'According to the Rules of Procedure you cannot accept this,' the President can do nothing else but open the Rules of Procedure and say 'You are correct, I shall reject it.' If, however, the whole Assembly accepts it, it is in my opinion not necessary to act as formally as Mr Scott-Hopkins is now doing—as I take it, contrary to his usual habits.

**President.** — Do you insist on your point now, Mr Scott-Hopkins?

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I am delighted, Mr President, to hear Mr Broeks say that one lone voice objecting to an oral amendment can stop the whole process. As he is chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee, I of course accept what he says, and I will not burden you further, Mr President.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR BEHRENDT

*Vice-Chairman*6. *Community measures for the desulphurization of fuels — Directive on the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels*

**President.** — The next item is joint debate on the report by Mr Kater on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on the need for Community measures for the desulphurization of fuels (Doc. 22/74) and on the report by Mr Rosati on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels (Doc. 103/74).

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

**Mr Kater, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, may I first of all make a practical observation: it does not generally happen that two reports of equal importance are discussed in one debate. In this case it was impossible to do otherwise, for reasons which are quite obvious from the preliminary data given on the first page of the report on the need for Community measures for the desulphurization of fuels.

A further personal comment, ladies and gentlemen: I shall not use all the time allowed to me as rapporteur, as the report I have prepared and presented on behalf of the Committee on Energy contains an extremely detailed explanatory statement.

**Kater**

To come to the subject of the report: in May 1973, the Committee on Energy realized that the desulphurization of fuels of different kinds was necessary for environmental reasons, but this was to a certain extent incompatible with ensuring energy supplies. As it is clear from many of its resolutions on this subject, the European Parliament anticipated the situation which has now obtained for over six months. Its latest warning on this matter was the report by Mr Burgbacher on ensuring energy supplies.

In May 1973, the Committee on Energy was authorized to draw up a report on the need for Community measures on the desulphurization of fuels. When this report was being prepared, the Commission announced that it would make proposals for a regulation on the desulphurization of light heating oils. The committee therefore suspended its work until this document was received and resumed it at the beginning of this year. However, as the Committee on Public Health and the Environment was, quite rightly, made the committee responsible for this document, while our committee was asked for its opinion, we drew up our report, which discusses the desulphurization of fuels in general, in such a way that it also constitutes an opinion on the practical regulation which Mr Rosati is dealing with today on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, the committee responsible.

One opinion we express in this respect is a favourable one. The Committee on Energy approves of the proposal, but must stress that the compulsory desulphurization of light heating oils should be only the first of a series of measures.

This brings me to desulphurization problems in general. In paragraph 1 of the resolution put forward on behalf of my committee, we state that priority must be given to securing energy supplies when seeking a solution to environmental problems arising from the production and utilization of energy. We base this opinion on the fact that the securing of energy supplies is one of the essential conditions for achieving the objects of the EEC Treaty, since it is stated in Article 2 of the Treaty that the task of the Community is to promote a harmonious development of economic activities, a continuous and balanced expansion, an increase in stability and an accelerated raising of the standard of living, and these objects cannot be achieved without a steady rise in energy consumption.

On the other hand, the solution of environmental problems can, and probably will, lead to a greater consumption of energy, since, for example, the disposal of waste water, air purification and the utilization of waste all result in greater energy requirements. There is thus

competition between different needs, and if we are to fulfil the Community's task, as defined above, in accordance with the Treaty, we must give the securing of energy supplies clear priority.

This applies all the more since, for a certain period, an option is forced on us, in view of the growth of the population and its requirements, and on the other hand the fact that certain energy sources are becoming more difficult, either because of a reduction in supply or because of price increases.

Ladies and gentlemen, in paragraph 2 of the motion for a resolution, Parliament states the opinion, already expressed in the resolutions contained in the reports by Mr Burgbacher, Mr Giraud and Mr Normanton, that account must be taken of all energy sources in efforts to secure supplies. This also means that we must fall back on sulphur-containing energy sources available in the Community. Otherwise, the proposals concerning measures for the desulphurization of all fuels or their waste gases mentioned in paragraph 4(a) would be pointless. I shall come back to this again shortly.

I should like to comment further on paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution, in which we state that the costs of the necessary desulphurization measures will not in general exceed acceptable levels. We explain this view in paragraphs 11 to 15 of the explanatory statement: the prices of the energy available to us are rising, while the costs of desulphurization per unit of any given energy source either remain stable or only increase in proportion. The proportion of the final price accounted for by desulphurization costs therefore falls, and as a result these costs will in general fluctuate within reasonable limits. The principle of 'the polluter pays' is not specifically introduced in the resolution, because it has already been stated many times by the European Parliament: anyone using a source of energy which harms the environment must pay the cost of remedying the damage done.

We qualify this statement, however, with regard to certain cases such as particular types of steel production and also desulphurization. We take the view—and here I come back to paragraph 4(a) of the motion for a resolution—that, depending on the suitability of the energy source concerned, either the fuel is desulphurized or the waste gases are desulphurized after combustion, and that desulphurization measures should cover both producers and users. It was not without good reason that we dealt with the desulphurization of combustion products in paragraphs 18 to 22 of the explanatory statement.

The last point seems to us particularly important, because in view of the situation the con-

**Kater**

sumer, too, must play a part in the process. We took as our example the adaptation and regular inspection of oil heating burners because this can contribute to the purification of the atmosphere as well as improving fuel-oil utilization.

In paragraph 4(a) we mention the desulphurization of all fuels. In our recommendations to the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, we therefore urge the committee, in paragraph 33 of the explanatory statement, to ensure in its report that the issue of the directive on the desulphurization of heavy fuel oil is synchronized with the entry into force of the directive we are dealing with here. We have also urged the Committee on Public Health and the Environment to ask for a proposal for a directive laying down standards for the construction, maintenance and inspection of heating installations. Both these measures would help to save energy and protect the environment, as paragraph 36 of the explanatory statement shows.

In paragraph 4(b) of the motion, we have gone even further and called for proposals for directives requiring Member States to approve the construction and use of new power stations and oil refineries only when provision is made for fuel desulphurization. Existing establishments of this kind must be brought into line with these requirements, provided that this does not result in greater consumption of a limited energy supply. We do not make this request for rhetorical reasons. Power stations should only be built in Member States when there is sufficient space for such installations. We also try to indicate in the explanatory statement that appropriate measures are already being prepared or investigated. This last point will be briefly discussed again later.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a characteristic of environmental pollution that it knows no frontiers. We therefore consider international agreements on this matter to be essential, so that the Community is not exposed to pollution from other countries. We are thinking here of highly-industrialized non-Member States from which sulphur may be emitted into Community countries, primarily Switzerland, Austria, perhaps even Sweden. These three countries are only chosen as examples.

Finally, in paragraph 4(d) we call for proposals for the effective coordination of existing research projects on the desulphurization of fuels and the utilization or dumping of the resulting waste products. There is still a broad area of Community activity to be worked out here, and we assume that the Commission will submit proposals on the matter before very long.

In the final paragraph of this resolution, paragraph 5, Parliament instructs its appropriate committees, in this case the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology and the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, to keep the progress of all these measures, including the proposals, under review and where necessary to report to Parliament on any action or failure to act in this field.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this is all I wished to say about this motion for a resolution, which outlines Parliament's scheme for a general policy on the preparation and implementation of desulphurization measures. With these proposals we are working on the same lines as the World Energy Conference of 1972, and wish to try and translate these intentions into a practical policy. I therefore ask you to adopt this motion for a resolution without reservation.

*(Applause)*

**Mr President.** — I call Mr Rosati, who has asked to present his report.

**Mr Rosati, rapporteur.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, when presenting his report on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, Mr Kater spoke of the problem of fuel desulphurization. I, on the other hand, on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, shall introduce Document No 103 on a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels.

First and foremost, I should like to congratulate the Commission heartily on the thoroughness with which it has examined the problem, which, though essentially simple, is really very important.

This proposal was referred to us by the Commission in February 1974 and, at three meetings (the last on 10 May), the Committee on Public Health and the Environment finally approved the text under consideration, with only one vote against.

This proposal is designed to approximate current and planned laws, regulations and administrative provisions in the Member States, which at present differ widely from one state to the other, particularly in respect of the permissible maximum sulphur content, the structure of the provisions and the solutions adopted to reduce noxious emissions by various types of fuels.

An extremely positive factor, I hasten to stress, was that this proposal is designed to introduce full rather than partial harmonization—in other

**Rosati**

words, to replace the current legislation applying in the various Member States by Community provisions.

I have heard many discussions of the relative merits of full *versus* partial harmonization—during the last meeting in Luxembourg, for example. There seemed to be a difference of opinion, and I got the impression that most of my colleagues favoured partial harmonization, feeling that individual states should be left to make decisions about their various internal laws. In this motion for a resolution, the harmonization seems to be half-and-half in that, while the Commission has jurisdiction over some possibilities, others are left to the Member States. Furthermore, individual—or should I rather say national—initiatives to this effect have been taken in recent years, e.g., the provisions recently issued in this field in the Netherlands, France, Germany and my own country. I think that they probably have had a good effect and encouraged the Commission to deal with the problem. In addition, this proposal, which deals only with light fuel oils, should, as the Commission recognized, represent the first element of an ensemble of laws aiming to reduce atmospheric pollution. In other words, proposals limiting the sulphur content of heavy fuel oils will follow. I think that Mr Kater also referred to this point.

A directive of this sort obviously has financial implications. I should point out that desulphurization plants require a larger quantity of crude oil and therefore higher additional investment. The report forecasts that, as a result of the higher value of crude oil and the resulting increase in the energy requirements of the plant, costs will rise by around 5%. Another consequence is likely to be an increase in the price of crude oil, although, according to the Commission, this should not be more than 0.5%.

In my report, I pointed out that, after the second recital of the Commission's proposal, which reads: "These legal differences compel the Community oil companies to adopt their production with regard to sulphur content, depending on which Member State is being supplied", it should have been pointed out that the application of this directive would obviate the need for this diversification. The oil companies could then restrict production to two types of gas oil, as is pointed out in the directive, both on a large scale. This would make rationalization easier, leading to cost savings which could also be passed on to the consumer. In other words, the expected rise in gas oil prices would, at least partially, be offset by these savings, and therefore be less than originally forecast.

This said, I should like to explain the various

articles of the proposed directive. I shall be extremely brief, since there are nine of them and they are very simple. I shall deal in particular with the one which gave rise to most discussion in committee.

Article 1 lists the various types of gas oil. Articles 2 and 3 define gas oil type A, the use of which is not subject to any restrictions in the Member States, and gas oil type B, whose use is restricted. Article 2 establishes the circumstances under which these two types of gas oil may be made available for sale on the internal Community market. They can only be marketed if their sulphur content is not greater than 0.5% by weight for type A and 0.8% for type B as from 1 October 1976, and 0.3% for type A and 0.5% for type B as from 1 October 1980.

Article 3 is important in that it allows Member States to bring the provisions of Article 2 into force earlier than therein provided.

Article 4 merits particular consideration. Your rapporteur and the majority of the committee felt that this stipulation by the Commission was somewhat dangerous. The article stipulates that, as from the date of application envisaged (possibly anticipated, as I mentioned above, by Member States, by virtue of Article 3), the Member States may not, on the grounds of the sulphur content, prohibit, restrict or impede the marketing of gas oils provided that the latter comply with the requirements of the directive. We consider this might be taken to mean that Member States may also permit the marketing on their own territory of gas oils with a higher sulphur content than laid down in the directive, or that, in any case, they are not authorized to prohibit their use. In our opinion, in the text proposed by the Commission, the directive loses its binding force. I therefore submit an amendment to Article 4 to make it effectively binding on Member States. This amendment stipulates that Member States must, on the grounds of sulphur content, prohibit the marketing of gas oils if the latter do not comply with the requirements of the directive.

I accordingly invite Parliament to adopt this new text for Article 4, which we feel is more in line with the spirit of the directive.

Article 5 stipulates that the Member States shall determine those regions and zones in which the use of type B gas oil (with a greater capacity to pollute) is to be permitted and shall inform the Commission of their decision.

Article 6 states that the Commission must supervise the effects of the application of the directive and the progress accomplished in determining the objectives.

**Rosati**

As the other articles are merely administrative, I should now like to touch upon an argument tackled by Mr Kater in his report. When drawing up the report under consideration, I naturally studied my colleague's most estimable report, which is similar and linked to it. One might, in fact, say that the objectives which they deal with, though different, are complementary.

Mr Kater refers to the pollution which results from burners used for domestic heating. I feel that this problem is so important that I have also taken it up in my report. We must find a means of systematically checking these burners and eliminating the pollution which they cause, which is almost as important as that caused by industry. I have heard, for example, that some readings carried out in a heavily industrialized canton of Switzerland show that the sulphur-dioxide content of the air in the summer, while heating is not in use, is one-sixth of that recorded in winter, when private heating systems are running at full capacity. The atmospheric pollution resulting from domestic heating could therefore be appreciably reduced if this inspection of burners were made compulsory. We have included this proposal in our resolution, and I hope that the Commission will be able to adopt a directive to this effect.

I apologize, Mr President, for having carried on so long and once more express the hope that a directive of this type will be adopted.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Gundelach to state the position of the Commission of the European Communities on the amendments tabled to the text of the directive.

**Mr Gundelach, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(DK)* Mr President, Parliament has before it two reports, one by Mr Kater, which deals with the general question of sulphur in fuel oil, and Mr Rosati's report, which deals with the Commission's proposal for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels.

First of all, I should like to thank the two committees for the very thorough and efficient work they have carried out, which has resulted in reports which are fundamentally in favour of the proposals submitted by the Commission.

I am also grateful for the very thorough presentation of the problem by the two rapporteurs here this afternoon. It makes it possible for me to be fairly brief.

In introducing a discussion of these questions, there are two matters of principle that I should like to emphasize.

We are fully agreed with the two committees responsible that with these proposals for directives we have started a process which will continue. Other proposals for directives will follow. This is an indication of future developments.

But, gentlemen, we are dependent on Article 100. That means that the measures taken on the basis of this directive and those to follow are measures which are necessary to ensure the functioning of the common market. This has its advantages, but, I would remind you, it also entails certain limitations. There are other legal bases for Community decisions on environmental measures, but I shall not go into that now; what we are discussing is the use of Article 100, and that is relevant to the matters raised by the committee.

The other main point that I should like to stress, and which also emerged in the reports, is that any serious attempt—especially in the energy sector—to solve pollution problems is connected with problems of expenditure—whether these take the form of industrial investments or increased consumption of energy, which, as we all know, has become permanently more expensive.

It must therefore be the duty of the decision-making bodies—and here I mean Parliament and the Commission—in each individual case of this nature, to consider the advantages which can be gained as regards improvement of the environment, reduction of atmospheric pollution and, on the other hand, the resulting costs for society, whether these take the form of new investments, price increases or increased energy consumption. When we confront our citizens with the consequences of a change in terms of trade with the rest of the world resulting from the steadily increasing prices of raw materials, in particular energy sources, it is our duty to make quite clear to our citizens the costs involved in the measures we decide upon.

Bearing this in mind the Commission intends to continue the work begun with the proposed directives under consideration.

As you know, these proposals deal only with certain fuel oils, namely, so-called light fuel oil and not—as the committees would have wished—with heavy fuel oil.

However, as regards heavy fuel oil, the research situation in the various international and national bodies has progressed sufficiently for us to be able to submit rational and well-founded proposals in the near future, and I am convinced that the Assembly will agree with me that we needn't rule out the proposal for a directive on light fuel oil on the grounds that a proposal for

**Gundelach**

a directive on heavy fuel oil is to be submitted at a later date. It follows from the remarks I have just made about expenditure that further deliberations are necessary as regards heavy fuel oil, since the cost situation, as the rapporteurs state, is acceptable for light fuel oil while far greater problems are raised in connection with heavy fuel oil. Nevertheless, I can announce that a proposal for a directive on the use of heavy fuel oil with low sulphur content in highly polluted areas will be submitted to the Council before the end of the year, and the Commission will give priority to further work concerning directives on heavy fuel oil, so that all fuel oils will be subject to regulations on limited sulphur content.

The Commission was interested to note the results of research into sulphur dioxide pollution caused by oil burners—another aspect which was brought out in the report.

Here I would recall the remarks I made a few moments ago regarding Article 100 of the Treaty, which is the legal basis for the directives concerned. It is perhaps rather doubtful how far we can base a directive concerning private oil burners on Article 100 of the Treaty, which deals with the free working of the common market. However, this does not mean that there are no other provisions which can be used as a basis for a common solution to problems recognized by the Commission where atmospheric pollution by private oil burners is concerned.

The Committee on Public Health and Environment complains in its report on the Commission's proposal for a directive that it will not be binding for the Member States and refers to the wording of Article 4.

Allow me to reassure Parliament by saying that the proposal for a directive is binding. Article 4 must be seen in connection with Article 2 and therefore also Article 1. It follows from these provisions that gas oil is found in only two categories—type A, which is gas oil sold without geographical restrictions, and type B, which can only be sold in certain areas with low atmospheric pollution. Thus the main distinction between the two types is geographical. All gas oils on the market in a zone with low pollution are by definition type B gas oil, therefore the sulphur-content may not be higher than the maximum laid down in Article 2. The same goes for type A. If a Member State allows a gas oil with, for example, a 1% sulphur content, then it will be infringing Article 2. There is therefore no reason to amend the wording of Article 4.

The wording of Article 1 could possibly be improved in order to make this clearer.

The Committee on Public Health and the Environment has proposed the addition of a provision to Article 7, whereby the method of analysis must be determined at the latest when the directive enters into force.

I am seriously worried that the introduction of this provision would do more harm than good. Since the provision would be stated in the text of the directive itself, it would have no effect before the directive came into force on the basis of its general provisions. If the analysis method is not laid down, on the other hand, there may be some doubt as to how far this decision would have the effect of postponing the entry into force of the directive.

There must be absolute agreement between Parliament and the Commission that the intention is not to postpone the entry into force of the directive, and I therefore cannot accept this proposal for an amendment.

However, I am glad to be able to emphasize that I do not believe that problems will arise in practice, since the discussions on spot-checks seem to show that we have all possible grounds for optimism and that this problem will be solved in the course of a few months. Thus, in practice there will be a method of spot-checks from the entry into force of the directive. Were this not the case, we should have to return to the matter, but I do not think this will have to happen.

The last point raised by the committee is the question of review clauses and the hope that the Commission will not wait until the time-limit of 1 October 1980 for the submission of new proposals. On this point I can only say that the Commission's aim is to follow developments both with regard to atmospheric pollution and with regard to the technical means of preventing such atmospheric pollution, and the economic consequences of measures taken, and when appropriate will submit new proposals to the Council and the Assembly.

Unfortunately, we find ourselves in a period when the deadlines laid down by the European Community have a sad tendency to be overlooked. I hope that this will not be the case in this very important sector.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Gundelach.

I call Mr Springorum.

**Mr Springorum.** — (D) I should not have asked to speak were it not that Mr Gundelach's contribution raised questions of particular interest to me. Both committees have particularly welcomed the Commission's proposals for a directive

## Springorum

on the desulphurization of fuels—the more so that both committees have for some time been preoccupied with the question of desulphurization. And both committees have expressed regret that a directive has been proposed only with regard to gas-oil, for—and stress has already been put on this—the directives on light and heavy oils should be absolutely inseparable. Industry must know where it stands and what criteria it has to observe.

What disturbs me somewhat at this moment is a draft Council resolution on energy and the environment which the Commission has submitted to the Council and in which it is stated that every measure to save energy is also a measure of environmental conservation.

If the Commission had devoted more energy to drafting this resolution the environment would certainly have come to no harm, because such an assertion is quite simply wrong. The Commission produced a great catalogue of all possible kinds of proposals which have nothing to do with what is being said now. In this draft resolution it is insisted that temporary and even long-term supply difficulties cannot justify the relaxation of efforts to protect and improve the environment.

In that case the Commission should have made it clear that its position was opposed to resolutions of this Parliament, which clearly state that in seeking a solution to environmental problems arising from the production and consumption of energy 'priority must be given to securing energy supplies'.

It is not clear to me what the Commission means here. When it states, for example, that every measure to save energy is also a measure of environmental conservation, I can only say: if I set up a power station in the middle of a densely-populated area, that is certainly a measure which economizes energy, but it is in no way a measure which leads to conservation of the environment.

A large number of connections and of interrelated measures is involved here, and they have to be balanced one against the other in ways that make it unacceptable to make basic assertions which are liable to prove unworkable in practice.

The content of the resolutions of the two committees is much closer to reality than that of the Commission documents.

Apparently in this paper too—and I am very sorry about this—the need to desulphurize heavy fuel-oils has been abandoned. With regard to sulphur dioxide, it calls for 'reduction of the sulphur content of gas oils', but with regard to heavy heating oils it merely speaks of more

rational supplies of clean fuels such as mineral oils low in sulphur content. To this one can only say: Good—in so far as we have any! But unfortunately, as we all know, deliveries of mineral oil low in sulphur content have diminished sharply. Our main sources of supply were North and West Africa. Europe is now importing much larger quantities of Gulf oil, which has a much higher sulphur content, and this will make desulphurization inevitable in the long run.

The Commission should give much greater consideration to these questions than has been done in this proposal to the Council of Ministers of the Environment. The aim should not be to coat the pill in order to secure the ministers' agreement but to have the courage to say what you, Mr Gundelach, have just said, which is very different from what is being submitted to the Ministers of the Environment as a draft resolution.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Gundelach.

**Mr Gundelach, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (DK) Mr President, I shall take the floor even though I must admit that I am not absolutely sure of the exact nature of the criticism I am answering. I did not intend my remarks to announce any change in the Commission's programme which has already been put to Parliament.

On an earlier occasion, in answer to a question by another Member from the other side of the Assembly, I replied that medium-term supply difficulties of a particular product—in this case energy—would not have any effect on our action programmes. That is still quite true.

One thing I wanted to say today as on earlier occasions—and something which the speaker himself repeated at the end of his speech, which is why I am a little confused now I have to answer—is that we must decide ourselves on the balance between the costs and the advantages and reach our decisions by asking how much we can afford today and how much we shall be able to afford tomorrow, and then we must explain to our citizens why we took these decisions and what they will actually cost.

In some cases measures to economize energy can be beneficial to the environment, but in other cases the opposite is true.

We must, and indeed we intend, to consider all aspects of the problem, and this is only the beginning.

What I was stressing was that we must not deceive our citizens by giving them to understand that this is not going to cost money. But we

**Gundelach**

believe that the expenditure is well founded, that it costs as much as it ought to, and we have not tried to hide the truth. That is what I wanted to stress.

I also emphasized that this was the first of a series of further proposals, and I gave a precise answer and indeed a precise deadline as regards heavy fuel oil, which the speaker referred to. So that important sector has not been forgotten and the proposal is therefore not lopsided.

**President.** — I call Mr Springorum.

**Mr Springorum.** — (D) Mr President, I have stressed that I am in entire agreement with what Mr Gundelach has said. The speech he has just made reflects my own opinion precisely. Only, it does not correspond to the contents of the paper the Commission put before the Council.

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall first consider the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Kater.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted<sup>1</sup>.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Rosati.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted<sup>1</sup>.

7. *Directives on the activities of self-employed persons engaged in the retail sale of pharmaceuticals*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Vernaschi, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

- I. a directive on the coordination of certain laws, regulations and administrative provisions in respect of the activities of self-employed persons engaged in the retail sale of pharmaceuticals, and
- II. a directive on the implementation of freedom of establishment and freedom to provide ser-

vices in respect of the activities of self-employed persons engaged in the retail sale of pharmaceuticals

(Doc. 102/74).

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

**Mr Vernaschi, rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our assembly has been asked to deliver an opinion on two directives. The first is on the coordination of certain laws, regulations and administrative provisions in respect of the activities of self-employed persons engaged in the retail sale of pharmaceuticals. The second deals with the implementation of freedom of establishment and freedom to provide services in respect of the activities of self-employed persons engaged in the retail sale of pharmaceuticals.

These two directives complete the seven already approved by our Parliament which govern the whole of the pharmaceutical sector: industry, wholesale trade, retail trade and pharmacies. It should also be pointed out that Parliament, during its sitting of 16 November 1970, unanimously requested the presentation of a proposal to govern freedom of establishment of self-employed persons in the pharmaceutical retail sector. Obviously, when making this request, Parliament was bearing two considerations in mind: encouraging the liberalization of trade according to the principles of the Community treaties and, at the same time, safeguarding public health.

The two directives being discussed today, which were presented on 17 November 1972, aim to achieve these goals.

The first obliges Member States to lay down rules to control the geographical distribution of pharmacies according to certain criteria, when freedom of establishment endangers public health. These restrictions must be based on objective and non-discriminatory criteria and only applied in order to ensure a suitable distribution of pharmaceuticals at both national and local level. Realizing that capital benefits might accrue from the economic results of controlled geographical distribution, the Commission stipulates in the directive that permission to open a pharmacy is personal and not transferable.

The second directive takes up some general provisions which already appear in a number of earlier directives, and sets out to remove discriminatory restrictions on the activities of persons engaged in the retail sale of pharmaceuticals.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.



## Vernaschi

The two directives seem to be linked because there is a risk that application of the second without controlled geographical distribution of pharmacies might encourage pharmacists to move from countries in which distribution is controlled to those in which it is free.

The legislation in force in the Community countries should be known to my colleagues, because in my report on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee I have summarized the laws which apply in the individual states.

However, in order to make our conclusions more easily comprehensible, I should like to point out that in the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and Ireland, there are no rules which, directly or indirectly, govern the geographical distribution of pharmacies. In France, Denmark and Italy, there are specific provisions which link the number of pharmacies to the number of inhabitants. In Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg there are more flexible provisions with the same aim. There are therefore considerable differences between national norms in this matter.

I should like to point out that the introduction of control of the geographical distribution of pharmacies seems to pose a constitutional problem for the Federal Republic of Germany, inasmuch as it may be interpreted as an infringement of freedom to exercise a profession guaranteed by Article 13 of the German Basic Law. However, it is also argued that the legislator has the duty to limit freedom to exercise a profession in the superior interests of public health. This problem has already been dealt with, by our Parliament during its sitting of 16 June 1971 and by the Federal Constitutional Court in its judgement of 11 June 1958.

In the light of developments in the pharmaceutical sector—in practice, the pharmacist is simply selling finished products and his activities could therefore be covered by the obligations of all traders not to sell false or damaged products (in any case, in its second proposal for a directive, the Commission absolves the pharmacist of specific responsibility and attributes responsibility to the producer of the pharmaceuticals)—the problem becomes a question of establishing whether or not the liberalization of sales, as applied in Germany, the United Kingdom and Ireland, in any way jeopardizes public health.

Firstly, though the directive was drawn up as late as 17 November 1972, it did not take account of the situation in the new Member States, particularly the United Kingdom, where the retail sale of pharmaceuticals is largely conducted by commercial companies with many outlets.

Secondly, geographical distribution, indirectly guaranteeing a certain income, would generally assure service for all rural areas. (It should be pointed out that where, as in the United Kingdom, the concept of the traditional pharmacy is becoming outdated, pharmacies now sell various products other than pharmaceutical ones in the strict sense of the word—veterinary products, cosmetics and a series of products such as clothes for babies which could well be sold in other shops as well.)

This last result is difficult to ensure, and it is also difficult to guarantee pharmaceutical services in rural areas, though pharmaceutical products may be sold in grocers' or other shops. For obvious reasons, the directive does not forbid this possibility, simply stating that, in principle, medicines should only be sold in pharmacies. The possibility of economic capitalization seems excluded, since the principle of acquisitive rights allows the licence to be extended to partners.

Geographical distribution tends to eliminate the risk of the undertaking and therefore gives some unjustified privileges. If these remarks are accepted, the directive on freedom of establishment, though generally similar to others already approved, loses its basic purpose standing alone and should be revised in the light of the criticisms made by the Legal Affairs Committee.

This applies in particular to Articles 4 and 5, which refer to membership of a professional organization or body established under public law. They include provision for persons who have moved to another Member State to take up administrative posts in the professional organization or body established under public law. However, these articles lay down that administrative posts can be reserved for citizens of the host Member State if the professional organization or body has any legally-established official function.

In this connection, it is useful to note that both the Legal Affairs Committee and the Parliament have fully discussed Article 55 of the EEC Treaty, which reads: 'The provisions of this chapter shall not apply, so far as any given Member State is concerned, to activities which in that State are connected, even occasionally, with the exercise of official authority. The Council may, acting by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission, rule that the provisions of this chapter shall not apply to certain activities.' I shall not go over the discussion again, but refer you to the reports by Mr Broeksz and Mr Estève in which Parliament held that, since Article 55 constituted an infringement on the freedom of establishment, it should be given limited application.

**Vernaschi**

For all these reasons, which have been fully discussed by the Legal Affairs Committee and by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, the Legal Affairs Committee, in drawing up its opinion, considers that the proposals should be withdrawn and replaced by new directives aimed at liberalizing the retail sale of pharmaceuticals. In the light of experience in the Member States, particularly the United Kingdom, I think I must here draw attention to the point, also supported by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, that it is advisable, when drawing up new directives, to consult Community consumers, since their opinion of pharmaceutical services is most important.

**President.** — I call Mr Walkhof to speak on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, asked for an opinion, and of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — On a point of order, Mr President.

**President.** — Actually I have already called on another speaker, so that I should give you the floor for a procedural motion only after Mr Walkhoff has spoken, but I will make an exception.

You have the floor, Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I want no exceptional treatment, Mr President. Let Mr Walkhoff speak, please.

**President.** — I call Mr Walkhoff.

**Mr Walkhoff, draftsman of the opinion.** — (D) Mr President, dear colleagues, as spokesman for the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, I should like to thank the Commission for the good will they have shown with regard to implementing freedom of establishment in the countries of the European Community. Unfortunately the initiative taken in the production of a directive does not help us to solve the problem.

The directive on freedom of establishment is doubtless aimed at harmonizing the activities of pharmacists of foreign nationality with those of the home country. But that does not justify the use of the title 'implementation of freedom of establishment'; on the contrary, the supplementary directive, the directive on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action, would in fact impose restrictions on freedom of establishment in the single Member State which, owing

to its guarantee of freedom to practice a profession, has not applied any state regulations. This directive is aimed at preventing the influx of applicants that can be expected after harmonization in countries with relative freedom of establishment. One way that has been proposed for doing this is the harmonization of the geographical distribution of dispensaries, that is, establishing the same ratio of pharmacies to the population throughout the Community.

If the first of the two directives is deceptive because it claims to implement freedom of establishment, the fault with the other is that whereas the object of the directive—and I quote—is to ensure 'suitable distribution of pharmaceuticals', the implementation of the directive would, from a health and consumer point of view, lead to deterioration in the services provided.

The application of quotas to pharmacies and the exclusion of competition cannot in all conscience be called a measure designed to safeguard public health, as the Commission claims.

The directive will serve to maintain the privileged income status of the self-employed pharmacist. If it is believed that the interests of the consumer are best served by the free-market system, then pharmacists should not be treated as exceptions and exempted from the pressure of competition.

The Commission should also remember the EEC principle that the primary aim is to liberalize trade and that a monopoly situation can be accepted only in exceptional cases in the public interest. Good will is shown by the Commission where it tries to prevent capitalization of the monopoly situation—the profitability of which it incidentally thereby confirms—by making the sale of a pharmacy nearly impossible. Nor does the directive contribute anything to solving this problem. For pharmacists who have acquired rights before the directive comes into effect are to be exempted from the prohibition on capitalization. The effective restrictions on freedom of establishment that would be created by the directive on the coordination of laws and regulations would mean tremendous increases in the value of these old pharmacies in that it would then be possible to capitalize not only on the value of the business but also on the privilege of being allowed to run it. It cannot be in the interests of public health if a directive is to make some pharmacies the subject of speculation.

To sum up, I should like to make it clear that, in the opinion of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, there is, from the point of view of health safeguards, which has

**Walkhoff**

been the basis for all our judgement, absolutely nothing to be said in favour of these two directives. At the same time, one must make a distinction and say that the first directive, on freedom of establishment, is, although it promises too much, less deserving of criticism than the other; except that, without the second directive, it is left hanging in the air so that it is impossible to come to a decision on it alone.

Even if our arguments contain slight differences from those of the Legal Affairs Committee, we nevertheless agree with the committee responsible in calling on the Commission to produce new proposals which take our views and our suggestions into account.

At this point, I should like to congratulate my colleague, Mr Vernaschi, for preparing such an outstanding report.

Allow me, in order to keep matters short, to add a brief opinion on behalf of the Socialist Group. My group thanks the Commission for its efforts to implement the freedom of establishment. We are, nevertheless, of the opinion that these draft directives do not do as much as they might to achieve this aim.

The Socialist Group, therefore, in agreement with the two committees, asks the Commission to withdraw its proposals and to prepare new drafts.

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr President, second and wiser thoughts have prevailed, and I do not wish to raise a point of order.

**President.** — I call Lord Mansfield to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Lord Mansfield.** — Mr President, we do not expect that the Commissioner will seek to defend or to justify the proposals. Therefore, I have torn up the speech that I was going to make on behalf of my group and I will confine myself to saying this: it is never pleasant to have to admit that one is wrong. By retiring from a previous position, even if it was untenable, the Commissioner is now doing just that. Nevertheless, I wish to congratulate him on taking this very broadminded and laudable view.

This is a case where Parliament, I suggest, has superbly fulfilled the role which has been assigned to it. Proposals were received from the Commission. No doubt the Commission, at least in the early stages, thought them good or they would not have formulated them. But

working within its committees, Parliament has dissected, analysed and finally condemned the proposals, in the case of my own committee shortly and politely but in the case of the other committee at considerable length and with somewhat less politeness—one might almost say brusqueness.

At the end of the day the effect was the same. The proposals were rejected. In my respectful submission, this is a situation which critics of our Community and institutions might well ponder. When things go well for us, we do help those citizens who send us here to look after their affairs.

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

**Mr Liogier.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of European Progressive Democrats endorses the conclusions expressed in Mr Vernaschi's report and congratulates the rapporteur on his valuable work, and Mr Walkhoff for the opinion he has prepared for the Committee on Public Health. It will vote for the motion for a resolution, and it calls upon the Commission to withdraw its proposal to the Council and draw up new proposals for full freedom of establishment and services in the retail pharmaceutical sector, at the same time safeguarding public health, which in our opinion is the essential requirement for the consumer's interests.

Having said this, may I be permitted to express a few personal opinions? I was somewhat surprised—and I think I should mention this—when I read Mr Vernaschi's report and the opinion by Mr Walkhoff, to see that, though they both devote a great deal of attention to freedom of establishment, they say very little about public health and the interests of the consumer, apart from the possibility of obtaining medicines in good condition and paying as little for them as possible, as a result of the increased number of dispensaries, helped by freedom of establishment.

It seems to me that very little importance is attached to the *deus ex machina* in this connection—namely, the pharmacist himself. Moreover, very little consideration is given to the interests of the consumer—in other words, the members of the public for whom the price of the medicine is not the main consideration.

Certainly, if a dispensing chemist were considered in the same light as an ordinary grocer's shop, the problem would be easily solved. But it is precisely because this is impossible, or at least

**Liogier**

would be extremely inhumane, that difficulties have arisen, to the point where the Community bodies have hesitated up till now, and seem still to be hesitating, to draw up a general directive, although this is necessary.

We must remember that pharmacy is a profession which is closely bound up with medicine, and, in France in particular, calls for long years of study and training leading to a diploma or diplomas which are difficult to obtain. This may be reviewed, but I am not altogether convinced of that.

It must certainly be admitted that dispensing has changed, as have the doctor's prescriptions. It is unusual now for a doctor to write a prescription involving preparation, as he has at his disposal a wide range of pharmaceutical products suitable for particular cases. The pestles and jars used for crushing and mixing the basic preparations are now found only in antique dealers' windows.

Samples for analysis are often sent to specialized laboratories, and the chemist himself no longer even administers enemas!

This is so, but there is more to the chemist's job—one might even call it a mission—than just test-tubes and enemas. This is where the idea of what is nowadays called 'quality of life' comes in, and, as you will agree, this is a completely different idea from the price of medicines.

I do not really understand, in any case, why so much importance is attached to cost, because all the Member States have systems of health insurance and social security, and in France this now extends to all sections of the population. Under these systems the costs of a doctor's prescription is almost completely reimbursed, according to a strict price-scale. This means that the chemist's prices are fixed and controlled by the organizations that pay the costs.

It might be said that the chemist is in direct contact with his clients' families, and at the same time is a sort of intermediary between them and the doctor, especially in rural areas. He thus fulfils an absolutely essential social and human role.

He can be called on and asked questions at any time of the day—and even of the night in an emergency, since he is required to provide a night service—without an appointment, unlike the doctor; he is always ready, free of charge, to give his clientele, whom he knows better than anyone, the benefit of his sensible and well-informed advice. And his clientele—one might even say his friends—are always ready to consult him, to seek advice and encouragement. In addition to the family doctor—who, alas, is

found less and less these days—there is also the family chemist, especially in country areas, and we must take care that he does not disappear.

He makes an essential contribution to public health, a field which you are so anxious to promote; he concerns himself with both body and mind—what the Latins called *Mens sana in corpore sano!*

How many fond mothers start to panic as soon as their babies have the slightest ailment, the slightest disorder of the bowels, the least little rash! In France at least, they run to the chemist, who reassures them. Countless men and women go to him, even if only for advice about those minor temporary ailments which we all have at some time or other. He comforts them and encourages them. Doctors cannot find fault with this, because when the chemist detects the first sign of anything more serious he immediately sends his customers to the doctor.

And I will not describe in detail the emergency cases he deals with while awaiting the doctor's arrival, accidents and other cases where immediate first aid is needed. Sometimes, in the old days when I still had some spare time, I used to stop at the chemist's in my village when I had been picking mushrooms, when I was not sure whether some of my finds were safe to eat.

At a practical level, we must remember that the chemist has certain duties that the ordinary shopkeeper does not, such as preparing statements of prescriptions, keeping records of the supply of certain drugs with a narcotic basis for example, replacing, often at frequent intervals, drugs which may become dangerous if not used within the stipulated period—all tasks which, you will agree, call for a high level of conscientiousness.

For all these reasons and many others which I have no time to elaborate on, the chemist cannot be grouped together with the grocer, for whom I have the greatest respect, but their responsibilities are not of the same order. The services the chemist renders to the community in the field of public health, thanks to his profession and his previous training, entitle him to some protection from the trade point of view so that he is not in constant danger of being replaced by some grubby little shopkeeper.

I have tried to draw attention to the situation of a body of men who make a greater contribution than many others to improving the quality of life, and who therefore have a right to a certain consideration and material security, in the firm hope that this fact will be taken into account in the general directive we are all hoping for.

**President.** — I did not quite see the connection, Mr Liogier, between what you had to say on the pharmacist's profession and the retail sale of pharmaceuticals. Perhaps I am preoccupied at the moment with the world football championship. In any case, I told myself that I could be generous when applying the Rules of Procedure and refrain from asking you whether you were really speaking to the point.

(Laughter)

I call Mr Gundelach.

**Mr Gundelach, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (DK) Mr President, because of changes in the situation, including the enlargement of the European Community, the Commission is convinced—although I fully recognize Lord Mansfield's emphasis on the significance of the parliamentary committee's work in this connection—that it is right to withdraw the two proposals for directives, thereby complying with the main demand of the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on Public Health and the Environment.

Quite naturally—since the problem, of course, remains—new proposals must be worked out, and this we intend to do—since we shall certainly take into account the discussions of the two committees and the Assembly's debate today—and we shall certainly do so as soon and as thoroughly as possible.

We must take into account the principle of ensuring a free market for persons who are a cornerstone of the European common market, in the same way as account must be taken of the fully justified concern for public health and consumer protection, since we are concerned with important and useful, though at the same time sometimes dangerous, pharmaceutical products.

It is my hope that the fact that the Commission has withdrawn these two proposals will not have a negative influence on the introduction of other proposals which are being considered by the Council and which aim at a liberalization of the trade in medical supplies, or indeed mean the end of deliberations on precisely such matters as we are dealing with now.

Mr President, I have every respect for the necessary safeguards for patients and the need for safety when dealing with medicines which may be dangerous, but I should like to point out to the Assembly that the pharmaceutical supplies sector is one which has been subject to a very high rate of inflation in a number of Member States. It must therefore be the duty of both the Commission and this Assembly to find a constructive solution to the problems we are dealing with.

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted<sup>1</sup>.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on a point of order.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr President, I wish to make a statement to you and to the House about which I wish there to be no doubt.

We have behaved in the most farcical manner in the last three-quarters of an hour. We have a proposal from the Commission which they are withdrawing. If we had known at the beginning of the debate that the Commissioner was intending to withdraw it, would you, Mr President, have thought that we should spend three-quarters of an hour on a non-existence report?

I believe we must improve our procedures in these matters. Everyone has worked very hard. The rapporteur has worked very hard. But the speeches that have been made here today, had Parliament known the situation, would have been completely unnecessary. Anyone from outside looking at our procedures would have thought that this evening we have gone stark-staring mad—as, indeed, I do myself.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Scott-Hopkins, for your observations. If, during a meeting of the Bureau, I had known that the Commission intended to withdraw its proposals, I should have proposed to leave this report off the agenda. Procedurally—and here we must be very careful—we are being consulted by the Council. The Council, therefore, should have informed us that the directives were being withdrawn by the Commission. We need not then have placed the report on the agenda, and we could indeed have saved ourselves this three-quarters of an hour. There I agree with you entirely.

I call Mr Gundelach.

**Mr Gundelach.** — In order to put the record straight, I wish to state that I asked for the floor at the beginning of this debate so as to inform Parliament that I was withdrawing these two directives. I was not permitted to do that. I was told that I could not have the floor before the chairmen of the political groups had spoken.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**President.** — Mr Gundelach, the remarks that have just been made were not in the least intended as a criticism of your conduct today in this Parliament. They arose from the following: when the Bureau of the European Parliament knows that a document is being withdrawn, it does not place this document on the agenda, but awaits a communication from the Council to the effect that the consultation is no longer necessary because the Commission intends to withdraw its proposals. Your conduct here today, Mr Gundelach, was therefore not the subject of discussion or of any criticism.

I call Mr Liogier.

**Mr Liogier.** — (*F*) Mr President, after your kind remarks about me, I must tell you that medicines are sold in dispensaries and this also concerns the chemist. I do not feel, therefore, that I was digressing from the subject of the debate, but rather filling a regrettable gap.

However, after what has just been said, I am very sorry that it was not possible to install a television set on your desk so that you could watch the football match instead of listening to the debates of this House.

(*Smiles*)

**President.** — Mr Liogier, the Rules of Procedure say that if anyone is not speaking to the point, the President must ensure that the discussion is brought back to the point. But I did not say that you were not talking to the point. I merely said that I had failed to see the connection, thereby taking the liberty of making a friendly remark which was not in the least intended as a criticism.

#### 8. Oral Question with debate: *Harmonization of nationality laws*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is an Oral Question, with debate, by Mr Premoli and Mr Durieux to the Commission of the European Communities on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group (Doc. 63/74).

The question is worded as follows:

Subject: Harmonization of nationality laws

In view of the repercussions in various fields—social, economic, civil status—of the differences between Member States' nationality laws, does the Commission not plan to propose to the Council that those laws should be harmonized?

I call Mr Brøndlund Nielsen to speak to the question.

**Mr Brøndlund Nielsen.** — (*DK*) Since my two colleagues who asked this question on behalf of the Liberal Group are not present, I shall make a few remarks about the matter and explain the reason for the question.

It is very important in a liberal society—and we believe that the European Community is and aims to be such a society—for there to be individual freedom and security, and for the rules governing citizens to be as simple as possible.

In the Liberal Group we therefore believe that to create uniform laws on nationality would be a considerable step forward towards the European Community that was outlined in December at the Copenhagen Summit Conference.

Many of the problems currently raised by differences in legislation affect in particular the socially weaker groups, and therefore it is particularly important to find a way to solve them. Harmonization of laws on nationality with a view to making regulations uniform throughout all the Member States would therefore be an important step towards creating a Community spirit in Western European society.

A situation which has often been advanced in Denmark as an ideal was that prevailing until the First World War, when young apprentices spent a period travelling around Europe and acquiring new knowledge of their trades and broadening their minds. In order to support the development of such valuable cultural exchange between people of different countries in our part of the world—and this has become far easier as a result of technical progress—uniform treatment of citizens would be very important.

We therefore think that an effort should be made to create uniform conditions for citizenship. That is why this question has been asked.

**President.** — I call Mr Gundelach.

**Mr Gundelach, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (*DK*) Mr President, the Commission is very much in sympathy with the motives underlying this question. However, when answering the question we must keep to the wording, and the basic matter raised is whether the Commission considers it necessary to harmonize national legislation concerning nationality—that is to say, harmonization which can only be based on Article 100 of the Treaty.

The Commission has no reason to believe that the differences in procedure and time-limits governing nationality in the various Member States lead to any difficulties with regard to the unimpeded working of the common market. Therefore there is no legal basis for the Com-

**Gundelach**

mission to take action pursuant to Article 100 of the Treaty with regard to the harmonization of Member States' legislation on the granting of nationality.

I should like to add in answer to Mr Brøndlund Nielsen that the Treaty of Rome, regardless of these different regulations on nationality, contains provisions to cover not only a free market in goods, but also a free labour market. This is one of the keystones on which the economic policy of the Community depends, the freedom of citizens to move across frontiers.

At various meetings on political goals there have been discussions on the question whether at some time or another there should be an effort to create a European citizenship. This is, of course, a very agreeable idea, but it can hardly be realistically discussed within the framework of the question asked, and in any case I should like to add personally that it can hardly be discussed realistically at the present time, when we have sufficient difficulties in merely keeping the Community together.

This is a topic which was brought into the discussion earlier in the week, in my view without justification. However, since it is a matter which bears discussion, I am prepared to say that as far as the rights of migrant workers are concerned, whether social, legal or with regard to their position in the community, the matter appears in a rather different light. Our economy makes use of millions of foreign workers, which naturally entails a political, moral and social duty to ensure that these people do not live under merely acceptable social conditions but also are safeguarded from a human and cultural point of view—in other words, in such a way that they are integrated into the environment in which they find themselves and enabled to develop. This raises not only legal, but also political, cultural and economic problems, problems which the Commission has stressed on several occasions that it wishes to deal with. This matter was dealt with in a social action programme which was not adopted by the Council. The Commission will return to it, since it is of paramount importance for the problem to be solved. We are not unaware that there are differences in the various Member States, owing partly to their traditional way of dealing with these problems and partly to their administrative structure and practice, and that solutions may vary greatly from country to country. But solutions must be found, as the problem is so great that there can be no moral or political justification for letting it lie.

I have mentioned this—since the matter was raised earlier in the week during the debate on migrant workers—to assure the Assembly

that the Commission seriously intends to submit proposals concerning migrant workers.

Apart from that, I do not believe that the matter strictly fits into the framework of the question I answered at the beginning of my speech.

**President.** — I call Lord O'Hagan.

**Lord O'Hagan.** — I promise to be brief.

With proper humility, as someone without legal training, I tried to guess at the reply that the Commission would give to this question. It seems to me that the Commission's competence to deal with nationality does not extend over the whole sphere but that it has a certain right to look at the matter under Article 48 (2), which lays down, in connection with freedom of movement, that there must eventually be 'the abolition of any discrimination based on nationality between workers of the Member States as regards employment, remuneration and other conditions of work and employment'.

For this and other reasons, the Member States define the nationals who are to benefit from these provisions of the Treaty, so that Member States and the Community institutions as a whole know to which country those provisions apply.

There is a certain *ad hoc* harmonization of the application of nationality law. Flowing from that, with the provisions of the Treaty that allow the Commission and the Council to extend their rights to matters which are needed to make the Community work, I should have thought that within the Treaty there might be the possibility of extending the competence of the Community to cover more than is already apparent in it.

I am very timid about coming forward with easy-sounding solutions to these difficult questions, both constitutional and legal—apart from anything else—but if the Community is to move ahead the Commission must begin to think deeply about the implications of a European identity and about the integration of the nationality laws of the Member States.

I suspect that it would be a good idea—perhaps not at the moment—to begin to draft proposals to the Council, as suggested in the question, but in a slightly less ambitious way, proposals that we should engage in deep thought and consultation about the implication of the increasing cohesion of the Community in respect of nationality.

I suggest that an interesting precedent has been thought up by the Commission. When dealing with the question of medical qualifications the

**Lord O'Hagan**

Commission invited interested parties and thereby ensured that all relevant views were taken into account. That might not be wholly relevant to this matter, because it involves mainly national bureaucracies, but I suggest that the Commission might consider whether some procedure should not be set up for engaging in fairly detailed consultation on the possible anomalies and difficulties that would stand in the way of ironing out some of the inconsistencies between the nationality laws of the Member States.

I suggest that a short-term goal for the Commission would be to aim towards a set of criteria, slightly tighter and more closely defined, flowing from the provisions in the Treaty, particularly those of Article 48, which already involve the Community in a certain interpretation of national laws governing citizenship, because those laws are the basis for what the Community has chosen to call its own nationals.

I suggest that we might move on from there to saying that there should be certain commonly applied standards in all Member States to judge whether their definition of nationals fell properly within the spirit of an expanding Community moving towards European identity.

This is a matter to which the Commission might usefully apply itself, perhaps taking as ground rules the many useful international conventions—the United Nations conventions, the Council of Europe conventions, and so on. From time to time some problems may pose political difficulties between Member States.

Although this is a problem which fascinates me, I hope that it is not just a private preoccupation but that the Commission will develop their thoughts on this subject as the Community moves closer together.

**President.** — I call Miss Lulling.

**Miss Lulling.** — (*F*) Mr President, I am a little disappointed by the Commission's answer to this excellent question, and I should like in my turn to stress the urgent need to harmonize nationality laws. As long ago as when Mr Hallstein was president—a long time ago—I asked the Commission to take action on the harmonization of legislation in this field. Unfortunately, Mr Hallstein gave me the same answer as Mr Gundelach: there was no article in the Treaty expressly providing for this harmonization.

I still think, however, that failure to harmonize legislation in this area is a grave handicap to freedom of movement and the right to work.

I should like to give an example to illustrate the disastrous effects of certain outdated laws, such as the Italian law according to which the whole family must take the nationality of the head of the family, an outdated idea which must be abolished.

Take the case of a girl from Luxembourg who marries an Italian—this happens frequently in my country. She automatically takes Italian nationality, and, as she has not the right to refuse, she loses her original nationality. If she is a civil servant or a teacher, she also loses her job; if she is a lawyer, she can no longer practise. We could, of course, make provision for dual nationality in our legislation, but as you know this is a very unsatisfactory arrangement. Everyone should have one nationality, and only one. The harmonization of legislation on nationality should not automatically result in the nationality of a country being given without due consideration to someone who comes to live and work in that country. That is not what we want. In my opinion, the harmonization of nationality laws should lead to these laws' being adjusted so that the person concerned is completely free to decide whether or not she wants to take her husband's nationality.

I also think—for I am in favour of equal human rights—that married couples of different nationalities should be allowed to choose the nationality of either husband or wife. The Council of Europe has done some valuable work on this subject, which I think the Commission should take as a basis. In the initial stage, for example, all Member States which have not ratified and signed a number of international conventions should be called upon to do so—for instance, the European Convention of 1963 on the reduction of cases of multiple nationality and military obligations in cases of multiple nationality, the United Nations Convention of 20 February 1957 on the nationality of married women and the United Nations Convention of 30 August 1961 on the reduction of cases of stateless persons. This would help to make life easier for a large number of people. The implementation of the Italian laws in particular presents problems of conscience. I can quote examples of local authority employees who wish to marry Italians and come to ask my advice. What can I say to them? If they marry an Italian, they are going to lose their jobs...

Is this not a good reason for harmonization? If you cannot find any articles in the Treaty on which to base this action, may I draw your attention to Article 235?

Since in the past the Ministers of Tourism have been brought together at Community level—and this is not expressly provided for in the Treaty



**Lulling**

either—it should also be possible to arrange a meeting of Ministers of Justice to discuss this matter and undertake an investigation with a view to harmonizing these laws so that every citizen of the Community, regardless of sex, enjoys the same rights.

I stress this point because many of our laws still oblige the woman to take her husband's nationality.

Harmonization in this field is particularly necessary. I therefore earnestly request the Commission to take action on the matter.

**President.** — I call Mr Gundelach.

**Mr Gundelach.** — I do not find myself in disagreement with the main philosophy of either Lord O'Hagan or Miss Lulling, but I cannot change the Treaty.

**Miss Lulling.** — You should use it.

**Mr Gundelach.** — You may be able to do so and I hope that one day you will.

On the question of the legal action we can take on harmonization—and that is the question I have been asked—I can only give the assurance that, provided I have a basis for reasonable belief that harmonization is necessary for the functioning of the Common Market, I will see what can be done. But so far I have not been presented with any such proof.

The House may rest assured that the couple of examples that have been quoted will be taken up immediately and examined, but this is the first time that specific cases have been quoted to me.

It must be borne in mind that I have stood before this House two or three times and sworn that I would not harmonize for the sake of harmonization—and I said so to the applause of the whole House. Consequently, I do not now propose to change and start doing so unless it is for some concrete purpose. When that concrete purpose is there, I will act.

I shall look into the examples that have been given to me this afternoon. Some of the examples given by Miss Lulling, and some of the thinking of Lord O'Hagan, were rather wide of the text, but of course the subjects they raised were meritorious and worthy of consideration and in whatever way we can deal with these matters we shall do so. This discussion will be duly reported to the Commission in the spirit in which those comments have been put forward, outside Article 100.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Gundelach. I have no motion for a resolution on this debate. The debate is closed.

#### 9. Agenda for the next sitting

**President.** — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Friday, 14 July 1974, with the following agenda:

9.30 a.m. to 12 noon:

- Report by Mr Martens on the common organization of the market in sugar;
- Report by Mr Houdet on the stunning of animals before slaughter;
- Report by Mr Gibbons on pure-bred breeding cattle;
- Report by Mr Martens on the fat content of whole milk;
- Report by Mr Früh on the suspension of customs duties on certain agricultural products;
- Report by Mrs Orth on health problems affecting trade in poultrymeat;
- Oral Question with debate to the Commission on the third conference on the Law of the Sea.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 7.20 p.m.)*

## SITTING OF FRIDAY, 14 JUNE 1974

### Contents

<p>1. Approval of the minutes: Mr Scott-Hopkins ..... 217</p> <p>2. Documents received ..... 217</p> <p>3. Regulations on the maximum quota applicable to sugar during the 1974-75 marketing year — Regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar: Debate on a report by Mr Martens on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 92/74): Mr Martens, rapporteur ..... 218 Mr De Koning, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Liogier, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities ..... 219 Adoption of the resolution ..... 222</p> <p>4. Directive on the stunning of animals before slaughter — Report by Mr Houdet on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 82/74) ..... 222 Adoption of the resolution ..... 222</p> <p>5. Regulation on pure-bred breeding animals of the bovine species — Debate on a report by Mr Gibbons on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 83/74): Mr Gibbons, rapporteur ..... 222 Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities .. 222 Adoption of the resolution ..... 223</p> <p>6. Regulation on the fat content of whole milk: Debate on a report by Mr Martens on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 112/74): Mr Martens, rapporteur ..... 223</p>	<p>Mr Frehsee, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Liogier, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Deschamps; Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Martens; Mr Frehsee; Mr Lardinois ..... 224 Adoption of the resolution ..... 229</p> <p>7. Regulation suspending autonomous customs duties in the CCT on certain agricultural products: Debate on a report by Mr Früh on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 116/74): Mr Früh, rapporteur ..... 229 Mr Liogier; Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities ..... 230 Adoption of the resolution ..... 231</p> <p>8. Directive on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultrymeat: Reference of a report to committee ..... 231 Procedural motion: Mr Albertsen, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Lange; Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment 231</p> <p>9. Oral Question with debate: Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 124/74): Mr Laban; Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities; Lord Mansfield; Mr Laban 232</p> <p>10. Agenda for the next part-session: Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Kirk ..... 236</p> <p>11. Approval of minutes ..... 238</p> <p>12. Adjournment of session ..... 238</p>
--	--

IN THE CHAIR: MR BERKHOUWER

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 9.30 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Very briefly, Mr President, on the subject of yesterday's minutes, may I draw your attention to the difficulties we had with the last report yesterday evening, when the Commissioner concerned wished to withdraw his initial proposals to the Council, yet the machinery did not seem to work very well. We had an hour's debate on a report and a proposal from the Commissioner which was being withdrawn.

That happened—and I do not want to go back over the events again. However, may I suggest that the Bureau of the Commission and your enlarged Bureau examine ways of improving the liaison between the two bodies so that Parliament does not debate proposals from the Commission which are to be withdrawn?

May I, while I am on my feet, also take the opportunity of saying that I have viewed with some disquiet during this week the lack of Commissioners attending our debates? I am delighted to see here Commissioner Lardinois, who deals with agriculture. He will recall, Mr President, that there have been many occasions when the Commissioner concerned was not present, although I know that it is a collegiate responsibility. I suggest that it would be courteous if the Commissioners spared some of their valuable time to be present during our important debates.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I shall most certainly take account of Mr Scott-Hopkins's suggestion after the incident of yesterday afternoon.

The question of the absence of members of the Commission during debates at which their presence has been requested will be raised at the traditional meeting with the presidents of the other two Institutions. I shall draw Mr Ortoli's attention to this and press for a solution along

the lines indicated by Mr Scott-Hopkins. I share his concern.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received the following documents:

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

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation No 121/67/EEC as regards certain conditions for granting aid for private storage of pig meat (Doc. 137/74).

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

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation on the customs treatment of goods imported for testing (Doc. 145/74).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Budgets as the committee responsible and to the Committee on External Economic Relations for an opinion.

(b) from the committees, the following reports:

— reports by Mr Manfred Schmidt on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the setting up of an Audit Committee in the European Parliament (Doc. 138/74);

— report by Mr Peter Brugger on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to honey (Doc. 139/74);

— report by Mr Jan Baas on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

I. a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of a Community tariff quota for 30,000

**President**

head of heifers and cows, not intended for slaughter, of certain mountain breeds, falling within sub-heading ex 01.02 A II (b) 2 of the Common Customs Tariff; and

- II. a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of a Community tariff quota for 5,000 head of bulls, cows and heifers, not intended for slaughter, of certain alpine breeds, falling within sub-heading ex 01.02 A II (b) 2 of the Common Customs Tariff

(Doc. 146/74).

(c) The following Oral Questions:

- Oral Question with debate put by Mr John Brewis on behalf of the European Conservative Group to the Council of the European Communities on the Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 140/74);
- Oral Question without debate put by Mr Lucien Martens to the Commission of the European Communities on support measures for greenhouse cultivation (Doc. 141/74);
- Oral Question with debate put by Mr Donal Creed on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group to the Commission of the European Communities on regional policy (Doc. 142/74);
- Oral Question with debate put by Mr Jean Durieux on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group to the Council of the European Communities on simplification of the institutional structure (Doc. 143/74);
- Oral Question with debate put by Mr Schelto Patijn on behalf of the Socialist Group to the Council of the European Communities on bilateral economic, industrial and technological cooperation agreements (Doc. 144/74).

3. *Regulations on the maximum quota applicable to sugar during the 1974-75 marketing year — Regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar*

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

I. regulations concerning the level of the maximum quota applicable to sugar during the 1974-75 marketing year; and

- II. a regulation supplementing Regulation No 1009/67/EEC on the common organization of the market in sugar

(Doc. 92/74).

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

**Mr Martens.** — (NL) Mr President, this is the third time in the space of a few months that we have held a debate on sugar in this House. You will consequently allow me to be as succinct as possible. The first time, we considered the Memorandum of July 1973, which was intended to establish future sugar policy. The second time, we spoke about measures which had to be taken to secure Community supplies. Everyone knows that the sugar shortage will persist. It was proposed at the time that the C quota, which would normally be exported, should be kept in the Community by imposing an export levy.

Today the Commission proposes a second series of measures to secure Community supplies, by increasing the maximum quota generally from 135% to 145%, from 100% to 110% for the United Kingdom and from 200% to 235% for Belgium and the Netherlands, which both apply the compound price. Furthermore, a quota of B sugar and a price for this sugar is established for the United Kingdom, and we are able to agree with this.

The Commission also proposes increasing the supplementary payments for Italian sugarbeet producers from 1.8 to 4 units of account per metric ton. In the Committee on Agriculture, the Commission's representative explained the justification for this increase using numerous arguments which can be found on page 13 of the report.

The committee's motion for a resolution puts forward two ideas. In the first place, the committee expresses its agreement with the measures taken to secure the Community's sugar supply. It is of the opinion that the various measures have resulted in a drop in the income of sugarbeet producers. The levy on the C quota of sugar is liable to reduce their income even further.

We should like to emphasize first and foremost that a price increase of 5.5% was allowed in March 1974 in view of the rise in costs between October-November 1972 and October-November 1973, which came to 11%. At the time of sow-

**Martens**

ing, this was about 15-17%. The price fixed in March 1974 will be paid out for 80% of production at about the end of December 1974 and the rest in about June 1975. The question now is what the purchasing power of the money received by the sugar-beet producers will be when it is paid. It is for this reason that, whilst I declare most emphatically that we desire an optimal supply situation for the Community, we also find the producer's income important. The best way of guaranteeing satisfactory supply is to pay the producer a reasonable price.

This, briefly, is the content of the report. I hope that Parliament will accept our motion for a resolution.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr De Koning to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

**Mr De Koning.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to start by congratulating the rapporteur on his excellent report and expressing to him our gratitude for the ample data which he has provided on the sugar regulations within the Community, especially those concerning Italy, and the factors influencing sugar production in Italy.

The Christian-Democratic Group agrees with the rapporteur's suggestion that we accept the Commission's proposal and increase the quota for B sugar (semi-white sugar) to 145%, since we believe that under the circumstances special consideration must be given to guaranteeing Community sugar supplies.

We also agree with the rapporteur's observations on the possible effects on the incomes of sugar producers. I should like to ask Mr Lardinois what production levies have been imposed on the B sugar quota. At a time when there is a shortage of the world sugar market, it is not surprising that the B sugar should be under pressure. For what reason and to what extent must production levies still be imposed on B sugar?

My group has no objection to the extra increment on the price of Italian sugar. We understand that Italian sugar producers require a special stimulus in order to maintain their level of production. We recommend that measures be taken not only in view of the position of Italian agriculture, but also in view of the difficulties of the Italian economy as a whole. Does Mr Lardinois believe that the supplementary payment to be made this year can subsequently be reduced to the earlier level? Does he anticipate that this payment will be completely abolished in future so that we have one single price level for the whole of the Community?

Mr Martens has provided interesting data on the structure of Italian sugar-beet production. They show that the structure is exceptionally inadequate. Is the Commission considering any measures, in particular structural measures, to put the Italian sugar producers in a better position than at present?

Mr President, I should like to reiterate my compliments to the rapporteur.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — On behalf of the European Conservative Group, I congratulate Mr Martens not only on his extensive grasp of the problem of sugar and sugar-beet growing within the Community and the attendant difficulties, but also on this report.

As he said, this is the third report we have had in a very short space of time. Our group agrees with the report and the proposals being put forward.

I wish to make three points. First—and this is certainly the case in my country—the advantages the consumer has had or is receiving from the sugar régime within the Community at a time when world prices of sugar are extremely high are insufficiently understood. Prices in the Community have been stable. Indeed, there has been an advantage to our consumers throughout the whole of the Community. I do not think this fact is widely enough appreciated throughout the Community; certainly it is not appreciated in my country.

My second point is a corollary to that. There are improvements. There are increases in the quotas. For example, in my country quota A is acceptable and for the first time there is quota B. I have had fairly extensive discussions with our sugar-beet growers in the United Kingdom. They are dubious whether at the present price-levels they will be able to accept the increased amount of acreage available to them on either quota A or quota B.

I am sure the Commissioner will realize that there is a great problem throughout the Community regarding the crop, as already referred to by honourable Members who have spoken from the Christian-Democrat benches. The Commissioner must look at this problem very carefully.

Has he any estimates, in view of the appalling weather conditions—the lack of rain causing drought throughout many areas of the Com-

**Scott-Hopkins**

munity—of the level of crop he will be expecting later in the year? Great acreages of sugar beet have not germinated in the United Kingdom. I have a feeling that the same situation exists in other parts of the Community.

Shall we be in a position, assuming that conditions continue as they are, in the autumn of this year, when the crop is beginning to be lifted, in which we are very short of sugar because of the adverse conditions? If so, what is the Commissioner's view on what needs to be done now and what stimulus there should be?

Our group would support what the rapporteur has said about the Italian situation, which is covered in the second part of the proposals. It is understood that this extra help is given to our Italian beet-grower friends on a temporary basis only. As long as it is on that basis, that will be acceptable.

However, I would reiterate Mr De Koning's question to the Commissioner whether the Italian growers will be put in a more advantageous position by these measures than they were before. Is there to be inequality with the rest of the growers throughout the country?

We accept these proposals, and the group will support the report of Mr Martens.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Liogier.

**Mr Liogier.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, once again we are required to deliver an opinion on further amendments in regard to the common organization of the market in sugar. This raises the question whether the original regulation proposed by the Commission was really justified: this in fact we have always doubted, and we have had occasion to say so many times in this Parliament.

What are the Commission's latest proposals? They contain two main provisions: the 'B' quota is to be raised from 135% to 145%—this measure will have the effect of increasing the British basic quota, which is itself aligned on the 'B' quota—and there is to be more aid for Italian sugar production; this aid will thus be increased from 1.8 u.a. to 4 u.a. per metric ton of beet.

As far as Italy is concerned, the measures proposed are specific and the additional aid seems on the whole justified, in particular by the relatively low yield in the northern part of Italy—40% less than in the north of the country—which is due essentially to the very low average acreage. In fact, with these measures,

we are reaching the small producers whom we obviously have an interest in helping.

Similarly, Italy has to cope with strong competition in regard to maize.

These measures are also justified by the fact that, in the present period of world scarcity, the producing countries are unable to meet Italy's needs.

This has repercussions on processing industries such as the manufacture of chocolate, which in Italy, for example, have to pay more for their supplies than in other countries with surpluses. Thus, although we accept the specific measures proposed for Italy, we join with the rapporteur—whom we congratulate on his excellent report—in deploring the absence of precise information from the Commission, and we urge the Commission to carry out more detailed research, if possible, and submit it to us.

As far as the second measure, increasing the B quota from 135% to 145% is concerned, we are of course in agreement as this will encourage greater production, but it must be coupled with the fixing of prices which are profitable for the producer.

We therefore support the rapporteur's proposals that the production levy for the B quota be abolished.

In fact, it must be admitted that our producers do not benefit from the high world prices—as Mr Scott-Hopkins pointed out earlier—because the Community system is, in our opinion, much too Malthusian.

The whole system will no doubt have to be reviewed, for in a period of scarcity, when it is of the utmost importance to ensure adequate supplies internally, one must give some encouragement to those one depends on to provide them. Although, therefore, we accept the last measure proposed, we deplore the system of which it is a part, as we have emphasized at length in previous speeches.

We urge the Commission to review the organization of the sugar market fundamentally and open the Community market to profitable world outlets.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I too would like to join those who have complimented the rapporteur on his report. Before I speak about the report, I should like to take

**Lardinois**

this opportunity to congratulate Mr Martens both personally and on behalf of the Commission on his appointment as Vice-President of this Parliament.

*(Applause)*

As Mr Martens himself has already said, he has drawn up a number of reports in the past few months on sugar problems. His reports show that he is becoming an expert on the matter. If the Committee on Agriculture continues to appoint him rapporteur for sugar problems in the future, this will not be the last year that he will report on sugar problems. In fact, the Commission is due to submit a very specialized proposal in some weeks on negotiations with the Associated states in the framework of Protocol 22 and especially with those countries which are parties at the present time to the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. There are undoubtedly so many aspects to this agreement that the sugar problem in general will once again come up for consideration.

Far from finding this a matter for regret, the Commission admits that sugar is a product which is full of problems. Sugar has always been, as it was during the accession negotiations, a politically loaded product. For this reason I believe politicians should give great attention to it.

Mr Martens put a number of questions. He asked about the price for producers. He calculated that the prices we fixed last March, which represent an increase of 6.5% for white sugar, will only apply, at least to a great extent, after the 1974 harvest, which is due in the autumn, and at the same time, according to Mr Martens, production costs will presumably have risen more than the prices which we increased.

I do not wish to deny the fact; I would even affirm it. In my opinion, it does in fact seem evident that production costs for sugar have risen more than prices, but on the other hand we must also bear in mind that the new prices will be effective from 1 July and they will thus also apply to a part of the 1973 harvest, which was not affected by this enormous rise in production costs. The rise in production costs will mainly come with the sowing for the 1974 harvest and the processing of the sugar from the 1974 harvest. You must see this, not just from one side, but from both sides. If there is no change in the general increase in sugar costs, then I believe I can already say that in all probability we shall not be able to avoid increasing the sugar price even more next year than was the case this year.

Naturally I am not able to give any precise figures yet, but one thing is clear to me—and this will answer Mr Scott-Hopkins's point—and that is that the sugar-beet price in the United Kingdom is at present too low, for example, even in comparison with the production costs in that country. This is certainly the case if we look for the production of cheap sugar, namely B sugar, in the United Kingdom. I believe that from a climatological point of view as well the United Kingdom must be counted as one of those countries where sugar production must in the long term, with specialization, be given a chance to spread. Our method of doing this has always been to use the B sugar device; this, especially in the long term, offers an opportunity for specialization despite the existence of a quota. It is clear to me that at the present time and in the framework of the United Kingdom's total sugar production, B sugar is not an economic proposition but has only a marginal rôle to play depending on fluctuating harvests.

The big problem which will face us in a few weeks is that when the sugar price in the United Kingdom no longer enjoys extra subsidies we shall soon have to face the fact that we shall probably have to pay 20% more for sugar from the Commonwealth than the price of beet-sugar in the United Kingdom. From the point of view of internal policy, among others, this is a relation which will be extremely difficult to interpret for the European producer. This problem is partly a result of the fact that the United Kingdom still has to bridge a certain gap, but basically it is a question of the monetary compensatory amounts. In effect we have a devaluation of the exchange rate of the pound sterling in comparison with two years ago. In the past, the British sugar price has always been fairly close to the West European beet-sugar price, but this shift in exchange rates, especially in the last two years, has given rise to the considerable gap I mentioned, and I still do not know how the problem should be solved for, in particular, the Caribbean countries, to whom we shall soon have to offer a price.

This will be an extremely difficult problem if we do not succeed in finding a solution, albeit in the long term, for the excessively low beet-sugar price in Great Britain.

Mr De Koning put another question on production levies for B sugar. These are not enforced at the moment, and I am therefore able to say that the same price applies to both B sugar and A sugar. I do not anticipate that these production levies will be reintroduced in the near future in view of the supply and demand on the world market, but I have learnt to be cautious in these matters and not to make very formal predictions.

**Lardinois**

The supplementary payment for Italy about which Mr Scott-Hopkins spoke is indeed a temporary measure. The costs incurred in connection with the exchange rates of the lira and the rapid drop in Italy's total production made it necessary, in our view, to regulate the matter temporarily in this way. The Memorandum states that this kind of exception must be abolished by 1978.

Mr Scott-Hopkins also asks about harvest prospects. Weather conditions have been such this year in the United Kingdom that a not inconsiderable part of the sown area had to be ploughed over. Other agricultural crops have been planted in the place of beet. Generally speaking, the whole of the north of Europe, including Denmark, has been adversely affected. Things are not so serious in the Benelux countries, northern France and northern Germany. Southern Germany has had excellent weather.

I should be particularly pleased if this year's crop in Europe were equivalent to the average of the last five years expressed in terms of yield per hectare. It is not possible for me to say more about this matter at the moment. Unfortunately, I cannot say that there are good prospects for the sugar harvest. If we are to reach the average yield for the last five years, then we require the cooperation of mother nature.

In reply to Mr Liogier, I am able to say that we believe that we can use every kilogram of sugar in Europe. We shall be glad to do so, especially as long as there is a shortage on the world market. This has always been our view. If Mr Liogier will take the trouble of reading last year's Memorandum on sugar, he will notice that there is no mention of a policy of retrenching sugar production in Europe so long as there is a world shortage.

(Applause)

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak? The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted<sup>1</sup>.

#### 4. Directive on the stunning of animals before slaughter

**President.** — The next item is the report drawn up by Mr Houdet on behalf of the Committee

on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the stunning of animals before slaughter (Doc. 82/74).

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted<sup>1</sup>.

#### 5. Regulation on pure-bred cattle

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Gibbons on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation on pure-bred breeding animals of the bovine species (Doc. 83/74).

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

**Mr Gibbons.** — This resolution deals with the proposal from the Commission to introduce certain measures to facilitate trade in pure-bred cattle. In so far as it envisages the introduction of standards for confirmation and the regulation of documentation and other things dealt with in paragraph 8 of the Explanatory Memorandum, we welcome this proposal. There is a corrigendum to be made to paragraph 5 of the motion which I recommend to the House.

In one part of the Commission's proposal, Article 6, the Committee on Agriculture suggests an amendment as set out on page 6 of the report. The reason for this is that the Committee on Agriculture felt it necessary to guarantee parliamentary participation and control in the setting up of a Standing Committee on Zootechnics in order that at all times measures adopted by the Commission and by the Standing Committee would be under the supervision of the Parliament itself. The committee felt that this is a necessary measure in order to restrain a burgeoning bureaucracy. I recommend the amendment to the House.

I am aware of no other complications. I would recommend that the necessary correction be made in paragraph 5 of the resolution and that the amendment for which we ask in Article 6 of the Commission's proposal be also accepted.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (NL) Mr President,

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.



**Lardinois**

I should like to thank the rapporteur not only for the fact that he has given so much of his attention to this important matter, especially to the trade in breeding animals in Europe, but also for the fact that this proposed amendment would in fact give the Commission greater influence and power than the Commission itself proposes. This he does by proposing that a conventional management-committee procedure should be followed.

However, I should like to ask the rapporteur and Parliament not to be more catholic than the Pope in this respect, and I would ask them to follow the Commission's proposal, since the Commission believes that in this case the procedure it proposes is better at the present time in view of the fact that the national governments have at their disposal more know-how and such-like facilities than the Commission.

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted<sup>1</sup>.

#### 6. Regulation on the fat content of whole milk

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Martens on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation modifying Regulation (EEC) No 1411/71 as regards the fat content of whole milk (Doc. 112/74).

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

**Mr Martens, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I shall try to explain clearly what this is about. At the end of 1971 a scheme was established for full liquid milk. This stipulated that as from 1 January 1974 the fat content of milk should not fall below 3.5%. At the end of October 1973, a Belgian delegation from the special Agriculture Committee requested that the deadline be postponed. We approved a Commission pro-

posal in December and accepted an extension to 31 May 1974.

Recently, several delegations from the special Agriculture Committee requested that this date once again be extended to the end of 1975 in conformity with the dates agreed for the United Kingdom on the basis of the Act of Accession. When we debated the proposal in December, we asked whether the Commission would make use of this time to investigate the results of this increase in fat content in certain countries, such as Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg and perhaps a few other countries. We have tried to find out what influence an increase in price could possibly have on the consumption of full milk, since the original intention of the proposal was—as it dated from the end of 1971, i.e., after the experience with the butter surplus in 1969-70—to sell as much full milk as possible and thus to limit butter production.

Taking a practical view of things, however, we come to the following conclusion. We can presume that every consumer consumes about 200-250 grams of full milk per day; this is the equivalent of 9 grams of fat per day per consumer if the fat content is 3.5%, and approximately 8 grams if the fat content is 3.2%. If we now compare this with the overall consumption of fat per capita per annum of approximately 40 kilograms—or 110 grams, approximately, per day, we are now talking about a consumption of 1 gram per day as part of a total consumption of 110 grams per day.

Now we know—and this has often been confirmed by dieticians—that much too much is eaten in Europe. It would be better to cut down the amount of fat in our food. It has also been ascertained that dairy products with less fat content have been sold very successfully. I admit that harmonization is required in this area and the question whether we should retain a fat content of 3.5% or 3.2% is by the way; there must be harmonization. However, is it a good thing, if the consumer definitely prefers milk with less fat, to take a step in the opposite direction and stipulate a fat content of 3.5% for milk?

My proposal is therefore very simple. We agree with the Commission's proposal to apply the 3.5% figure in those countries where this figure is not in force, from the end of 1975. Meanwhile, the Commission must investigate the optimum fat content for milk, taking into account proper and healthy nutrition as required by the consumer.

We must not forget that the increase in the fat content of milk will entail a price increase of 4%, although from a nutritional point of view

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**Martens**

we consider the higher fat content to be quite unnecessary.

This is the essence of the problem. We therefore agree to the proposal, but wish to request the Commission to investigate what the optimum solution is, 3.5% or 3.2%. I myself would not like to take up a position on this question, and would prefer simply to ask the Commission to look into this problem as soon as possible.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Frehsee.

**Mr Frehsee.** — *(D)* Mr President, I wish to thank the rapporteur for his report and oral presentation, and congratulate him on the objectivity with which his written report is composed. With regard to his oral introduction, however, I have some remarks to make.

It seems to me that the intended effect of the regulation is being delayed if the rapporteur now asks for a reexamination of the question whether the 3.5% are justified—a percentage on which, as the rapporteur himself has stated, this House agreed in 1971.

On the basis of the report, I should like to stress that this document was a subject of much dispute in the Committee on Agriculture. This may be seen from the results of the voting, indicated in the report: seven members of the Committee on Agriculture voted for the regulation, while six others showed their disagreement when voting on paragraph 1 of the motion, which expresses approval of the regulation.

For the third time now we are discussing whether the six original Member States now, at long last, and the new Member States of the Community after 31 december 1975 should have a uniform fat content of 3.5% for whole milk. The first time was in 1971, the second last December. Then, we were asked to discuss the Commission's proposal for a regulation extending until 31 May of this year the transitional period laid down in the regulation of 1971. Now we are confronted with another regulation, this time postponing the deadline to 31 December 1975. The transitional period was agreed to in 1971 on account of the same doubts as were expressed again today. But the fact remains that in 1971 we agreed to a harmonization of the fat content of milk at the level of 3.5%.

Some of the original six Member States have introduced the 3.5%, others not; these others are of the opinion that the stipulation of 3.5% should continue to be ignored as long as possible in the hope that it may never enter into force at all. From this point of view, the rapporteur's

oral remarks are understandable where he urges that we ask the Commission to reconsider whether another figure than 3.5% would not be better. But the motives seem to me very transparent, for in any case it is a fact that as long ago as 1971 the Commission and also the Council of Ministers, which issued the regulation with the approval of the European Parliament, were of the opinion that it was right to harmonize and establish uniform standards for the quality of milk. So far, this has not been done. The much-to-be-desired harmonization of Community law is thus being postponed once more, since the Member States' national laws remain in force and are to continue to do so. In this way, so far as whole milk is concerned, the free movement of goods in the Community is being hindered. This I may state without reservation: as regards whole milk there is no free movement of goods, and the regulation is designed to maintain this situation until 31 December 1975.

In fact, however, the economies of the countries concerned—namely, the Benelux countries and France—have really had enough time since 1971 to adapt themselves to a new legal situation. The explanatory statement points to the United Kingdom, for which an exceptional ruling was adopted in the Treaty of Accession. Now this exceptional treatment is not necessarily a justification, for there whole milk is sold with its natural fat content, which, so far as I know, is 3.7 or 3.8%, i.e., more than 3.5%.

Mr Martens pointed out that the price of fresh milk would go up if the fat content were increased. That is perfectly true. The increase would perhaps amount in Holland, for example, to 2 or 3 cents a litre.

But this amount is 8% less than the recommended price increase adopted by the Council of Ministers, on this House's recommendation, for the coming milk year 1974-75. These price increases gave no cause to fear any appreciable reduction in consumption. This was discussed very thoroughly. The increase in fat content can quite easily be accommodated in these price increases.

Further, Mr President, an increase in the consumption of milk fat through the sale of whole milk—this was pointed out by Mr Martens, too—would not be a danger in the view of the Socialist Group, but rather desirable in the light of the discussion we had not so long ago on the butter surpluses. In addition, it would lower market-regulation costs by reducing the quantities of butter registered with the state stock-keeping authorities. That, too, is an aspect which is important for other people as well as for those concerned with budgetary problems.

**Frehsee**

The rapporteur also discussed whether it was healthy to drink milk containing 3.5% fat. But the regulation of 1971 provides for various qualities of milk. The consumer who is worried about his calories—as many are nowadays—can switch over to partly or fully-skimmed milk. Incidentally, my experience suggests that an increase of about 10% in the fat content of whole milk, i.e., from 3.2 to 3.5%, is scarcely justification for such a course.

Mr President, yesterday we debated the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Bousch, which called for a deliberate policy of integration and urged that we should do more for integration. In it, we appealed to the Member States to implement the free movement of goods, to champion it and where it is threatened—the last threat came from Italy—to restore it as rapidly as possible.

Mindful of this debate and moved by all the considerations I mentioned previously, we are bound to say: this is the very opposite, this is disintegration, nothing but the postponement of an unwelcome regulation, an abandonment of harmonization which goes against the attitude that we are striving for in other measures for European integration but especially in the Common Agricultural Policy.

For all these reasons, Mr President, and also because the Socialist Group has the impression that the Commission is reluctant to see the 1971 directive dragged out like this, that it needs support because it is exposed to the pressure of certain Member States, the Socialist Group is unable to give this regulation its support and will consequently reject the motion.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — My group supports Mr Martens' acceptance of the Commission's proposal. Indeed, it would be very odd—speaking now as an individual and not on behalf of my group—if anyone from the United Kingdom objected to this proposal, because we have the transitional period up to the end of 1975 before we have to reach whatever standard is set.

I was sorry to hear what Mr Frehsee said about rejecting the report. I believe he is mistaken. It sounded as though he was saying that everyone but the Federal Republic was out of step. In this case I do not know whether it is he and the Federal Republic or possibly the Socialist Party who are out of step.

I am not sure that trying to set a standard for butter-fat content level is necessarily the right way of dealing with the liquid-milk market. In my country, the total solids form the criteria upon which one judges the availability and the quantity of liquid milk. I have often been amazed that this system has not been adopted by other countries. When one has SNFs and butter contents, one must put them together. It is the total solids of liquid milk which are the important factor. I assume that this is one of the issues which the Commissioner will be examining between now and the time when he comes forward with further proposals.

I wish to refer again to what Mr Frehsee said about my country. As regards butter fat, we sell milk on a description based on milk as it comes from the cow.

Mr Martens, who is an expert on these matters—and I compliment him on his report—dealt with the issue whether one should be encouraging people to drink liquid milk with a high butter-fat content. The whole trend throughout modern Europe and the modern world is to consume less fatty products where possible because of the phobia that people have these days about their health and about growing big. I am the last one to talk about that. However, it seems to have taken hold of everyone, except me and possibly one or two of my honourable colleagues here. Nevertheless, this is a very serious point made by Mr Martens. I hope that Parliament will give serious consideration to the matter before rejecting the points he made.

I am beginning to wonder whether we should try to standardize the butter-fat content of milk. If one goes too low, down to 3.2 or 3.3, one is in danger of encouraging the production of milk products, particularly butter. This might have, and has had in the past, serious repercussions throughout the Community. Perhaps that is a process that should not be encouraged by setting standardization too low. But I hope the Commission will seriously examine the possibility of changing from butter-fat standardization to a system of total solids or total protein, whichever term one chooses to use, in the new standards which we are discussing for the quality of liquid milk sold to the public.

Finally, I hope the Commission will seriously examine the existing methods of using such funds as exist to promote throughout the Community the sale of liquid milk to our consumers. Those in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland drink a vastly greater amount of liquid milk, with high or low butter-fat content—between 11.4 and 12.8—than is drunk anywhere else in the Community. I hope the Com-

**Scott-Hopkins**

mission will look at methods to be used to increase sales.

Undoubtedly my group will support Mr Martens in his proposals.

**President.** — I call Mr Liogier.

**Mr Liogier.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the proposed regulation states that the application of the 3.5% rate for the fat content of whole milk shall be postponed until 31 December 1975. We know that the date originally stipulated was 1 June 1974. Apart from the need to conform with an article of the Act of Accession in stipulating 31 December 1975, the Commission is motivated essentially by short-term economic policy considerations, whose object is to avoid an increase in the price of whole milk.

In fact, if the 3.5% rate were imposed immediately, consumer prices in certain Member States would rise. This measure might also lead to a drop in consumption in these countries. However, from the point of view of the consumer and the quality of the product, it would certainly be advisable to apply this rate at an earlier date, taking into account the recent studies reflecting the reactions of consumers who prefer their food to be not too fatty.

It appears, in fact, that there is a certain uneasiness about fixing these rates; the proposed regulation seems too absolute. We asked the Commission to make a detailed study of the effects of the present regulation, in the light of national legislation. The situation varies a great deal from country to country: Great Britain, Ireland and the Netherlands, for example, would have to reduce their rate, while France, Belgium and Luxembourg would have to increase theirs. Similarly, we must approach the proposed regulation with a certain amount of caution in view of the different kinds of milk currently consumed—whole milk, skimmed milk, semi-skimmed milk, and low-fat yoghurt. We therefore await the results of the Commission's investigation and favour a gradual tightening-up of the variations in rate in the interests of both consumers and producers, and in the anticipation of a revised regulation.

We therefore agree to the date of implementation being put back and urge the Commission to use this period to carry out a detailed study of the milk market and draw the appropriate conclusions.

**President.** — I call Mr Deschamps.

**Mr Deschamps.** — (*F*) Mr President, I shall be very brief. I should like first of all to congratulate Mr Martens on his report, which, like all his other reports, is excellent.

Mr Martens is right to ask us to comply with the Commission's views on the postponement of the decision to 1975. I endorse this on the political grounds that have just been mentioned: I agree that things should be made as easy as possible for Britain and that we should, when the opportunity offers, reconcile ourselves as far as possible to the application of this rule.

I also agree entirely with Mr Martens when he calls for a revision of the rule on the fat content of whole milk to be applied throughout the Community. He quotes the opinions of doctors. These are quite categorical and the housewives have not waited for their advice before deciding to buy low-fat milk, whose fat content is much lower than that of ordinary milk. I think even men—as was mentioned just now—have realized that after a certain age it is undoubtedly preferable to drink milk with a fat content of less than 3.5%. I therefore endorse Mr Martens' request that this generalized rate be reduced.

Advertisements, on television and elsewhere, for all forms of skimmed milk, either liquid or powder, and the prices of these products, justify the view that if ordinary milk had a fat content of less than 3.5% consumption of ordinary milk would undoubtedly increase, as consumers would no longer have any reason to use more expensive products. Farmers, too, would welcome this.

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (*NL*) Mr President, I too join in the gratitude expressed to the rapporteur for his report and not only because he advises Parliament to agree with the Commission's proposal. Mr Frehsee has put the case against the Commission—and this is also a healthy sign—with good arguments and the necessary suspicion.

I think it would be a good thing for me to begin by replying to Mr Frehsee. I believe that it is the Commission's duty to explain to the Parliament why it wishes to submit this proposal although the old proposal for 1971 caused some trouble and required some political effort for its adoption by Member States.

Here I can speak from my own experience. After the EEC had decided that we should increase the fat content to 3.5%, I, as the Dutch

### Lardinois

Minister then responsible, was bold enough to propose to the Dutch Parliament that we should take an intermediate step and raise the figure from 3%, which was in force in Holland at that time, to 3.2%. This caused a tremendous commotion in the Dutch Parliament and great publicity which I had not expected at all. It was only thanks to the fact that I had many good personal friends in the Lower Chamber that I escaped unscathed.

I believed that I was supporting a good cause and that this would also help to make the problem of butter fat less serious in the Netherlands—we are a great nation of milk-drinkers. However, it transpired that because of the publicity and the rather strong commercial action taken by some firms the final result in my mother country was not that we were selling more butter fat in liquid milk, at the full price, but less, since a large campaign was then started—partly inspired by the commotion in Parliament—in favour of the sale of milk containing half as much fat and twice as much protein.

In the intervening years, this milk has now captured a large part of the market; this part is larger than the market for fat which was captured at that time as a result of the measures I took.

This is mainly intended as a reply to Mr Frehsee's observation that the Commission does not want to return to the 3.5% figure, and that the Commission has been forced by some Member States to concede this point and that Parliament is in fact defending the Commission. In view of my story, which can, of course, be checked, I presume that Mr Frehsee's opinion has altered. It is not only the desire or, if you like, the pressure of a number of Member States which has led us to propose an extension. The proposal is also due to the fact that the Commissioner at present responsible for agricultural affairs has some doubts about the advisability of forcing this measure. It seems to me to be better to give further study to this point as Mr Martens in fact requested.

I should like to mention a second argument, and this will also serve as a reply to Mr Scott-Hopkins. The United Kingdom and Ireland asked us whether we should not continue doing what we did up to 1940, when war broke out, i.e., sell full milk to consumers. It would then probably be somewhat easier to avoid arguments about butter fat, how much there should be in milk and how much there should not, whether the percentage should be 3.5 or something else. I am of the opinion that nothing is so bad for the quality of a product as to force or encourage

the dairy industry to make all sorts of alterations to the quality of the milk. These alterations were, of course, caused at that time by the shortage on the Continent during the war. It was then that we learnt that liquid milk could be sold with a 2 or 2.25% fat content. After the war, in the initial period of austerity, this percentage was gradually increased, but there was always opposition even from the dairy industry. There were also the rising prices, which again prompted the dairy industry to take out the last hundredth of a percent.

In brief, we should ask ourselves frankly whether perhaps in these modern times it would not be better for the consumer if we returned to the original scheme we had on the Continent and which Great Britain still has. I am not saying that it is better; I do, however, believe that the matter should be looked into. There are experts who say that the fat in milk which has been specially treated is probably more detrimental than the fat in the untarnished natural product. Young people are also becoming increasingly fond of the pure natural product and the pure natural product could perhaps be a better solution in the future than the specially-treated products with a continually fluctuating fat content that we have had to present to our consumers too much in the past, one reason for this being the price relation.

This applies even more strongly if fat is no longer more expensive than protein. We have proposed a common price, and in the last few years have taken a major step in this direction. We have almost reached our goal. Perhaps we may be able to adopt a different view if we continue in this direction and no longer speak of fat or protein but simply of dry substances—protein, fat and sugar—in milk. I must therefore say that I have doubts on this point. I am partly responsible for our decision of 1971 and I am fully prepared to do what the rapporteur requests, namely, to institute a further study and not to leave this until November of 1975. I am of the opinion that we should submit this study to Parliament at least 6 months before our present system expires, since I do not want us to waste more time on this point. It is for this reason that I say that we should investigate whether our system should not be aligned with Great Britain's and consider whether there is not more to this and adopt a more flexible attitude, since, after all, almost 35 years have passed since 1940. This means that we have a whole generation which does not know what normal milk is, apart from the farmers themselves. We must therefore consider closely whether by the end of this century we could not present people with something different from what we had between '40 and '45.

**Lardinois**

Mr President, I should like to finish by saying that we shall naturally do everything possible. Our first duty is to promote the freedom of movement of goods, but fat content is hardly an element in this. Any dairy factory, any factory producing liquid milk can change the fat content of its milk from one day to the next according to the customer's requirements. Most milk factories already produce three or four different sorts, and if one country asks for a percentage of 3.2 instead of 3.5, then for present-day dairy factories, which have specialized in liquid milk, this presents no obstacle in itself to free trade.

(Applause)

**President.** — What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Martens rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I should just like to say one thing. I have listened with interest to Mr Frehsee's arguments but I do have the impression that he bases them too much on the regulation and too little on reality. It is a fact, as Mr Lardinois has said, that people are asking for something different. All his arguments are correct, and I fully agree that the fat content does not affect trade and that this is the least of the difficulties that have to be settled.

I should, however, like to issue a warning about the idea of natural milk as it comes from the cow. This milk is, of course, natural for the calf, but whether it is natural for human beings is, it seems to me, another question. We must consider the requirements of a balanced diet, and I am not convinced that the same proportions would apply for human consumption.

I should like to say to Mr Lardinois that I am somewhat doubtful about the proposal by Mr Scott-Hopkins which he wishes to adopt or at least consider, which is to try to produce milk with a natural fat content if no minimum fat content is to be established. In view of the fact that the fat content may fluctuate considerably between summer and winter I fear that this may lead to endless frauds from which we may not be able to extract ourselves.

A minimum fat content will have to be established; this is unavoidable. It does not matter how high this is. However, this is only possible if the milk goes direct from the producer to the consumer. In the case of industrial milk I would say: leave well alone, otherwise you will have considerable difficulties and uncontrollable fraud.

**President.** — I call Mr Frehsee.

**Mr Frehsee.** — (D) Mr President, I will be really brief, bearing the House and my colleagues in mind.

In reply to Mr Martens' latest remarks, I should like to say that there is a misunderstanding if he understood me to be pleading for the sale of milk in its natural state. Rather I was pleading for harmonization and for European integration; whether it was to be 3.8, 3.5 or 3.2% is a point I left completely open.

All I said was: Please don't take an anti-European course! That is the essential point for the Socialist Group.

As for your remarks, my dear Mr Lardinois, I am a little depressed and disappointed. I almost have the impression that a difference separates the Commission and the Commissioner responsible for agriculture. For the Commission is surely for greater integration, and that as soon as possible. It surely cannot be interested in disintegratory measures and champion them.

So far I have taken for my fundamental consideration the fact that those concerned have differing interests. With the formers, the milk producers, they are of course economic: what they want is a general increase in milk prices and in addition something in return for raising the fat content. The consumers have other interests. They say: For Heaven's sake don't raise the fat content of fresh milk if that will mean higher prices for milk!

Use is, of course, made of all these arguments; but, Mr President, they do not strike me as being the real motives.

If things really were as Mr Lardinois described them, it would be being inconsistent to propose first an extension of five months and, after these had run out, another of two years. I feel bound to ask: why, instead of last December's regulation extending the transitional period, did he not propose straight away a regulation introducing another fat content in lieu of the 3.5%? Here his conduct seems to be a little contradictory. I regret having to say such a thing.

Incidentally, my country—and not only the German Federal Republic but Italy too remained true to the EEC, Mr Scott-Hopkins!—has raised the fat content, in accordance with the regulation, to 3.5%. Our experience was like yours, Mr Lardinois, when, as the Dutch Minister of Agriculture, you decided on the increase from 3 to 3.2%. But we remained true to the EEC despite the difficulties, and we bowed to this EEC regulation. That's what I wanted to point out.

**Frehsee**

The doctors' objections and the health aspect I have already dealt with by pointing out that these things were known in 1971 and that the 1971 regulation stated that different categories of milk were possible and permitted in all six countries.

Since I want to be brief, I will only add, Mr President: for us, the important thing is fidelity to the EEC and integration.

The Socialist Group is opposed to the habit of constantly postponing unpleasant decisions. The Commission should produce a new proposal acceptable to all. The present procedure is intolerable and unsatisfactory, and we must reject it.

*(Applause from the Socialist benches)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(NL)* Mr President, in view of what has been said by Mr Martens and Mr Frehsee, it is impossible for me not to make a further comment. First of all, I did not say that the Commission has to change the proposal which it has now submitted. I simply said in a spirit of frankness that I doubt whether we chose the best system for the future in 1971 and that I am of the opinion that there are possible alternatives.

That is my reply to Mr Frehsee. If the Commission was in fact of the opinion that the strict system adopted in 1971 should be introduced at all costs in all countries, he would be right in saying that we are now shifting our position. I hope that my reply has shown him that I also require further investigation of an alternative method and that I do not exclude from the outset the possibility that the British may have a better system than we do, although this may be difficult for Germans, Dutchmen, Belgians, Frenchmen and others to understand.

What we are asking of the British, in particular during the first two years, is harmonization of as many matters as possible, including difficult questions of this kind; at the same time, we owe it to them to investigate with full objectivity whether there might not be possibilities for adjustments in the other direction, especially if that direction proves to be better when such a regulation is to some extent burdened by the past. Let us be honest: we should not be talking about the percentage of fat in milk if the historical situation in and after the war had been different. Once again, I repeat that I should like further study of this point.

I do not accept the remark that I am less in favour of harmonization than my colleagues, but I am against harmonization for harmonization's sake. There must be some reason for harmonization of this kind. There must be a reason and we must seek improvements.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

*7. Regulation suspending autonomous customs duties in the CCT on certain agricultural products*

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Früh on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation temporarily suspending the autonomous duties in the Common Customs Tariff on a number of agricultural products (Doc. 116/74).

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

**Mr Früh, rapporteur.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I hope that my report will not provoke any discussions of the kind in which one thinks he is more for harmonization and the other less. In this case we are dealing with the temporary suspension of CCT duties on certain agricultural products which are not produced or not produced in adequate quantities within the Community.

For most of these products the suspension is already in force, so that here all that is needed is an extension. Since time is passing, I shall confine myself to a few brief remarks.

The question primarily concerns fish landed in insufficient and in some cases diminishing quantities, so that we have to ensure that the processing industry which depends on such fish does not find itself exposed to distortions of competition *vis-à-vis* third countries. At the same time, of course, it concerns employment in this industry.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**Früh**

Oysters, for which the demand is steadily rising, are an especial problem. While the demand is rising, serious shortages are being registered in the breeding-grounds, partly owing to the growing pollution of the Atlantic coasts. As a result, we depend on imports from Japan, and this is the reason for the Commission's proposal to extend the suspension of duties.

As regards vegetable products, there is a shortage in the supply within the Community of chanterelles, bilberries and rose-hips. In order, here too, to prevent the processing industry and its labour force from being disadvantageously placed with regard to competition, we need imports from third countries, and so a suspension is asked for.

The same applies to dates, which hitherto have been mainly imported from Algeria and Tunisia. Since, however, these countries are interested in acquiring their own processing plants, our industry, particularly in southern France, needs to draw its supplies from elsewhere.

Ground paprika, needed for the fodder industry, has to be imported in its entirety. The Community's output of bitter oranges is inadequate, four-fifths of the total quantities required having to come from third countries. Consequently, here too an extension is necessary.

The same applies to dried apricots and, finally, Christmas trees, the high demand for which cannot be fully covered. Hence, it is proposed to remove the duties on supplies from Denmark.

The Committee on Agriculture approves the Commission's proposals, but asks the Commission to submit to the European Parliament and the Council a report on the reasons for the inadequacy of supplies. Where it would be possible to increase production—this applies in particular to fisheries and measures for protecting the environment and combatting water pollution—the question of overcoming these causes should be studied.

The aim should be to achieve an adequate Community production in all sectors where this is possible, in order to avoid the necessity of constantly repeating the suspension of customs duties. The Committee on Agriculture therefore asks for the House's support. Briefly, the reasons are three: first, the need to guarantee the Community's supplies; secondly, the need for security of employment in the processing industry; and thirdly, the desirability of curbing prices, in which we are all interested if inflation is to be combatted.

**President.** — I call Mr Liogier.

**Mr Liogier.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the regulation proposed by the Commission concerns the suspension of autonomous customs duties in the Common Customs Tariff for certain agricultural products. This may be either an extension, in the event of the period of suspension of duties having expired, or a first request for suspension. It is a highly technical regulation, but its interpretation may appear very simple - too simple, in fact.

Anyway, to return to the matter in hand. This system has been in existence for about two years. Up till now a specific procedure has been used for each product and these cases were dealt with once or twice a year. It is thus the first time that an overall suspension of duties has been considered for such a large number of products. We know, too, that in the near future consideration will be given to making the temporary measures final, under the generalized preferences system.

The question therefore needs to be considered in terms of final aims. The immediate object of this measure is to counteract the insufficiency of production in the Community, the ultimate aim being to avoid creating a shortage of direct supplies to the consumer and to industry. The intention is a worthy one, but within the limits covered by Mr Früh's report, on which we congratulate him, Community production must also be promoted from a structural point of view.

We must find a happy medium between emergency supplies from outside and the stimulation of Community production necessary to make it more flexible. The products concerned are extremely varied, as Mr Früh has just stated: dried apricots, bitter oranges, ground paprika, saffron, dates, mushrooms, Christmas trees and oysters, and the economic importance of oyster-farming in certain regions is well-known.

In the case of Christmas trees, the suspension of these duties may be regarded as an effective means of counteracting any rise in Christmas-tree prices, but the measure seems to be more detrimental to domestic production than advantageous to consumers.

We would therefore ask the Commission to bear in mind the synthetic aspect of the situation in any proposals it submits to us in the future.

**Mr Lardinois.** *Member of the Commission of the European Communities.* — (NL) Mr President, I thank the rapporteur for his explanation and first and foremost for his report; I also thank Mr Liogier for his observations on the matter.

I have taken note of the suggestions made to me by both these gentlemen. Some things are—



**Lardinois**

as the rapporteur himself has noted—inherently of a temporary nature, such as customs duties. These still exist, for example, in Denmark, but they will automatically be abolished in the future so that the situation outlined should occur less often as time passes. Perhaps, in the case of a small number of products where we have dealings with third countries it will also occur less frequently in the future. In the GATT negotiations next year, we shall have to make concessions and we shall have to look primarily at those products where there are difficulties in respect of such concessions.

Mr President, I would point out that this is a continually changing situation. We must not only think of protecting our own production. Naturally this point plays a very important rôle, especially in agriculture, but it is also important for trade with third countries. These are often islands which have very close links with the Community—for example, in the sphere of fishing—but are not part of the Community as such. This aspect is also very important to us.

**President.** — Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

#### 8. Reference of a report to committee

**President.** — The next item is the report drawn up by Mrs Orth on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending the Council Directive of 15 February 1971 on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultry-meat (Doc. 115/74).

I call Mr Albertsen to speak on a procedural motion.

**Mr Albertsen.** — (DK) On behalf of the Socialist Group and in agreement with the Chairman of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, Mr Della Briotta, I move that the proposal be referred to the Committee on Public

Health and the Environment for further consideration.

The reason for this is quite simple. We believe that the proposals for amendments that have been submitted possibly require further consideration by the committee, and therefore it would be less valuable and less appropriate for the proposal to be dealt with here today. I hope this proposal for reference to committee will meet the Assembly's approval.

**President.** — Mr Albertsen, did you request this reference to committee on behalf of the committee responsible?

**Mr Albertsen.** — (DK) I am making this proposal on behalf of the Socialist Group in agreement with the chairman of the committee, and I therefore recommend that the Assembly approve the proposal.

**President.** — According to the Rules of Procedure, such reference takes place automatically if requested by the competent committee. I now hear that the request is made by the Socialist Group and that the chairman of the competent committee is in agreement.

The request was not, then, made by the competent committee as such.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I intended to say that I would support the request made by Mr Albertsen on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, if Mr Della Briotta had been here, he would have made this request as committee chairman. It is therefore the committee's intention to recover this document. A colleague from the Socialist Group, of which the chairman of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment is also a member, has declared this intention of the committee's in the absence of its chairman. The question is therefore whether this cannot, without too much fuss, be regarded as an application by the chairman of the competent committee.

**President.** — I have the impression that there is agreement in the House on this matter.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — In the absence of the chairman, and as I have the privilege of being the vice-chairman of that committee, I formally so request.

<sup>1</sup> OJ No C 76 of 3 July 1974.

**President.** — I therefore have a request for reference to committee, presented by the Committee on Public Health and the Environment.

According to Rule 26(2) of the Rules of Procedure, the reference, which in this case is automatic, is authorized.

The matter is closed.

9. *Oral Question, with debate: Third Conference on the Law of the Sea*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the Oral Question, with debate (Doc. 124/74), put by Mr Laban on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture to the Commission of the European Communities and worded as follows:

*Subject:* Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Will the Commission report on what progress has been made in reaching a common EEC position with regard to the following problems at the Conference:

1. The creation of an economic 200 miles zone beyond the present 12 miles territorial waters.
2. The extent of national jurisdiction over fishing-rights in that zone, bearing in mind that fishing-grounds inside it provide the major part of world catches.
3. International measures to ensure the conservation of fish stocks, bearing in mind the increasing impoverishment of resources in areas of vital importance to Community fishing fleets, e.g., the North-east Atlantic?

I remind the House that on Monday last we decided to limit speaking-time for Oral Questions to 10 minutes for the author of the question and to 5 minutes for other speakers.

I call Mr Laban to speak to his question.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President during the discussion of the regulation on harmonization of aid to fisheries in April this year, I pointed out that the results of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea at Caracas might well be more important for the future of fisheries in the EEC than the drawing up of the regulation. I drew attention to the danger of overfishing, which is not at all imaginary, as a consequence of the constantly increasing intensity of fishing in the North-east Atlantic: 85% of total EEC imports of fish come from there, and for the northern Member States as much as 100% of their catches.

There are at present many new fishing-boats on the stocks, and the modern fishing-fleets of the Soviet Union are active in this area of the sea.

If a halt is not called to this growth, in the foreseeable future there will be no more fish for all these boats to catch. We also note that the self-sufficiency of the EEC is declining sharply, from 95% in 1960 to 75% in 1971, while the world catch rose by 30% in that period, as did consumption in the EEC. This type of protein supply to the Community may be endangered.

The international catches of sole in the North Sea are falling very rapidly. The fish death rate has been from 45 to 50% in the last few years, but the maximum sustainable yield is 20%.

Sole has disappeared from the German Bight. For plaice, the situation is, by chance, somewhat better. There have been a couple of rich years, the Danes fished less for sole and the British found other fishing grounds. This has meant that the maximum sustainable yields in this sector are approximately equal to the fish death-rate. The balance may, however, alter rapidly if sole-fishing falls further and there is a changeover to plaice.

In the case of North-Sea herring, the situation is just as bad. The herrings are small, and increasingly fewer age-groups occur. To catch the same quantity of herring, one now has to fish three times as long as in 1960. At the moment, a third of the catch consists of immature (1 to 2-year-old) herring.

The North Atlantic Fishing Convention lays down a quota system to avoid a further decline and to promote restoration of fish stocks, but no agreement has been reached on this as yet.

Another worrying point is that more and more fish are at present being caught for industry. The question is whether we should not stop processing fish fit for human consumption, such as mackerel and herring, into fishmeal for animal food. This extra link in the food chain involves a 90% loss; 10% of the fishmeal comes back for human consumption in the form of chicken or pork. Should we not move one step back down the food chain? The production of fish for consumption is falling, while world production of fish is increasing.

What we are doing is wasting, in an unacceptable manner, a piece of the common heritage of mankind—to wit, the living riches of the sea. In the longer term, it is essential for the Community that production of sea-fish should take

**Laban**

place as cheaply as possible, and with takes at such levels that fish stocks are not affected in the long term.

We shall have to make a choice in favour of a biologically and economically rational approach. In this case, this means measures to limit the free-market economy, which is producing increasingly larger and more powerful boats and refined fishing gear, thereby bringing about over-fishing. This may in the long run mean the end of fishing in the North-eastern part of the Atlantic Ocean.

In the Mediterranean Sea, fish stocks are under serious threat from sea pollution by industrial outflows.

The laws of the national states offer practically no possibilities of limiting the intensity of fishing. For this, international regulations are necessary. These should deal with catch quotas—for preference—and also close seasons, closed areas, prohibition from fishing for industrial fish, increasing net-mesh sizes, increasing minimum fish sizes and restricting certain kinds of fishing gear.

The extension of the sole rights of coastal states to a 12-mile zone may make a contribution here, although in my view the provisions of the London Fishing Convention must be maintained. This also applies to the fixing of an adjacent 200 mile zone, with the proviso that international or regional bodies are set up with powers to prevent over-fishing, so that the long-term preservation of fish stocks is guaranteed. In our view, boats of all countries should be able to fish in these adjacent zones.

It is anxiety on the state of affairs in fishing which brought me and the Committee on Agriculture to initiate this debate. I should have preferred to be able to do so as part of a discussion of a parliamentary report on the Memorandum from the Commission concerning the EEC position on the general problem-area under discussion here. There is, however, no such report, and I have therefore explicitly limited myself to the waters lying above the seabed. These waters fall directly within the competence of the Community, and the Commission ought at least to be able to appear in Caracas with a Community position. It is particularly unfortunate that Mr Wischniewski, when he answered the oral questions from the Legal Affairs Committee to the Council, again omitted to give information on the position to be adopted by the Community.

In the meantime, the Member States have already given instructions to their delegations to the Caracas Conference. But the European Parlia-

ment has still been told nothing and is cut off from all information.

The Committee on Agriculture, which is, of course, especially interested in fishing, hopes that Mr Lardinois will be able to be more informative. I should particularly appreciate it if in answering the questions he would also go into a number of the facts and suggestions dealt with in my explanatory statement.

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, Member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (NL) Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Laban for the opportunity he has given me with his questions to go into this important material. I shall begin by answering his written question.

He asks whether the Commission can report on the progress that has been made in reaching a common EEC decision with regard to the creation of an economic 200 mile zone beyond the present 12-mile territorial waters.

At the end of March, the Commission sent a Memorandum to the Council giving the broad outline of a common standpoint for Caracas. I can inform the Parliament, as my colleague Sir Christopher Soames has no doubt already done, that on 4 June the Council took the necessary procedural decision to guarantee a joint front.

As far as the first point is concerned, I can say that the Commission does not have a wholly negative attitude towards the granting of certain preferential fishing rights to coastal states, on condition that the traditional rights of traditional fishing countries which are not coastal states are guaranteed. The second condition is that international supervision is required.

On the second point raised by Mr Laban, concerning the extent of national jurisdiction over fishing-rights in the economic 200-mile zone, in view of the fact that fishing-grounds inside it provide the major part of world catches, I would repeat that it is not a case of exclusive rights, the traditional fishing rights, in this zone, of states which are not coastal states must be guaranteed and there must be international supervision to protect those who traditionally have rights in this zone.

Mr Laban's question goes on to refer to international measures to ensure the conservation of fish stocks, bearing in mind the increasing impoverishment of resources in areas of vital importance to Community fishing fleets, e.g., the North-east Atlantic. These points are not directly connected with the Caracas Conference, though they have also been broached by Mr Laban in

**Lardinois**

his introduction. I am in fact in full agreement with the views Mr Laban has developed in his introduction. Not only on the basis of experience over the past few years, but also on the basis of my experience as Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries in the Netherlands, I have gradually become more sombre as regards fish conservation and the future possibilities of fishing. This is not because nothing has been done on this point, but because what has been done has unfortunately proved inadequate. If we wish to prevent fishing from becoming almost impossible because modern equipment in fact no longer gives the fish a chance, we must take stronger measures than has been possible hitherto. We can no longer get by merely with international consultations along the lines of the North-east Atlantic consultations; we must work out positions at Community level as soon as possible, so that we can come to agreements as a Community with other countries who are greatly interested in the matter but are outside the Community, such as Norway.

Fish have increasingly less chance of survival, and therefore increasingly fewer fish are left for the normal reproduction process. This has a lot to do with modern equipment, whose tremendous power plays a part too. For instance, I can mention that boats for inshore fishing sometimes have an engine power of more than 1 000 HP. This makes the absolute decline, by more than a half, of such a delicious fish as sole more than explicable, even in areas where it was traditionally the most lucrative fishing.

As far as this is concerned, we now find ourselves in a new position. We need a lot of energy, a lot of oil, for these engines, and we all know that oil has become expensive recently, so expensive that Member States even provide subsidies to keep these expensive engines turning.

I have unfortunately to tell you that we were not able to forbid this subsidy all at once, and have had to permit it for a year, especially for inshore fishing—not for seafishing. It would seem to be justified, but only by way of a transitional measure. I am of the opinion—and I think I am talking along Mr Laban's lines here—that we must take drastic action as regards the tremendous engine powers of these coastal boats and limit this power considerably. This will undoubtedly require transitional measures, but it is only if we are bold enough to take such a step that there is a hope that inshore fishing will become profitable once fish stocks have had a chance to regenerate. Profitability is also helped if one fisherman is not compelled to install heavier gear than the next one, so as to catch the few fish which are still left over. If we could all go back to considerably lighter fishing gear,

the fish would have a greater chance and fishery costs might fall considerably.

This is, of course, only a single example. There are a whole number of other aspects; for example, Mr Laban mentioned the environment. It is clear that if largescale projects take place—for quite different reasons, such as safety considerations, etc., in areas such as the Dutch province of Zeeland in connection with the delta works—this may have tremendous consequences for the function as fishbreeding grounds which such areas have in nature. It is therefore important for areas such as the Waddenzee to be able to carry out this important function for the German Bight or the Dutch Waddengebied, and in fact for the entire area of the North Sea.

I am also fully in agreement with Mr Laban that we must take a new line on industrial fishing; i.e., fishing aimed at the industrial processing of fish protein. In the North Sea, we must bring about a reduction in fishing for industrial purposes. Fish is gradually becoming a luxury product, while even a generation ago it was actually called 'poor man's steak'. It is gradually becoming a luxury product *per excellence*, and we can only reverse this trend, we can only try to bring fish into the normal menu of the average citizen and the average worker, if we can in fact manage to curb the egoism of particular coastal areas, even if there has to be some recompense for this.

That this must be taken in hand, not only through international consultation, but also at Community level, and through a joint approach by Western Europe in consultation with third countries is an absolute necessity in my view also, and I shall therefore take advantage of this speech by Mr Laban to get this process started.

(Applause)

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Lardinois.

I call Lord Mansfield.

**Lord Mansfield.** — I congratulate Mr Laban on tabling this question, which, above all else, is timely. The attitude of the United Kingdom, as one of the three acceding countries in 1973, to the Community depends on this and other important questions. Because of our long coastline—I think it is the longest in Europe—and because of our traditional fishing industries, we are particularly concerned that the fisheries around our coasts, even in the deep water, are conserved and augmented so far as possible.

I am very much depressed by what Commissioner Lardinois told us today. We are all con-

**Lord Mansfield**

cerned with the conservation of fish stocks. However, he did not go any way to answer the questions raised by Mr Laban. It is no use, in the second half of the twentieth century, suggesting that we should in some way reduce the efficiency of our fishing fleets and the sizes of the boats so that, almost as in a game of football, the fish will have a better chance of escaping the net and possibly breeding a few more fish. That Luddite, thoroughly old-fashioned approach, is not good enough for us now.

The second matter that profoundly distressed me was that, to my way of thinking, the only way that we can possibly ensure a good supply of protein for the future, for whatever purpose it is to be used—either for our citizens to eat or for making into fish meal—is by restricting catches.

I will give one small example. Scotland has a flourishing salmon industry which is perhaps not traditional in the sense that it produces high-quality fish and sport. A few years ago the Danes discovered that if they put their trawlers in just the right position off Greenland they could scoop up the Scottish salmon and remove them before they could get back to Scotland to be taken by us. As a result of pressure, an agreement was entered into by the United Kingdom and Denmark restricting the catches to 1,100 tons per year. That has proved eminently satisfactory. This year the Danes have taken more than their allocated tonnage, but they immediately tried to rectify this and there is a considerable measure of international accord.

I suggest that this approach will have to be broadened both within the Community of the Nine and in their attitude to other countries, great and small, particularly Russia.

I return briefly to the question of traditional fishing rights. In the United Kingdom, especially in Scotland, there is a large and prosperous fishing industry. The deep-sea fishermen see their traditional fishing grounds being withdrawn from them as, for example, in Iceland.

They want to know what is to be their mission and rôle in fishing in the future. Are they to be allowed to find new fishing-grounds to bring back the catches of cod which they have traditionally made?

At the same time the inshore fishermen are nervous, if that does not put it too low. They are concerned that some form of factory fishing will sweep up the fish round our coasts and that they will be deprived of their livelihood.

I appreciate that we have a form of derogation from the Treaty of Accession which lasts until 1 January 1983, but everybody wishes to make plans. People wish to invest capital in new equipment. The Community must begin to think about what is to happen when this time-limit expires.

The problem facing us, which is acute in some senses but not in others, must be faced. I hope that the Commissioner will be able to give some signs that the Commission is getting ready to state a position which it will adopt *vis-à-vis* the Council of Ministers.

What of the future? As to the first of Mr Laban's questions about territorial waters, I think that 12 miles is a figure to which we should aspire. We have to make some decision about coastal limits, and that perhaps is better than nothing.

Mr Lardinois dismissed the question of the economic zone almost in a sentence. If the translation was right, the phrase was: 'The Commission is not entirely negative.' What is the Commission? I hope that it will be a little positive, because we have a huge expanse of water which at present is being thoroughly overfished, both by our own fishing fleets and by those of the Russians.

The fishing interests in my country are coming round increasingly to the view that this economic zone of 200 miles beyond the 12-mile territorial limit can be adjusted as a basis for areas of agreement both within the Community and between it and the nations outside it so that we can have a régime laid down to restrict catches.

The matter cannot be left in this negative way. A glance at the map shows that if we have France, Ireland and Great Britain on the western seaboard of Europe all having economic zones of 212 miles, so to speak, they will clash. That may, indeed would, bring dissension within the Community, let alone differences without. I suggest, therefore, that the Commission must lay down the kind of zone they envisage and the way in which nations would exercise their rights within it.

I would suggest four objectives about which we should all be thinking, instead of trying to restrict the engine size of our trawlers. I would much prefer that a very large and safe trawler went out for two days, caught its quota and came back and sat in port rather than that a sailing-boat sailed out for two months trying to make a living. The first objective must be economic management of the fishing-ground so that the natural resources, which we know are

**Lord Mansfield**

so rich, can be preserved and possibly augmented. That must be above all our first objective.

Secondly, we must ensure that the production of an important and palatable source of food can be continued at a realistic price for the consumer, for it is no use producing food unless people can afford to pay for it. Thirdly, we must maintain and encourage our traditional fishing industries, so that there is a fair return to all who derive their living therefrom. Fourth, but not least, we must have regard to the welfare of mankind as a whole.

The resources of the sea, beyond the proposed 12 miles and outside the immediate coastline of the particular shores, belong to the whole of mankind. We must not forget the countries which are geographically at a disadvantage: I am not being too facetious when I suggest Luxembourg or some of the poorer emerging countries which do not have fishing fleets but nevertheless depend on this source of cheap protein to feed their population.

I should like some statement from the Commission in the not-too-distant future. I hope that that statement will be taken up by the Council of Ministers, showing that the Community and those who govern it are alive to these very difficult and technical questions and will do their best to do something about them.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — In view of the importance of the subject, I was very generous with Lord Mansfield's speaking time.

I call Mr Laban.

**Mr Laban.** — *(NL)* I shall be brief, Mr President. I should like to thank Mr Lardinois for his answer on the Community position to be adopted and especially for the inspired manner in which he went into the over-fishing problem, particularly in the north of our Community. I find that he fully shares the anxieties which I have expressed. I hope that he and his staff will now produce a number of proposals to reduce this danger. I would likewise hope that the proposals will reach Parliament soon.

**President.** — I have no motion for a resolution on this debate.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The debate is closed.

**10. Agenda for the next part-session**

**President.** — There are no other items on the agenda.

The enlarged Bureau proposes that our next sittings be held at Luxembourg from 26 to 28 June 1974.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

The enlarged Bureau proposes the following agenda for the next part-session:

*Wednesday, 26 June 1974:*

4.00 p.m.:

- Order of business;
- Commission statement on action taken on opinions of Parliament;
- Report by Mr Gerlach on the draft estimates of Parliament for 1975;
- Report by Lord Lothian on the recommendations of the EEC-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee;
- Report by Mr Schwabe on a system of bracket tariffs for the transport of goods by road;
- Report by Mr Jahn on the disposal of waste oils;
- Report by Mr Lange on the importation of cultural materials.

*Thursday, 27 June 1974:*

10.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m.:

- Question Time;
- Oral Question without debate by Mr Memmel on relations with countries in the Mediterranean Basin;
- Oral Question with debate by Mr Brewis on the Conference on the Law of the Sea;
- Vote on the motion for a resolution in the report by Mr Gerlach on the draft estimates of Parliament for 1975;
- Report by Mr Schmidt on the setting up of an Audit Committee;
- Report by Mr Terrenoire on the carrying forward of appropriations from 1973 to 1974;
- Report by Mr Schwörer on the release of goods for free circulation;

- Report by Mr Herbert on the customs treatment applicable to certain goods.

*Friday, 28 June 1974:*

*9.30 a.m. to 12 noon:*

- Report by Mr Bousch on minimum stocks of fuels at thermal power stations;
- Report by Mr Brugger on honey;
- Report by Mr De Koning on soya beans;
- Report by Mr Martens on nursery products;
- Report by Mr Baas on Community tariff quotas for bulls, cows and heifers;
- Oral Question without debate by Mr Martens to the Commission on greenhouse cultivation;
- Report by Mr Gibbons on the Standing Veterinary Committee.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — First, I wish to object strongly to agricultural matters yet again being put on the agenda of the final day. It has happened almost every time since I have been in Parliament. I know that these matters are important and of great interest to many people, yet we always seem to have these debates on the last day, and look at the House now—just look at the poor attendance! I urge most strongly, not that agriculture should figure in the middle of the agenda every time—far from it—but that it would be helpful if perhaps now and again during our part-sessions—and I am sure Commissioner Lardinois would be more than willing to attend on a day other than Friday—we had agricultural debates in the middle of the part-session.

The second point concerns the tabling of amendments. As I understand it, the tabling of amendments should take place by 6.30 p.m. on Wednesday 26 June, the first day of the next meeting. This will leave the political groups not more than a couple of hours to consider all the reports and whatever amendments they may wish to table. This is a problem.

I hope it will be possible to discuss this point with the leaders of the groups in the enlarged Bureau in order to find an easier solution, because the present procedure will not give much time.

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — Mr President, my friend Mr Scott-Hopkins has raised points concerning the agenda, points which I think were shared by the Bureau yesterday morning. I take strongly his point that agricultural business always seems to take place on the Friday, which is hard not only on this House but on the Commissioner, too.

I want to make only two points. First, you will recall the wish of the Committee on Budgets that the Budget should go through without debate as a formal operation the next time we meet. It is important that the House should know about this, because it will obviously affect the tabling of amendments and the way in which you will look at the final arrangement of the Budget debate next time.

The second point that I want to make, with great respect and indeed thankfulness to Mr Lardinois, is that I hope that at the next part-session in June, and indeed at the part-session in July, we shall see a few more Commissioners present. The attendance by Commissioners has been very poor this week. We value their presence here, and I hope that they value the opportunity that they have of coming here to explain things to us.

**President.** — The arrangement of the Budget debate is a matter for the rules. These have to be proposed and the vote can take place shortly afterwards.

I agree with Mr Scott-Hopkins' comment, but, to be fair, the situation arose partly from Commissioner Lardinois' time-schedule. Is it not the case, Commissioner Lardinois, that you were not free this week before the Friday, so that all the agricultural items had to be debated this morning? I gather that Commissioner Lardinois indicates that this was not so and that he would have been available on other days. I had understood that not to be the case.

Perhaps we could arrive at this solution: in view of the fact that we need to fix the agenda as early as possible, we must leave the arrangements for the next part-session as they stand, but I will ensure that we do something to meet Mr Scott-Hopkins' point in the future. Is that all right? I gather that Mr Scott-Hopkins agrees. Thank you very much, everyone. There is a consensus.

Are there any other objections to the draft agenda?

That is agreed.

11. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

12 *Adjournment of session*

**President.** — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 11.15 a.m.)*