

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 2-326

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1985-1986 Session
 Report of Proceedings
 from 6 to 10 May 1985
 Europe House, Strasbourg

General contents

Sitting of Monday, 6 May 1985	1
Resumption, p. 1 — Minutes, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 9 — ERDF, p. 9	
Sitting of Tuesday, 7 May 1985	26
Minutes, p. 27 — Decision on urgency, p. 27 — Iron ore, p. 28 — Budget 1985, p. 33 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 61 — Question Time, p. 62 — Budget 1985 (continuation), p. 75 — Budgetary policy 1986, p. 79 — Votes, p. 85 — Annex, p. 90	
Sitting of Wednesday, 8 May 1985	93
Formal Sitting (Fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War) — Agenda, p. 97 — Enlargement, p. 97 — Bonn Summit (Statement by the Commission), p. 114 — Question Time (continuation), p. 121 — Mediterranean countries, p. 134 — Votes, p. 145 — Annex (Formal Sitting on the occasion of the visit of Mr Ronald Reagan), p. 149 — Annex 'Question Time', p. 156	
Sitting of Thursday, 9 May 1985	194
Budget 1985 — Votes, p. 197 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 206 — Budgetary policy 1986 (continuation), p. 235 — Votes, p. 237 — Mediterranean countries (continuation), p. 244 — World Conference in Nairobi, p. 246 — Social Fund, p. 252 — Environment, p. 259 — Animal feedingstuffs, p. 263	
Sitting of Friday, 10 May 1985	268
Minutes, p. 268 — Votes, p. 270 — Fishery, p. 276 — Provisional twelfths, p. 277 — Animal feedingstuffs (continuation), p. 278 — Whaling, p. 281 — Toxicology, p. 287 — Adjournment, p. 291	

NOTE TO READER

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

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

SITTING OF MONDAY, 6 MAY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Resumption of the session:</i> <i>Mr Balfe</i>	1	<i>Douro; Mr Provan; Mr Arndt; Mr Balfe; Mr Jakobsen</i>	2
2. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Tomlinson; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Huckfield; Mr Tomlinson</i>	1	4. <i>ERDF — Report by Mr Newman (Doc. A 2-5/85):</i> <i>Mr Newman; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Chanterie; Mr Schreiber; Mr Chanterie; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Valenzi; Mr Barrett; Mrs Piermont; Mr Ulburghs; Mr D. Martin; Mr O'Donnell; Mr Hutton; Mr Ephremidis; Mrs Lemass; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mrs Gadioux; Mr Varfis (Commission); Mr Pearce; Mr P. Beazley; Mr C. Beazley; Mr McCartin; Mr Sherlock; Mr Eyraud; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mr Balfe; Mr Huckfield; Mr Filinis; Mr Hutton</i>	9
3. <i>Order of business:</i> <i>Mr Chambeiron; Mr Arndt; Mr Klepsch; Mr Brok; Mr Arndt; Mr Saby; Mrs Castle; Mr Pitt; Mr Galland; Mr Balfe; Mr Falconer; Mr Balfe; Mr Arndt; Mr Møller; Mr Alavanos; Mr Staes; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Collins; Mr Galland; Mr Huckfield; Mr Falconer; Lord</i>			

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

(The sitting opened at 5 p.m.)

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declared resumed the session of the European Parliament which had been adjourned on 19 April 1985.

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, may I begin this historic week by raising a point of order under the Rule of Proceedings relating to points of order and recalling that I raised one last time and now refer to it under Rule 25 — the accountability of the Bureau. In response to my point of order the occupant of the Chair, Mr Griffiths, undertook to raise with the Bureau the matter of the conditions under which firearms would be used in this Chamber during President Reagan's

visit, the number of firearms that would be allowed in the Chamber and the positioning of guards. You can understand that with the ability of the Americans to shoot straight, many Members are extremely worried that they should be allowed to have a gun at all.

President. — I can assure you, Mr Balfe, that no one will be allowed armed into the Chamber.

(Applause from the Left)

2. *Approval of the Minutes*

President. — The Minutes of Proceedings of the sitting of 19 April have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, you will recall that I am getting rather tedious in raising a particular question about the votes. Mr Nord, when he was assuming the Chair on the Friday of the last part-

Tomlinson

session, did give me an assurance that you had written to Members concerning what appeared to be irregularities in the vote on agricultural price-fixing. He said that as soon as replies had been received information would be given. Have any replies been received from the Members to whom you wrote?

President. — As stated by Mr Nord, who was in the Chair at the time, letters have been sent to four Members about this incident. So far we have had only one reply and we are waiting for the other three.

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — *(DA)* On a point of order, Mr President. It says in Rule 47 that any Member may table a motion for a resolution on a matter falling within the sphere of activities of the Communities. This must mean that one cannot table motions for resolutions falling *outside* the Community's sphere of activities. Such an illegal motion has been printed, translated and distributed, and I wish to lodge an objection to that. It concerns motion No PE 96.910 from the Christian-Democrats and the Conservatives. The motion calls on the Community to say yes to the American 'star wars' programme — the SDI — and it is given the absolutely absurd justification that star wars are to protect mankind against nuclear war. But the fact of the matter is that military policy — including star wars — is light years away from the Community's sphere of activities. This document has therefore been distributed illegally and should be withdrawn.

It would also interest me to know whether the Danish members of the Conservative Group and the Christian-Democratic Group support this document. Denmark in its own parliament has decided that the country is against the deployment of weapons in outer space and against research on such weapons.

President. — Mrs Hammerich, I can tell you that the motion to which you refer has been submitted to the Political Affairs Committee, which will have to consider first of all the question of its admissibility, provided this question is raised in the committee by one of its members. It may be that this question will then be submitted to the House in plenary sitting, under circumstances which cannot be foreseen for the moment, on the basis of a report by the Political Affairs Committee.

Mr Huckfield (S). — Mr President, I don't wish to trespass on your generosity, but when you gave your response to Mr Balfe you very specifically said that security agents bearing arms would not be allowed within the Chamber. Now as you know, that is only one small part of the building. I am sure you do not need me to remind you that when the President of Israel was here there were people on the roofs of the buildings, there were people all the way round these

buildings who absolutely bristled with some kind of arms and some kind of ammunition.

Can we please have your assurance that no kind of agent representing any kind of power will be allowed into any part of these buildings who in any way bears arms, and if you can give that assurance, can you tell us how you intend to ensure that?

(Laughter)

President. — No, Mr Huckfield, I cannot give you such an assurance.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

You speak of the precincts of these buildings. No one can deny that when statesmen come to visit us security problems may arise. Unfortunately, in view of the terrorist attacks that have recently been growing more and more frequent — one, of which all of us here are still mindful, took place in your own country, while another directed against the premises of one of the institutions of our Community, recently occurred in Brussels — one would have to be very irresponsibly-minded to deny the need for security measures to prevent the recurrence of such attacks.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, I am grateful for the information that you gave us in your reply, but the fact that three of the Members concerned have not seen fit to respond to your office is obviously a matter for some continuing concern. Will you put a deadline on the time by which you expect a reply, and if you don't receive a reply, then advise this House accordingly?

President. — I shall send a reminder to the colleagues in question.

(Parliament approved the Minutes)¹

3. Order of business

President. — At its meeting of 16 and 25 April 1985, the enlarged Bureau drew up a draft agenda, which has been distributed. At this morning's meeting, the

¹ For items relating to membership of Parliament, a request to waive the Parliamentary immunity of a Member, membership of delegations, petitions, authorization of reports, reference to committee, changes in reference to committee, written declarations under Rule 49, carry-overs of appropriations, documents received and texts of treaties forwarded by the Council, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

President

chairmen of the political groups authorized me to propose to the House a number of modifications.

With regard to Monday, I have received from Mr Chambeiron and nine others a request that a minute's silence be held at the beginning of the part-session in memory of all the victims of Nazism.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* As you know, Mr President, France and many other countries have organized events to commemorate the liberation of the camps. These commemorative ceremonies were held on 24 April. We were not sitting then, otherwise I would have made this suggestion at the time. I consider that it would be desirable for the European Parliament to observe a minute's silence as a way of associating itself with the events organized in remembrance of those who were deported and all the victims of Nazism.

(Applause)

President. — I understand your intention perfectly. I would merely point out that on Wednesday, the day after tomorrow, 8 May, we shall be holding in the morning — you note that I say, in the morning — a formal sitting to commemorate the anniversary of 8 May 1945, and during this commemoration, it is my intention to ask the House to observe a minute's silence in memory of all the victims of the war, and in particular the victims of genocide.

Consequently, I think it is this formal sitting of Wednesday morning that should provide the proper occasion for paying homage to the victims of Nazism.

(Applause)

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Forgive me, I have no wish to reopen this debate but, as I was just saying, the commemorative ceremonies held recently in France and elsewhere were concerned with deportation. But there are also going to be special events on 8 May, as you know. I feel that since the European Parliament was not sitting on the anniversary date of the liberation of the camps, it would have been appropriate if we could have shown that we wished to be associated with remembrance of the sacrifice and martyrdom of those who were deported, by simply observing one minute's silence.

To my mind, these would be two quite distinct gestures.

President. — That being so, although the matter is far from being a petty one, I have to proceed according to our Rules of Procedure. A draft agenda drawn up by the Bureau was discussed this morning by the meeting of political group chairmen, who proposed no changes

for Monday's agenda. Nevertheless, the House can always make a decision on the question of changes. I therefore put Mr Chambeiron's request to the vote.

(Parliament approved the request, and the House, rising to its feet, observed a minute's silence)

With regard to Tuesday, the oral question, with debate, by Mr F. Pisoni and others to the Commission (Doc. B 2-282/85) will be included in the budget debate.

The vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Schmid (Doc. 2-1777/84), which was postponed pursuant to Rule 36(2), will have to be added to those already envisaged for voting-time.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* The motion before you, tabled by Mrs Barbara Castle, has in the meantime been endorsed by the Socialist Group. We therefore ask for a suspension of the sitting on the morning of 7 May so that we can take part in the Socialist Group's demonstration at the Struthof concentration camp. I must confess that as the leader of the group I did say to you earlier that no such suspension would be necessary, but the Socialist Group considers this demonstration so important that we should not be holding a debate in Parliament on budgetary matters whilst part of the House is at Struthof.

President. — I have to point out that if the request you have put today were to be followed, the time available for the budget debate would be considerably reduced.

I must also remind you — and this was pointed out at the meeting of group chairmen — that in any case no votes will be taken and no decisions adopted or proposed during the time set apart by your own and other groups — that is to say, from 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m. — to visiting the concentration camp at Struthof.

(Parliament rejected Mr Arndt's request)

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I must add a comment of my own, because you did not check beforehand who was in favour and who was against. I am disappointed that this vote has taken place and that as a result a totally erroneous picture has been created of the various Members' views on the demonstration. Our schedule of work has been planned during a number of negotiations by the enlarged Bureau and the group chairmen and we cannot suddenly, at the eleventh hour, overturn Parliament's entire schedule for this week. This matter has consequences for the future, and it is thus a true precedent. I very much deplore that it has arisen.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* May I make an observation on my own account? It is somewhat difficult for me as a German of the younger generation at a time like this to take part in a vote on agenda questions of this kind. If we wished to honour together the victims of fascism, it would in my view have been more appropriate to clarify these matters by inter-group agreement than to make them an agenda item and thus put me in the position of having to vote against honouring the victims of fascism and keeping to the agenda. I would thus ask the Socialist Group to try for such agreement in future so that you, Mr President, or other members of the House do not find themselves in a similar situation again.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — Mr Brok, I understand your sentiments perfectly, but the President is only empowered to conduct debates and to put matters to the vote in pursuance of the Rules of Procedure.

We are concerned here with the order of business for the present part-session. This was drawn up by the enlarged Bureau and, I would point out, adopted unanimously. There was no difference of views within the enlarged Bureau.

This morning there was the customary meeting of the chairmen of political groups, which discussed the question of changes to the agenda, and at this meeting, where each group was represented by its chairman, no modifications were proposed . . .

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* We did table an amendment.

President. — But you were not there, Mr Arndt.

However that may be, the matter was discussed in the enlarged Bureau, which adopted the draft agenda which has been submitted to you.

Since they are allowed by the Rules of Procedure, proposals to change the agenda cannot be avoided, and this is what has happened. We have had changes proposed by Mr Chambeiron and the chairman of the Socialist Group, and they have had to be decided by means of a vote.

Personally, I too, I must admit, am embarrassed to find that a matter on which I am sure virtually everyone in this House takes the same view has to be settled by a vote. All the same, on the way our work is to be organized and the efficiency of this work there may well be differences of view, and these differences have had the opportunity of being expressed.

Mr Saby (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, on a point of order. Members' pigeon-holes have been used for the

distribution of a text which constitutes a clear case of manipulation of documents and falsification of information.

I would like to see the Rules applied, with action taken to prevent this sort of document being put in our pigeon-holes. It is a rag in which information and documents have been manipulated to give credence to the idea that Mr Jospin is implicated in a case involving terrorism.

I take the strongest exception to this state of affairs and would ask you, Mr President, to ensure that our Rules are enforced and that unauthorized people do not gain access to our pigeon-holes to put whatever they please into them.

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, in view of the fact that so many people have expressed their regret that they have had to vote against our motion, are they perhaps having second thoughts? It would be quite wrong to blame us for asking for a vote on something on which our group feels very strongly indeed. As you have pointed out, it is quite normal for people to move changes to the agenda and for votes to be taken, and I object to the insinuation that somehow there was something wrong in our pressing for a vote. It has merely made a lot of people feel how legitimate and reasonable our request was. All we are saying is: Here we are having this great demonstration with representatives from all over the European countries to honour the resistance fighters and the victims of Nazism and to pledge ourselves to safeguard freedom and human liberty in the future. Surely it is not asking much, in this week of all weeks, that this Parliament should adjourn for a short time to enable everybody to attend. Will you therefore put it to the vote again, because I think some people will have had second thoughts and would wish to be associated with this great demonstration against Nazism and this pledge for the future?

President. — Mr Saby, the question of distributing all kinds of documents and depositing them in Members' pigeon-holes has already been discussed several times by the Bureau.

You ask for this to be subjected to some surveillance. You yourself have found that the number of slips, folders, documents of all kinds, deposited in these pigeon-holes is considerable. We cannot set up a system for filtering them and selecting those that are admissible. It is quite impossible. If this document really provokes the disapproval you say it does, I am sure that our colleagues will share your sentiments and in any case your remarks will be recorded in the Report of Proceedings of this meeting.

With regard to Mrs Castle, I would reply to her that I have by no means reproached the Socialist Group for making its proposal. I simply pointed out, in reply to

President

Mr Brok, that the order of business of this part-session had been drawn up in a manner that was entirely correct.

It may well be that a matter is presented in such a way that it has to be put to the vote where a vote was, perhaps, not entirely suitable, but I cannot now go back upon a vote that has been conducted absolutely correctly.

Mr Pitt (S). — Mr President, I have been trying for 15 minutes to raise two points of order on Tuesday morning's business as expressed in the agenda. When I indicated that I did not wish to be called after Mr Chambeiron, that was because I did not wish to contribute to the very valid points he was making about Monday's business, not Wednesday's, which you have now moved on to.

If you will allow me to make my two points though, it may help you to reconsider what Mrs Castle has said. The two points of order are as follows.

You were quite right a moment ago when you said that the President has the right to speak from time to time. You are absolutely right there. However, there are moments when I wonder on what authority the President does speak. My first point of order relates to your decision on 29 April, in the course of budgetary conciliation, unilaterally to propose that a research heading be added to the draft budget for 1985. I would submit, Mr President, that you had no authority from the Committee on Budgets to do so and you had no authority from Parliament to do so, since that research heading, which I understand you personally proposed, was not in Parliament's resolution.

My second point of order has to do with Tuesday morning's general budget debate. In my view it would be quite easy to curtail that, if not abolish it altogether, in order to comply with the Socialist Group's resolution. Frankly, I am appalled that the Parliament is being rushed into a debate and a vote on a new budget which presents us with two major problems. The first is that even after the four days the ministers of agriculture have spent together, we still do not know the outcome on farm prices, so what we are debating tomorrow is arithmetic nonsense. My second reason is that again no one in this Parliament has expressed any view that we need urgently to take the budget this month. So in my view it is political cosmetics.

If you will answer those two points of order, Mr President, I think you may find that we easily have time tomorrow to accede to Mr Arndt's request.

President: — With regard to the first point, of the subject of which the House, as such, may be unaware, it is true that I attended a conciliation meeting with the Council of Ministers on the question of the Com-

munity's own resources. It was a conciliation meeting, and the very term 'conciliation' implies the possibility of an exchange of views between the two parties — that is, the Council and the delegation from Parliament. Parliament's delegation is not there simply to convey to the Council of Ministers what is contained in resolutions adopted by this House: if that were so, the conciliation would have no purpose.

Since you contest my right to raise the problem of a common research policy, I must say that we asked for the proceedings to be suspended and that during this suspension of proceedings the Parliamentary delegation held a meeting attended by a number of members of the Committee on Budgets. Moreover, the chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control and all the political groups were represented. The Parliamentary delegation made the unanimous proposal that certain steps be envisaged with regard to research. I therefore consider that what you reproach me with is quite ungrounded.

With regard to the other point, you say that the budgetary debate is pointless. If that is your view, you could have proposed, one hour before the beginning of the part-session, that the budgetary debate be deleted from the order of business. I should have been surprised if such a proposition had been supported by a majority.

Mr Galland (L). — (FR) Mr President, I had no intention at all of taking part in this debate, which I find extremely unpleasant, but a serious matter has come up which I feel cannot be allowed to pass. At the end of her speech Mrs Castle asked for a second vote to be taken so that the outcome might be changed and a majority obtained — to quote what I heard in the interpretation — against Nazism and for our future.

Mr President, I voted to reject this request for the reasons which you outlined but, in common with other honourable Members who voted the same way, I am not prepared to allow my vote to be interpreted as not being a vote against Nazism.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — As regards Wednesday, . . .

Mr Balfe (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, in accordance with Rule 56(1). One hour and one minute before the part-session opened, I presented to your office a request signed by 21 people to delete the first item of business on Wednesday afternoon from the agenda. I would point out that the standing orders of this Parliament make no distinction between formal business and agenda business. It speaks merely of a draft agenda, which is the title of this document, which informs us that the first business on Wednesday afternoon is an address by Mr Ronald Reagan. Many

Balfe

of us feel that Mr Reagan is not a welcome visitor at this point of time and wish to place on record an expression of opinion to this effect. This seemed to me to be most effectively done by moving that the item be deleted from the agenda in protest at his recent policies, especially in relation to Star Wars and Nicaragua.

I would therefore ask you, Mr President — since the Rules do not distinguish between the two types of business — to place before the House, on a vote, that the first item of business on Wednesday afternoon be deleted.

President. — It is not true that no distinction can be made between these two types of business.

On 8 May, two formal sittings are to be held apart from the ordinary sitting. The first, in the morning, will be devoted to a formal commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War. The second, in the afternoon, will be devoted to the speech by Mr Ronald Reagan, President of the United States.

We have always made it perfectly clear that speeches made here by Heads of State do not form part of the sittings of this Parliament as governed by our Rules of Procedure. These are formal sittings: the guest delivers a speech, and this is never followed by a debate.

This will be our procedure for Wednesday afternoon's formal sitting. I therefore cannot regard a proposal to delete this formal sitting as an admissible request for a change in our order of business.

This sitting does not figure in our order of business in the strict sense of the expression.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Falconer (S). — Mr President, Mr Balfe has made a point of order which I wish to pursue. At the end of the day it is surely the Members of this Assembly who will design, draft and implement the agenda. Mr Balfe is saying, quite simply, that the matter should be put to the House for that decision to be made. With the greatest respect to yourself, Mr President, if you have decided to place this on the agenda, then it gives rise to a point of order in respect of a vote of confidence in yourself as president.

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, I always address myself to the rule book when I raise points of order. I respectfully submit that the rule book makes no distinction between formal sittings of the House and normal sittings of the House. Indeed, the precedent is, as most recently established during the visit of President Herzog, that the proceedings of a formal sitting are recorded in the 'Rainbow' and in the Minutes, which are placed before this House for approval, and are, in

all ways, a part of the debates of this House and they appear in the formal record of this House. We may not like this, but I would submit that the Rules are fully in line with the resolution that was tabled, and I would ask you to put it to the vote. I can only conclude if it is not put to the vote that you realize that President Reagan will be rejected by this House because we all recognize what he is.

President. — Mr Balfe, I regret that I do not share your interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

These rules, you say, make no distinction between formal and other sittings. But this is for the very good reason that our Rules of Procedure make no allowance for formal sittings! Formal sittings do not form part of our proceedings. Wednesday's agenda, as you have it in front of you, envisages that the Parliamentary sitting shall take place from 10 a.m. to 12.15 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 8.30 p.m.

That is the agenda for Wednesday's sitting.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, we have already discussed this matter in the House and, as you know, I told you that the overwhelming majority of the Socialist Group was in favour of these two formal sittings given the necessary conditions.

The position of the majority of the Socialist Group is thus clear. I should nevertheless be grateful if you would actually enable the House to vote on the matter. This would be the simplest solution. I am sure there will be a clear majority, since all the groups in the enlarged Bureau were in favour of holding the formal sittings given the necessary conditions.

Mr Møller (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, it seems to me that the debate we have been witnessing these last twenty-five minutes is embarrassing for us all, both because we have to sit here and listen to it and because we have to vote on it. I hear those who are somewhat annoyed with us for voting out Mr Arndt's motion, but the majority has spoken, and I think that Mr Arndt is a good enough democrat to take the consequences. If he does not wish to do so, he can leave the budget debate — as Mr Pitt says — and go to Struthof. I would point out that I myself thought it a fitting way to remember those years when we were young and war raged in Europe. I would therefore have no objection, Mr President, if you decided that we extend the lunch break tomorrow by half-an-hour — Mrs Castle said that a visit to Struthof would take two hours — so that those who want to go to Struthof can do so in the lunch break.

President. — Mr Møller, that question has been settled. We are now concerned with another problem, the

President

proposal made by the Honourable Mr Balfe, who has already twice taken the floor. . .

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, in spite of all the respect I have for you I do not think there is anything in Rule 56(1) to prevent the alteration of the agenda and that the best solution would be for us to follow the procedure proposed by the chairman of the Socialist Group. Of course, as the previous speaker has said, we are not unaware that Parliament has taken a position with regard to the visit of President Reagan. But notwithstanding this we must not make light of a new factor, namely that the formal sitting to welcome President Reagan comes just two days after his visit to the Bitburg cemetery. This visit has stunned public opinion in our countries, especially in Greece, where the Nazi and fascist occupation took 520,000 lives.

This really is a new factor, and I think that Mr Balfe's motion asks nothing more of the European Parliament than that it rise to the level of the American House of Representatives, which with 257 votes came down against Reagan's visit to the Bitburg cemetery, while 82 members of the Senate tabled a motion demanding that the visit be cancelled. I think therefore that, on the occasion of the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the defeat of fascism, and with a mind to the enormous sensitivity that exists about this business, the European Parliament should vote on the matter.

(Protests from the centre and the right)

Mr Staes (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, the proceedings of this Parliament depend on the correct interpretation of the Rules of Procedure. You have given your interpretation. What is clear from the debate to which this has given rise is that the situation is not at all clear. I therefore call for a vote on the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, we have heard many interventions representing extremely small and minority views on this subject. You have given your ruling.

Mr Arndt has made it quite clear what his position is in regard to the leadership of the Socialist Group. I think it is disgraceful that we should be wasting so much time when we have far more important business to deal with, and I formally move that we proceed to the next piece of business immediately.

Mr Collins (S). — Mr President, I was intrigued by your apparent ruling on the point raised by Mr Balfe. You appeared to suggest to Mr Balfe and to the Assembly that there is a distinction between normal sittings of the Parliament and the kind that is being held to welcome (if that is the word!) Mr Reagan to this building. If that is so and Mr Reagan is not actu-

ally addressing a sitting of the Parliament, can you make quite clear what instructions you have issued to the cash office in respect of those Members who only sign in for Mr Reagan's address? Do they collect their expenses?

(Laughter)

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to say that you are absolutely right as regards strict interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

The problem with which we have to deal here is, in my view, of a somewhat different nature. It seems to me that it would not be inappropriate for us to take a roll-call vote on this matter, as Mr Arndt has requested, and I trust, Mr President, that those who are seeking interpretation of the Rules of Procedure on this point appreciate that the interpretation of the Rules will apply to them on Wednesday, when we shall be receiving a visit from President Reagan.

Mr Huckfield (S). — Mr President, surely the main point that we ought to be addressing ourselves to is whether the part of the session when President Reagan speaks is deemed to be a formal sitting of this Assembly or is deemed to be a normal part of the session. We, above all, ought to be in control of our own business. I really cannot understand why, whether it is deemed to be part of the normal session or is something slightly more elevated than that, we are now being told that in some way we cannot even vote on our own business. Now for the other point I want to put to you, Sir, and I should like to have your interpretation on this. On 14 February this year, this Parliament voted formally that we would decide to celebrate formally at its May 1985 part-session the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War in order to highlight in a fitting manner the importance of the victory over Nazism, without which peace could not have been restored and there could have been no true reconciliation between the peoples of Europe. When we took that decision in February, surely it was then up to you to see that that decision was carried out. When you have a resolution from the Socialist Group that suggests a way of carrying out that resolution, surely it is your duty to see that we stick to it.

Mr Falconer (S). — Mr President, I do not want to interrupt the flow of this debate.

(Protests from the European Democratic benches)

I am sorry if some Members over there are a wee bit hot under the collar. However, Mr President, if you rule that no vote will be taken, then I wish to give notice that a point of order will be raised at that stage. Do you understand? If you rule from the Chair that no vote will be taken, I wish to give notice that I want to raise a point of order at that stage.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, at this point I think the situation needs to be clarified. It is as follows.

Our order of business does not include the formal sitting at which the President of the United States is to speak any more than that of Wednesday morning with which we shall commemorate among ourselves, in our own way, the anniversary of 8 May 1945. That is perfectly clear.

In fact, from the legal point of view a formal sitting is not a sitting of the Parliament as such but a meeting of its Members at which, for example, no voting is admissible and no debate. It would be a grave breach of both the letter and the spirit of our Rules of Procedure to transform a formal sitting organized to welcome a Head of State into a normal sitting subject to the rules governing normal sittings and providing an opportunity for debate and for a vote.

If such an interpretation of the Rules of Procedure were adopted, I do not believe that we could in future continue to welcome Heads of State who come to visit us and whom we receive with courtesy and deference.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

That having been said, I shall now put to the House, for a vote, the interpretation I have just given, which is, once more, that the formal sitting of Wednesday afternoon does not form part of the session of Parliament and consequently cannot be the subject of a vote concerning the order of business.

(Parliament approved, by a roll-call vote, the President's interpretation)

Mr Falconer (S). — On a point of order, Mr President . . .

(Loud protests from the centre and the right)

Could we have the point of order, Mr President?

President. — No, Mr Falconer, you had your say before the vote. I am not giving you the floor again.

Mr Falconer (S). — Mr President . . .

President. — Mr Falconer, you do not have the floor. I call you to order, pursuant to Rule 68.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Still with reference to Wednesday's agenda, I have a request from Lord Douro and others to take separately the report by Mr Hänsch (Doc. A 2-20/85),

which figures in the joint debate embracing the reports by Mr Galluzzi and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti.

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, at the Stuttgart Summit it was agreed that before new Member States acceded to the Community, the Parliament would be formally consulted before the treaties of accession were signed. As a result of that Mr Hänsch, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, has proposed to Parliament a resolution. Because that resolution has a very special status — it is the first time since the Stuttgart Summit that this consultation has taken place — I would propose to yourself and to Parliament that this should be taken separately; in exactly the same order, but separately. I think it has a special status, parts of the resolution being specifically directed to the Council. I think it should therefore be given the status of a separate report. I hope it is sufficiently uncontroversial for the House to accept it.

(Parliament expressed its agreement with this request)

President. — With regard to Thursday, the oral question, with debate, by Mr Christopher Jackson and others (Doc. B 2-184/85), entered as Item 70 in the agenda, is deferred to a later part-session with the authors' agreement. This will be replaced by the oral question tabled by Mr Arndt on behalf of the Socialist Group to the Commission (Doc. B 2-287/85).

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, I do not want to delay the proceedings any further, but can I put down a marker for the future? I think that it is wrong for the Bureau to change the urgent debate time from Thursday morning to Thursday afternoon. I think we have enough changes of the agenda and it is difficult enough to plan our time for the week that we are in Strasbourg. I would request you and the Bureau to consider seriously having a set time for the urgent debates so that we can all plan our week and give ourselves the proper time for those urgent debates or whatever else we have to do at that time. I think we do need to have a more coherent agenda.

President. — You are perfectly right, Mr Provan, although experience shows that it is often very difficult to achieve such coherence. In any case, we shall bear your observations in mind.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, in our discussions with you we expressed the wish that Commission President Jacques Delors should make a statement on the economic summit under Rule 40 and that we should then have 30 minutes in which to put specific questions concerning it. Although we cannot decide on this for the moment, because Mr Delors has not yet given his agreement, we ought nevertheless to inform the House so that we can prepare ourselves in case the

Arndt

President of the Commission does make a statement on the outcome of the Bonn summit.

President. — Mr Arndt, your suggestion has been conveyed to Mr Delors, who, unfortunately, cannot be with us on Thursday. We are therefore keeping in touch with the President of the Commission to try and find out when he will be available to make the statement you wish to hear. We shall be discussing this tomorrow in the enlarged Bureau.

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, with regard to Thursday, Rule 89(2) states that at the beginning of each sitting the President should place before Parliament the minutes of proceedings, and Rule 89(3) provides that any objections shall be put to the vote. In view of our previous decision, can I have an assurance that the speech of President Reagan will not form part of those minutes, but that if it does you will accept a motion for deletion?

President. — Mr Balfe, the speech by President Reagan will not figure in the Minutes. Moreover, earlier speeches by Heads of State have never figured in the Minutes.

You see, we are trying to practise the coherence advocated to us just now by Mr Provan.

Mr Jakobsen (PPE). — (DA) Mr President, we have been very patient in coping with the crowd we have here today. If the President cannot say it, I think it is time the rest of us did: the conduct of some Members today is such that we would greatly appreciate it if they were not present when President Reagan is here. It would be a very good thing if we did not see them. We want to give the President a proper welcome, and we don't want to be disturbed by certain Members with disturbed ideas in their heads.

(The President read out the modifications introduced into Friday's agenda.¹ Parliament adopted the order of business thus modified)²

4. ERDF

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Newman, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning (Doc. A 2-5/85), on

the Eighth (1982) and Ninth (1983) Annual Reports (COM(83) 566 final and COM(84) 522

final) by the Commission on the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)¹

Mr Newman (S), rapporteur. — Mr President, I speak on the report drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning which examines the Eighth and Ninth Annual Reports of the European Commission on the European Regional Development Fund for the years 1982 and 1983 respectively. As the European Regional Development Fund has a new regulation which came into operation at the beginning of this year, 1985, there is a temptation to disregard the activities of the ERDF as long ago as 1982 and 1983 and to say: well, let us see what happens with a new regulation this year and next and in future years.

The new regulation, it is true, has some important differences from the old, but many of the problems and the realities of the operation of the ERDF and the environment in which the ERDF applied in 1982 and 1983 continue for this year and for the foreseeable future. Lessons have to be learnt from the past, particularly from the recent past, if any progress is to be made in the present and in the future.

As rapporteur, in preparing my report for the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning I did not see my task as producing a dry, statistical, academic, non-partisan *précis* of the Commission's report. I was not producing an original report but rather a report or commentary on somebody else's report. So it seemed important to me — and I had the support of the Socialist Group's members and some others on the committee for this approach — to draw some lessons from the operation of the ERDF in 1982 and 1983. I tried to look to the future and to relate the drawbacks and the possibilities to other European Community and European Parliament policies and aims — especially the ones which seem to me to be socially progressive. That approach led me into a path of controversy and failure to reach consensus. However, it seems no bad thing to me to fail to reach consensus if instead I achieve clarity, if I reject an approach that uses language that can mean many different things, if I point the way forward, if I am not prepared to be a simple tool of my political opponents and if I try to keep to the policies and the values which won me election by my constituents with a large majority.

The main themes of the report presented by me to the committee were, firstly, that there is *not* a narrowing of the gap in living standards between the richer and the poorer Community regions and that unemployment is especially high within the less prosperous

¹ See minutes.

² For items relating to time-limits for tabling amendments and speaking-time, see Minutes.

¹ The oral question, with debate, tabled to the Commission by Mr Valenzi and others, on the stage reached in implementing the Naples integrated operation and formal recognition thereof (Doc. 2-1454/84), was also included in this debate.

Newman

regions. There is an economic and social background of poverty and low pay linked to unemployment and underemployment.

Secondly, investment in the poorer regions is essential, yet ERDF aid represented only 5% of the Community budget expenditure. My report to the committee pointed out that this figure contrasted sharply with the over 60% of the EEC budget taken by the common agricultural policy.

My original report objected to this balance of expenditure and called for new priorities, with the redirection of funds away from financing the surpluses of large agricultural businesses and instead towards aid to the poorer regions. Yet, for reasons that I can only describe as tendentious, the majority of the Committee on Regional Policy, including the British Conservatives, rejected the contrasting of regional expenditure with the amount spent on the CAP, rejected the call for the redirection of available funds and instead called for additional EEC regional expenditure to be financed by considerable increases in funding the Community's own resources. So that is the position in the text before you today.

The third theme concerns the job-creation potential of the ERDF. The insufficient level of resources produces an insufficient level of job creation. The forecasts and statistics relating to job creation and maintenance have, to say the least, occasioned a great deal of doubt surrounding the accuracy of what are often presented as very precise employment statistics. The services, industrial and craft sectors of the quota section of the Fund are more likely to combat unemployment than the infrastructure sector, and yet only 12% of the Fund's quota section went to services, industry and crafts instead of the target of 30%. Similarly, the funds available to the non-quota section, which can help to fight job loss, were underutilized — particularly in 1983.

My original report contrasted the relatively low level of even the claimed ERDF job maintenance and creation figures with the many millions of unemployment in the EEC, and also called for close and on-the-spot analysis of the accuracy of the job forecast figures. However, the majority of the committee deemed it appropriate to reject these two points.

The fourth theme of the report was additionality, complementarity, and Community objectives. The notions of additionality and complementarity are not new to the European Parliament's consideration of the Regional Fund. ERDF aid in 1982 and 1983 all too often continued to fail to appear as genuinely additional to the expenditure that would have been carried out if EEC monies had not been forthcoming. Likewise, that ERDF aid often failed to complement other regional assistance in an integrated manner, partly because the recipients of the aid on the ground, in the regions, are not involved enough in the procedures

and decisions. In my original report to the committee I introduced the idea of linking ERDF aid to progressive European Community or European Parliament objectives — what we might call in EEC jargon 'conditionality'. Regional aid should not just be linked, as at present, to Community aims such as increased productivity, new technology and electronics, and assisting small and medium-sized enterprises. Regional aid should also be fundamentally linked to socially progressive Community aims such as a shorter working week, the improvement of working conditions, the promotion of equal opportunities and respect for trade-union rights. In the Committee on Regional Policy, by the narrowest possible margin, these Community objectives were deleted or watered down into a vague call for social, economic and cultural renewal — whatever that means!

The fifth major theme of the report concerns the various integrated programmes. They are of great importance in the field of regional aid and need to be carefully monitored and evaluated so as to ensure the effectiveness of their implementation and to adapt their successful aspects to more integrated programmes in the future. Today, of course, other colleagues will be dwelling on the various points about the Naples integrated operation.

The sixth theme concerns the controversial substantial grant from the European Regional Development Fund to British Telecommunications of 23 millions pounds sterling just two months prior to its privatization coming into effect, with massive speculative profits being made by the private shareholders. A resolution on this by Mr Martin had been referred to the Committee on Regional Policy, and it was resolved to consider this in my report on the ERDF. However, the committee rejected my text, which was very critical of this particular grant, although the committee did agree with the principle that when granting funds the Commission should discourage speculation as far as possible and ensure that the benefits of the projects financed serve the general interest. This rejection of speculation as a matter of principle was agreed with only the British Conservatives splendidly isolated in their opposition to it, although I see that a few people seem to have changed their minds in the meantime.

The seventh and final major theme of my original report concerned the recognition that the European Regional Development Fund is trying to deal with two different kinds of problems: those affecting underdeveloped regions and those affecting traditional industrial regions in decline. My report did not call for two separate funds but rather for a more flexible response to these differing problems. This theme became distorted into something different by the voting at the meeting of the Committee on Regional Policy.

In conclusion, my original report to the committee has succeeded in raising many important issues for discussion and political analysis in what might have seemed

Newman

at first glance a dry and uncontroversial field. Some vital points in my original report were rejected by the committee, but the opportunity is before you today, when examining the amendments, to reinstate these vital points.

I should like to draw your attention to the explanatory statement appended to the report, as this statement, of course, was not subject to alteration.

(Applause from the left)

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — Madam President, is it not the duty of a rapporteur to present the report of the committee? We seem to have heard a great deal about the original report, but that surely is not the purpose of the rapporteur?

Mr Chanteric (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, I should also like to protest against the bias with which the rapporteur has presented the report. What he presented was not the report approved by the committee but his own personal ideas. I believe we must protest against this.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you, Mr Chanteric, your point and remarks have been noted.

Mr Schreiber (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I should like to thank Mr Newman for his report and his hard work, and especially for the enthusiasm he has brought to his task as rapporteur in the last few months.

The Socialist Group, whose views on the two annual reports on the ERDF I am expressing, has moved a series of amendments to improve this report in certain important respects, and I am sorry to see that the majority of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning was not willing to incorporate these points which seem to us important, in the report. For this reason we again request today that a number of observations and demands be added to Mr Newman's report, and we ask for the House's support.

The aim of the Community's regional policy is to narrow the tremendous gap in prosperity between the individual Member States and their regions by means of specific aids to the less developed areas from the Regional Fund. It is apparent that in 1982 and 1983

the Fund was not financially equipped to perform this task properly. Payments from the Fund in 1982 totalled 973 million ECU, or 4.8% of all Community budget spending. In 1983, this proportion rose by only 0.4% to 5.2%, or 1 256 million ECU in absolute figures. Compare this with the CAP, which in 1982 swallowed up 60.6%, and in 1983 even 64.9% of the budget — a rise once again of 4.3%!

This comparison makes clear once again that the common agricultural policy ties up far too much of the Community's budgetary resources, which are not then available for the large expenditure requirements of the future, amongst which I count the Regional Policy. Enormous sums are squandered to finance agricultural surpluses, and these would be better invested in a carefully designed regional policy to narrow the gulf between rich and poor in the Community.

A further observation here: in the poorer regions the backbone of the economy is generally the many small farmers and agricultural producers, primarily rural family concerns. Thanks to an agricultural policy which unilaterally favours and encourages the big factory farms, their livelihood is increasingly threatened and as often as not they go under. The misguided agricultural policy of the Community thus has a direct negative effect on precisely those disadvantaged areas which the EC seeks to help through its regional policy — a vicious circle which must now be broken by a long overdue thorough reform of the agricultural policy.

In 1982 and 1983, unemployment in the Community also continued inexorably to rise. Nearly 12 million people were affected, above all in the disadvantaged regions. One of the principal aims of the Regional Fund is to create new jobs in the poorer regions and protect existing ones, and I have considerable doubts as to whether the regional policy is carrying out this important task adequately. We do not know if the figures given in the two annual reports tally with the new jobs created with money from the Fund.

We share the Commission's view that the data supplied by the Member States should be regarded with extreme scepticism. As often as not, applicants exaggerate their claims as regards the prospective effects of their projects on employment in order to qualify for funds. It is thus vital that there should be stricter monitoring of individual projects and closer checks to see whether the predicted numbers of new jobs are in fact created. But even if the figures stated are correct, 44 000 new jobs against a background of 12 million unemployed are just a drop in the ocean. The Regional Fund needs to be built up urgently, if regional policy is to avoid becoming totally powerless to affect employment.

It has become apparent that funds channelled into the services sector, industry and small businesses create considerably more jobs than money spent on tradi-

Schreiber

tional infrastructure measures. We therefore call for a greater rearrangement within the Fund in favour of projects which will create jobs.

The regional policy must not, however, concentrate only on the least developed areas of the Community if it is to fulfill its mission adequately. There is a second type of disadvantaged region in which a 'new poverty' is spreading. I refer to the old industrial areas which are experiencing harrowing structural crises. Unemployment there, which has for years been high, has risen even further. These areas need the Community's help. The Ruhr basin, for example — I live very close to it — faces enormous problems which the European Community ought to tackle with greater energy than it has shown so far.

In my view the granting of money from the Fund should more than hitherto be made conditional on the pursuit of other Community objectives. In one amendment, the Socialist Group goes back to decisions taken by Parliament during its last term and demands that a shorter working week, improved working conditions, equality of opportunities and the observance and strengthening of workers' and trade unions' rights be made part of the regional policy.

As regards the granting of funds to British Telecom, my honourable friend David Martin will present our views on this in some detail. I shall confine myself to a comment as to form: it would perhaps have been better for the committee to have prepared a special report on this question. This would have been more appropriate to the problem.

In conclusion let me take a look into the future. We must manage in the next few years to get more money for the Community's regional policy. We must check more closely that this money is really spent sensibly, and we must consider whether the criteria for the awarding of money from the Fund are still valid. If we go on as before the gulf between rich and poor in the Community will widen, unemployment will rise further, and we shall end up failing dismally in one of the Community's major tasks for the future.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, the EPP Group must unfortunately say that the purpose and aims of the Regional Fund and the regional policy, which we fully endorse, have not been achieved. My group regrets this. If we consider why these aims have not been achieved, we find that the most important reason has been the shortage of resources. As previous speakers have already said, the regional policy accounted for 4.8% of the budget in 1982 and for 5.2% in 1983, a very small amount when compared with what is needed and the goals that have been set. The second reason is that the appropriations available have not been used or have been used badly.

This is abundantly clear, for example, from the non-quota section of the Regional Fund, where substantial resources — not so substantial, of course, when compared with the budget as a whole — have not been used.

Madam President, Parliament has criticized this situation for many years and called for a thorough reform of the regional policy and of the Regulation governing the Regional Fund. The Council is entirely to blame for this being done so late in the day, with the result that the new Regulation did not enter into force until 1 January 1985. I believe that the Council must therefore take full responsibility for the unsatisfactory operation of the Regional Fund in the past and especially in the years we are now discussing on the basis of this report.

Madam President, we can only say — and we find this extremely regrettable — that Regional Fund operations did little or nothing in either 1982 or 1983 to narrow the wide gap between the living standards of the inhabitants of the wealthier and poorer regions of the European Community. This is a regrettable fact. We can go on complaining about the past, but I believe that we must also look to the future and hope that the application of the new Regulation will make it possible to narrow the gap that has existed for many years between the poorer and wealthier regions. We must also think of the Community of Twelve that will soon be a reality. We already know of various regions, particularly in Spain and Portugal, that will undoubtedly qualify for assistance from the Regional Fund. We must therefore make sure that the newcomers, neither of whom can be numbered among the wealthier Member States, do not cause a war of the poor, as this situation is sometimes described. We must make sure that the resources, which must, moreover, be substantially increased in the very near future, are distributed better and more fairly in every way.

As regards the budgetary situation, I would remind the House that in the past we have had to live with a budget that was almost completely exhausted. Now that there are good prospects of more of the European Community's own resources being released, my group hopes that a considerable proportion of these new resources will be used for the new approach to the regional policy and particularly for the integrated programmes under which the various Community objectives can be achieved and a coordinated approach can be adopted to social and economic recovery.

In this connection, I would also underline the need for the local and regional authorities to have a greater say in decisions on Community assistance. The participation of the regional authorities is of the utmost importance if we are to succeed in establishing and implementing integrated programmes in a proper manner.

Finally, I would refer to the problems arising when areas having to contend with the same difficulties are

Chanterie

not given the same access to Regional Fund assistance. This is especially true of my own country, but the problem also exists in the rest of the European Community. Such arbitrary geographical distribution results in serious discrimination.

There are thus many doubts about the old Fund. Let us hope that the new Fund leads to an improved policy, with Portugal and Spain involved as equals.

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — Madam President, we are reminded this week of the extreme youth of the European Community and of the events, only 40 years ago, which originated the Community, itself now only 30 years old. European regional policy is scarcely a decade old, as we are reminded by this review of the Eighth and Ninth Annual Reports. It is therefore not surprising that many of the original ideas of regional policy are hard to fulfil in such a short space of time, but surely it is quite the wrong attitude to belittle the achievements which have been made to date and to wish to denigrate the entire policy itself. I, like my colleague Mr Chanterie, would like to dwell on the more positive sides of this particular report.

Before I do so, I must refer to the previous speech by Mr Newman, because he does make it quite clear that he does not regard this report as being for the purpose of reviewing how regional policy has affected the regions. He sees this in strictly political terms, and he also sees it in strictly national political terms. Madam President, I wish to place on record here that I am speaking not simply as a British Conservative but as a European Democrat and as one who represents a region of Europe. Therefore I will not seek to score points with Mr Newman about national political issues, where he attacks my own national government. Of course he may expect me to respond in like manner, but I think it would be a great shame if this debate were to be brought down to that level, as no doubt Mr Newman would like. As he found in the committee, a huge majority of the committee — and I confidently predict the majority of this House — will reject such a negative and nationalistic approach to the European regional policy. It is an extremely important and positive side of the European Community's programme.

As Mr Chanterie has said, unfortunately insufficient funds are allocated. However, I would like to draw attention to that part of the report which particularly attacks my support, namely, the issue of additionality and of publicity. It is quite wrong that Member State governments should use European Community funds merely to replace funds which they might otherwise have spent themselves in the regions. Equally, it is quite wrong for the public of Europe to be totally unaware of the work — small though it is — which is undertaken in their name and on their behalf.

I am very pleased to be able to place on record that in the city of Plymouth, which I am proud to represent,

£ 9.6 m were allocated to the A38 road linking Britain to the County of Cornwall, which I also represent, and I am delighted that the City Council, which is not obliged to do so, has put up an enormous notice saying that this project was partly funded by the European development programme. A vast number of people have said: we knew vaguely that this regional policy exists, but we had no idea that it actually affected us and we are delighted. I hope that the section of the report that deals with the question of publicity will make an impact and that attention will be drawn throughout Europe to the success of the regional programme. It is extremely important.

The tendentious parts of the report — I was not the rapporteur, Madam President, but I feel a little tempted to represent what the majority of the committee said, seeing as we have heard little about that so far — were two in particular. One was to contrast the percentage of spending on regional funds with the percentage of European funds which go to the CAP. As a majority of members of that committee pointed out, the regions which we represent also benefit very much from the CAP. To try and run down the CAP and say that these regions should be deprived of farm support would not, in fact, serve the interests of those regions of Europe. Therefore we responded to that tendency extremely firmly and we amended that part of the report.

Secondly, even more flagrantly in breach of the European ideal was the inclusion of the part about the privatization of British Telecom. This has nothing whatsoever to do with the European Community and the European regional programme. This is, I am afraid to say, only a small section of one of the political groups — a national section — which attempts time and time again to attack its own national government. The vast majority of this House, European Members, reject that sort of approach as negative, as base, as thoroughly demeaning. This week we shall be remembering extremely important European events; we shall not be banging our small nationalistic drums. As far as the regional policy is concerned, therefore, this part of the report was equally deleted and I confidently predict that it will not be restored when the House reassembles to vote on this report.

I would conclude, Madam President, by formally moving my amendments and also recommending to the House those amendments tabled by my colleague, Mrs Boot, on behalf of the European People's Party and the amendments tabled by my colleagues, Mr Romeo and Mr Ducarme. It was indeed a significant achievement that the centre-right majority in this House, in committee, were able to make something sensible, something practical of this report which would recommend itself to the peoples of Europe and would not give the opportunity to a small section of the British political scene to reap the cheap publicity which they seek in order to attack their own government.

C. Beazley

We hope therefore that this report will mark a significant stage in placing before the peoples of Europe the importance of regional policy. Indeed, we hope that the Regional Fund will be increased. It is extremely important part of the European Community's action.

(Protest from the Socialist benches)

I am glad that I have the attention of the British Socialist Members. I do not wish to draw the attention of this House to their behaviour because that has been done amply by themselves.

In conclusion, Madam President, I do speak on behalf of all those Europeans who represent the regions, the peripheral areas far removed from the national administrations and the centres of population. We must speak for areas such as Cornwall and Plymouth, Brittany, the South of Italy and Portugal, which is to join the Community. Let us avoid the trap of falling into a nationalistic debate which only bores the European public!

Mr Valenzi (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, when the earthquake of 3 November 1980 tragically shook the city of Naples and the Campania and Lucania regions of our country, there was much emotion in Europe and throughout the world. I can personally bear witness to the very deep impression that the tragedy made on the feelings of this Chamber: so much so, in fact, that on 7 May 1981, there was a solemn debate in this Parliament following upon another than had taken place less than a month after the earthquake.

Together with a political delegation from Naples — of which city I was, at that time, Mayor — I listened to that debate from the gallery, and I remember that the President, Madam Simone Veil, was extremely moved as she wound up the debate, and the resolution on the subject was adopted unanimously.

There were other meetings on this subject: the one at Strasbourg on 14 June 1982, for example, with President Dankert, and with the chairmen of the various political groups; the one at Brussels with the Economic and Social Committee; or the one at Naples on 18 February 1983, with the delegation from the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. But already, before the earthquake occurred — since March 1979, in fact, when Mr Giolitti was a Commissioner — a decisive, positive relationship was being built up between Naples and Brussels. And so it was that the idea of the 'integrated Naples operation' was born — an operation that affected not only the city of Naples itself, but also a further 96 municipalities in Campania province.

Why, then, Naples? Not only because Naples is a great city that has rightfully earned its own place in European history, but first of all, and above all,

because in this area of southern Europe the social and economic situation is one of the most difficult in existence anywhere, the housing shortage and unemployment are very serious indeed, and the gap between these areas and the richer areas of the Community is very wide.

The second reason — and this is an idea that was born and developed in the Economic and Monetary Committee itself — is that it is essential to concentrate the available financial resources in certain areas, certain cities — such as, for example, Naples or Belfast — instead of spreading them around widely but thinly on the ground. What was necessary — so it was then said — was a properly thought-out operation, one that was planned and programmed.

After the 1980 earthquake, and the pressure brought to bear by this Parliament on the Commission and the politicians responsible for decision-taking in this field, it seemed that things were well on their way towards a rapid, fruitful solution. Instead, today, the bitter fact is that, some five years after the earthquake occurred, the operation is marking time.

Recalling President Mitterrand's remark on the danger that the undertaking would be reduced to an abandoned construction site, I would say that the 'integrated Naples operation' is in danger of being a veritable non-existent building-site. The great publicity boost given in Italy to the 'integrated Naples operation', especially on the eve of the elections, talked of possible financial aid up to 11 m. million lire. The recent accounts tell us that, including the latest payments, the regional development fund responsible, the Cassa per il Mezzogiorno, has so far received in all 96 000 million, the Campania region has had 7 000 million and the Municipality of Naples has had 11 000 million. In all, 121 000 million in three years.

The recent visit by the Mayor of Naples, Mr D'Amato, to the Commissioner for Regional Development in Brussels, Mr Varfis, highlighted the seriousness of the delays and inadequacies that have impeded the operation, just as it also brought out very clearly the goodwill of Mr Varfis, to whom I appeal yet again today.

What are the reasons for these delays? What are the reasons for these inadequacies? Who is responsible? We put these questions very clearly, and very insistently, to the Commission. This is what those who are concerned are asking you, gentlemen of the Commission, so that we can finally get on with the implementation of INOP, as it is called for short.

There are — I think — some new factors that can be used to bring pressure to bear. The first is the new Regulation for the European Regional Development Fund, which, thanks to Article 34, finally makes formal recognition of the entire integrated operation possible. The second is that the new Commission, pres-

Valenzi

ided over by Mr Delors, seems to be in favour of quicker, more comprehensive action. The third factor is the liquidation of the Cassa per il Mezzogiorno, which took place recently in Italy, and the transfer of responsibilities . . .

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

I should like to add one important point: in Italy the Government has had to accept the liquidation by Parliament of the Cassa per il Mezzogiorno, which is one of the bodies most responsible for our difficulties in this connection, and which has slowed down, instead of developing, relations with the European Parliament.

There are grounds for hoping, therefore, that in this six-months' term of office of the Italian Presidency of this Parliament the Italian Government will also honour its commitments and pay that part of its contribution without which the Commission cannot make its own contribution.

I should like to thank the President and honourable Members for having given me their attention, and also because I am convinced that once more we shall have their full support for the re-launching of this operation, which is very important for Naples and for the South of Italy.

Mr Barrett (RDE). — Madam President, the Newman report provides us with an excellent opportunity to comment on the success or lack of success of the Community regional policy. Unfortunately, European regional policy has failed to live up to our expectations. Far from reducing the gap between the Community's rich and poor regions and nations, the ERDF has failed to prevent an increase in regional disparities. My group is alarmed at this trend and we fear that if it continues unchecked, Community cohesion will be jeopardized. As a group, we have always argued that regional policy must be one of the pillars of Community policy. It is the only Community instrument which specifically sets out to reduce unemployment through job creation, and yet its resources remain totally inadequate. As Mr Newman points out in his report, the ERDF accounted for only 4.8% and 5.2% of the total EEC budget in 1982 and 1983 respectively. We believe that these sums are derisory and propose that significant increases be made in the Community's own resources to permit essential additional expenditure and regional policy.

Although not strictly relevant to the 8th and 9th Annual Reports, I now propose to comment on some recent developments in regional policy which have given rise to some concern in my own country. I should first like to comment on the implementation of the new ERDF regulation which entered into force on 1 January this year. While welcoming the basic thrust of the new regulation, my group regrets that the Council was unable to address itself to the ERDF's

fundamental problem, which is its lack of resources. Having said this, however, we particularly welcome the intention to concentrate more aid on the Community's weakest regions and to provide more assistance for small and medium-sized businesses. It is to be hoped that disadvantaged countries such as Ireland and Greece will be able to take up their full quota entitlement. We also welcome the move towards programme financing and the greater involvement of local and regional authorities in the decision-making process. We would have preferred this to have been taken a step further, having advocated that payments should be made directly to regional authorities in preference to national exchequers. We are one of the Community members who have payments made to the national exchequer and we think this a mistake, not only by the Commission but by the national government.

In reply to a question in this House, the Commissioner of the day acknowledged that local authorities were better equipped and more knowledgeable on particular areas, regions or county council areas to prepare a proposal for the Commission and that they should be permitted to make it directly to the Commission. In the same way, we believe that payments should be made directly to these local bodies, where they would be far more beneficial not only to the local communities concerned but to the EEC and its image abroad amongst the member countries. I would point out that when they are made through the national exchequer, it is very difficult to identify the benefits that have flowed from a particular grant from the ERDF, and that by doing it the way I am suggesting — and the Commission should press Member States not already doing it this way to start direct payments — it will be easy to establish where the money from the EEC Regional Fund is going. And the people in the Community areas concerned will at least be able to acknowledge that there are definite benefits coming to those areas from the Community. This is very important when you consider the low poll in the last elections to the European Parliament.

(Applause from the right)

Mrs Piermont (ARC). — *(DE)* Statistical data and studies show that the gulf between the EC's poorest and richest regions — e.g., between the average income of a resident of Hamburg and that of a Sicilian — yawns ever wider. With the accession of Spain and Portugal the differences will be even greater. One reason for this is that the money available for the Regional Fund is too little and that it has not increased enough in proportion to the Community budget. Unlike the rapporteur, however, we do not see this as the main reason for the Fund's failure. On the contrary, we are convinced that the regional policy is founded on a misconception. Its aim — an aim echoed in the version of the motion for a resolution approved by the committee — is to provide the leading high-technology, highly rationalized firms with profitable

Piermont

investments and adequate new 'human resources' by means of appropriate infrastructure measures. An example quoted in the report is that of the Airbus industries. What a region needs is decided by sovereign decree in group headquarters, the national capitals and by the Brussels bureaucracy. To the decision-makers the region is just an 'object'. Not even its institutions have any *real* say in the matter, let alone the people who live there.

In view of these aims and this decision-making structure, it is only logical that small and medium-sized businesses in the craft and service sectors and agriculture, which could provide work for many people and which accommodate the needs and way of life of the people living there, find themselves pushed out in favour of wealthy large-scale industries which create few jobs, and that private speculators privy to the right kind of information can jump in in cases such as the privatization of British Telecom and pocket funds intended for the public benefit. A 'Europe of the regions' which respects the cultural identity, history, differing ways of life and established social structures of the regions, in which people can build on this foundation and decide their future themselves, cannot, however, be achieved through the EC's regional policy as it has been conducted to date.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Madam President, I should like to congratulate Mr Newman on his excellent report on the European regional policy. To illustrate the rapporteur's proposals, I will outline the policy towards an underdeveloped region which I know well and where I myself live: the mining district of Limburg in Belgium. I will also suggest a few alternatives to the present policy.

Firstly, I would point out that the economic decline in this mining district has assumed disastrous proportions, chiefly because of the threat of closure that hangs over the mines and the gradual dismantling of the multinational undertakings. Ford, Blue Bell, Philips and others have already gone, and this has destroyed many small undertakings. As a result, 25% of the working population have lost their jobs. There is also a serious housing shortage due to population growth and the Belgian Government's policy, which has reduced support for housing programmes from 10 000m to 2 000m Belgian francs over a period of four years. There is also a lack of education in social problems, and the environment has been neglected, particularly in these underdeveloped areas. I will not go into any more detail.

Secondly, I should like to suggest a number of alternatives for regional development. Priority should be given to the integrated and global development of underdeveloped regions in Europe, such as the Limburg mining district, by granting financial assistance to certain forms of development geared to the diversification and conversion of existing undertakings and

industries, such as the coal industry, by encouraging the creation of jobs with a social purpose, by assisting small-scale projects and cooperatives, welfare projects such as employment for immigrants, help for the elderly, integration-oriented education, basic training and, finally, the housing initiatives which subsidize tenants' associations and would chiefly benefit districts in which mineworkers live. There are also opportunities for the renewal of the environment and the combination of employment and housing in the surrounding environment.

To conclude, Madam President, I should like to draw attention once again to the assistance given to integrated programmes where the population of the underdeveloped areas are themselves involved in the planning of their own regional development, in solidarity with all underdeveloped communities both in the regions of Europe and in the Third World.

Mr D. Martin (S). — Madam President, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning instructed the rapporteur for this report to take into account a motion by myself dealing with an ERDF grant awarded to British Telecom. The rapporteur did this in his first draft, but during the passage of the report through the committee reference to British Telecom has been reduced to a mere three paragraphs. These three paragraphs fail to convey the concern expressed by many people about the grants to British Telecom. I therefore take the opportunity in the three minutes allocated to me to outline my objections to the grants to British Telecom.

In 1982, some 30m ECU of ERDF assistance was granted to telecommunication projects in the UK. In 1983, the amount was 58m ECU. In September 1984, when the second *tranche* of grants from the ERDF was announced, 23 million pounds was allocated to British Telecom out of a total UK allocation of 78 million. In other words, two months before BT was privatized, one-third of the UK share of ERDF grants went to British Telecom. We on this side of the House believe that that was a politically motivated act which had nothing to do with regional policy and everything to do with the British Conservative Government's desire to ensure the best possible promotion of its sell-off of public assets.

We are disturbed that so much money was handed over to an organization which is making a profit of around one billion pounds a year. The money that they were awarded is to be used to change manual exchanges to automatic exchanges, and these exchanges will actually reduce the number of staff employed by British Telecom. Here we have a case of an ERDF grant which is actually doing the opposite to what the Fund was set up to do in that it is reducing instead of increasing the number of jobs in the UK.

The right wing in this House, led by the British Conservatives, have tried to sweep this whole issue under

D. Martin

the carpet during the committee stage. I wonder what their motives are in doing this. I wonder how many of the British Conservatives or their families actually purchased BT shares and, if they did, I wonder if they will declare that before they vote today. It is immoral for them to vote on this report having made a quick buck out of the sale of these shares.

Mr Newman's first draft of his report contained a paragraph which stated: 'Parliament is concerned that while such grants to British Telecom had little impact on creating jobs, it could be regarded as an undue benefit from the Community budget to private investors who purchased British Telecom shares when it was placed in private ownership.' I regard that as a very moderate statement. We seek to reintroduce that moderate statement in our Amendment No 22. I hope the Assembly will support this and the other amendments we have put forward on the BT issue in order to set the record straight about this grant.

Finally, BT aside, let me congratulate Mr Newman on his report. His first draft had much quality and many good comments. I hope the final text will bear some resemblance to his first draft. He made a number of important points, perhaps the most important being the reminder that the Community's regional policy has failed to narrow the gap between the rich and poor regions.

Finally, in 1983 the olive-oil and vegetable sector of the agricultural budget received 2 ECU for every 1 ECU spent on regional policy. We are serious about regional policy, these priorities have to be changed.

Mr O'Donnell (PPE). — Madam President, the annual report of the European Regional Development Fund gives us an indication of the extent to which this important Community instrument contributes to the economic and social progress of the Community's regions. There is no doubt that the ERDF has made some contribution to the provision of infrastructures and to the creation of jobs in the disadvantaged areas of this Community. Indeed, the report for 1983 contains a table giving the employment creation figures for the period 1975-83. These figures show that about half-a-million jobs were created and preserved through a variety of projects granted aid from the ERDF during that period.

However, despite the facts and figures relating to job creation and the provision of infrastructures, the Eighth and Ninth Annual Reports of the ERDF clearly show that the gap between the richer and poorer regions continues to widen. It can be forecast that this gap will inevitably continue to widen still further with the imminent enlargement of the Community.

The report before us draws attention to the need for the Commission to accelerate its work on assessing the

economic, political and budgetary impact of enlargement on the Community's regions. A motion for a resolution tabled under Article 47 is now before the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, and a report is being drafted on the implications of enlargement for the Community's regions.

From a study of the Eighth and Ninth Annual Reports, certain basic and fundamental facts emerge. Firstly, the Fund is totally inadequate to meet the economic and social needs of Europe's disadvantaged regions. The Fund, in fact, has made very little real impact on the serious and growing unemployment situation in these regions. The ERDF has failed completely to halt, let alone reverse, the continuous trend in this Community whereby the rich regions continue to get richer while the poor continue to get poorer.

It is my conviction that this Community cannot progress towards ultimate European union nor can it have any real meaning for the people who belong to it so long as we tolerate a situation where some people continue to enjoy ever-rising standards of living while others are condemned to declining standards. This trend will continue unless this Community and, indeed, the member governments face up to their responsibility in this matter and provide adequate financing for the ERDF. The gap between the richer and poorer regions cannot be narrowed except through a massive transfer of resources from the richer to the poorer regions.

Since its establishment a quarter of a century ago, this Community has failed to achieve this objective. I believe it is essential for its survival and for its progress that this Community does so now and in the immediate future. The first essential for a realistic Community regional policy, then, is the provision of adequate funds.

The report before us also draws attention to the need for greater coordination of the various Community financial instruments and their coordination with national, local and regional instruments in the promotion of integrated regional development programmes. There is now no doubt that the application of the principle of integrated regional development offers the best hope for promoting the economic and social development of Europe's most depressed regions and thereby helping to narrow the gap between the richer and poorer regions. It is vitally important that the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes get under way as quickly as possible. There is also a very pressing need for the formulation of integrated programmes for the disadvantaged regions in the northern peripheries of this Community. Integrated development programmes of the type already being implemented in the Western Isles of Scotland would be appropriate to other peripheral regions in the northern perimeters of this Community. In my own country, there is a need for comprehensive and integrated development programmes for the western seaboard regions of Ireland

O'Donnell

as well as for the *Gaeltacht* and the offshore islands, some of which are now faced with total depopulation.

I believe that local and regional authorities are a widely important factor in the promotion of both Community and national regional policies. I believe that local authorities should be directly involved at all stages in formulation and processing of applications for ERDF assistance.

Finally, may I express the hope that the new regulations governing the Regional Fund which came into effect on 1 January of this year will achieve far greater success than hitherto in tackling the serious problems of regional disparities in this Community.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Madam President, at home I have two small boys. One is aged six and the other is aged three, and I am bound to say that, listening to the rapporteur this afternoon, I shut my eyes and thought: I must be back at home, for they — as small boys do — squabble and complain when they do not quite get their own way. I listened to the rapporteur complaining bitterly that he had not got his own way on his original tendentious and extremely unhelpful text for the report which stands in his name. I think the rapporteur should be giving thanks to the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning for actually injecting a sound dose of common sense into the report and taking out of it all those extremely unhelpful recipes for economic and employment disaster which have brought Europe to its knees and which this House should have no part in promoting through this report.

The members of my group, Madam President, greatly welcome the putting of British Telecom into real public ownership.

(Protests from the Socialist benches)

British Telecom is now owned by millions of real people, and this House should welcome the fact that the European Regional Development Fund has been spent on helping millions of real ordinary people, the people we are talking about Europe trying to help. I sincerely hope this House gives the report, as it stands, its full-hearted support and rejects all of the attempts to put back the tendentious and feeble text that the rapporteur originally submitted.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — *(GR)* Madam President, the Newman report is of interest because it confirms some of the Commission's own admissions. It is also fully in keeping with the stark reality that regional disparities not only exist in the Community but are growing and becoming more acute by the day. The same is happening with the living standards of these regions, which, instead of approaching the level of the prosperous regions, are slipping back from it all the time, with the problem of unemployment as the main outcome.

Mr Newman and many other colleagues have wondered about the reason for the unsatisfactory operation of the Regional Fund and have said that the resources at the ERDF's disposal are miniscule. I would say that they are not worth even so much as an aspirin as far as curing enormous problems like these goes, amounting as they do to one-thousandth of the Community GDP.

But this problem is nothing other than a symptom of a more general policy which neither Mr Newman nor the other colleagues want to mention. The truth is that the Community, which is primarily concerned with supporting big capital and large companies, shows no determination to change its strategy with a view to narrowing the regional disparities which exist not only at the Community level but also between different regions within individual Member States. I have not got time to go into the situation obtaining in my own country, which sees no sign of its less-favoured regions developing in harmonized fashion or of approaching the low level even of its ostensibly developed regions, despite the fact that the whole of the country, apart from the Athens and Thessaloniki regions, qualifies for ERDF support.

Therefore in my view, Mr President, this debate is somewhat pointless, given its reluctance 'to put its finger on the marks of the nails', to broach on the more general policy of the Community, that is.

Mrs Lemass (RDE). — Madam President, the European Regional Fund is *the* way of helping poorer countries. Unfortunately, the central part of Europe — the wealthy part — is benefiting substantially, while the countries on the periphery of Europe, such as Scotland, Ireland, the south of Italy and Greece, are the countries where there is a great need for more money.

In his report, Mr Newman referred to the integrated programmes. In my own country, my own national government seems reluctant to press for an integrated programme for my own capital city such as the one from which Belfast benefited. I believe that those integrated programmes are the way to help regions that really need a great deal of support.

Other matters of major topical interest are enlargement and the inauguration of the integrated Mediterranean programmes. We really must have assurances that those developments will not have a prejudicial impact on the operation of regional policy in severely disadvantaged regions in the Community's north, such as Ireland and Scotland. We must have guarantees that those regions will continue to qualify for extensive support from the Regional Fund, and we must be satisfied that funding will be not only maintained but increased in real terms.

I should like to direct a specific question to the Commission on the proposed extension of crossborder pro-

Lemass

grammes in Ireland. Those measures, which included the extension of the gas pipeline in Ireland, were proposed under Article 13 of the old Regulation and failed to be agreed prior to the expiry of that Regulation. Will the Commission confirm its intention to produce proposals to establish an appropriate legal basis for those measures to proceed and, if so, will the Commission give an indication of the time-scales envisaged?

Madam President, the Regional Fund is extremely important to the poorer regions of Europe, and that must always be kept in mind.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in an evaluation of the operation of the Regional Fund it must be emphasized that the regions themselves are in no way involved in the Community's regional policy. Even though they are essential structural elements in the construction of Europe, the regions of the Member States have no say, and that in itself is, I believe, having a disastrous effect on the quality of the process of integration we are all trying to achieve.

There is also a disconcerting lack of information, and the absence of any kind of information policy has resulted, among other things, in some Member States often failing to use all the Regional Fund resources allocated to them. At the end of the 1982 financial year, for example, Belgium had still not taken up almost 30m ECU of its quota.

The Commission is not entirely to blame. The Belgian Government in fact failed to submit enough projects or to submit them in the form required by the Community regulations. This is an incredible omission when we think that in such regions as Limburg and the Westhoek unemployment amounts to 25% and youth unemployment is over 35%. This only goes to show that there is no effective policy of providing information on the application procedure or the administration of the Fund with respect to those who may be entitled to assistance.

If we are to avoid a recurrence of these mistakes in the future, I am convinced that the Directorate-General for regional policy must have a department responsible for maintaining direct contact with the regions. This department could also act as an information centre, as a cell for the exchange of ideas and information on successful projects and also as a coordinating centre. The Member States themselves should also involve their regions in the conception and implementation of a Community policy. They might have observer status, just as the German *Länder* are represented in both the Council and COREPER.

Madam President, last year a Community conference of the regions and the applicant countries, Spain and Portugal, was held. They asked to be recognized and consulted by the Community in the foreseeable future.

To conclude, I will point out once again that it is essential for the regions to have direct access to the Community institutions if the Community is to correct the growing lack of regional balance.

(Applause)

Mrs Gadioux (S). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as the rapporteur has stressed, the Commission's Eighth and Ninth Annual Reports on the ERDF do not really give a clear idea of the economic and social impact of the Fund's actions, since the figures supplied by the Member States apparently need to be treated with a great deal of caution.

Administration of the ERDF needs, it would seem, to be guided by two principles, especially since the reform which came into force on 1 January 1985: the principle of coherence and the principle of transparency.

Coherence first of all between Community policies. There is no apparent reason why the ERDF should be operated in a vacuum, taking no account of the Community's other objective actions. There would seem to be room for further improvement in this respect, which would make for greater efficiency, and responsibility for this task should lie essentially with the Commission, with supervision by the Parliament. Secondly, coherence between Community policy on regional development and Member States' policies. The reform of 19 June 1984 will no doubt enable progress to be made in this regard, by putting the emphasis on programme financing, but the difficulties are not to be underestimated. Unlike the common agricultural policy, which is entirely under the control of the Community institutions, ERDF operations are always dependent upon the agreement of the Member States concerned. States constrained to budgetary austerity may therefore be under a strong temptation to regard ERDF aid as a partial substitute for national aid rather than a complement. The obligation to ensure additionality and complementarity should be mandatory and it should be a *sine qua non* for the granting of aid. The texts should be applied strictly. One of the means of achieving this coherence would surely be to set up closer relations between the Commission and the appropriate levels of government, regional authorities in particular, which could play a key role in this field, both in the planning and execution of projects. Admittedly, the appropriations to the ERDF are so meagre that it is impossible to have any grand illusions as to their impact on industrial reconstruction or efforts to combat unemployment. Moreover, the impact is difficult to gauge in economic terms. Nevertheless, these difficulties should not be taken as justification for the perhaps understandable but barely admissible behaviour of the budgetary authority.

It is precisely because money is scarce that care must be taken to ensure that it is used judiciously and the

Gadioux

principle of transparency must be affirmed unequivocally. The retrospective checks show that the targets set are rarely attained. Admittedly, as the rapporteur points out, the inspections carried out by the Commission did not reveal a single instance of irregularity. It is therefore strongly to be recommended that the Commission make fuller use of its powers of inspection at the premises of enterprises in all Member States and that an obligation be laid upon the States to supply statistics which are accurate and reliable.

Coherence and transparency are all the more necessary with the prospect of enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal, which was confirmed in Brussels at the most recent Council of Heads of State or Government. Thus another brick is going to be added to the construction of the European unity to which this Parliament aspires.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Madam President, I want to stress immediately that with regard to the elucidation of the problems, the anxieties expressed, as well as the policy guidelines proposed, the very painstaking report of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and the analysis made by the rapporteur find the Commission to a great extent in agreement.

This being the case, my comments will be short and of a general nature, and naturally I shall have the opportunity to reply in greater detail on the interesting specific matters which have been raised during the debate.

The mainspring of the concern felt by both Parliament and the Commission is that ten years after the commencement of operations by the Fund the disparities between the regions have yet to be reduced, and indeed perhaps they have widened. Moreover, as Mr Chanterie and Mr O'Donnell have pointed out, this concern is intensifying, because with enlargement the problem of the disparities will become more acute and tackling it will require a much greater effort than is being made at present.

As everyone has been at pains to say, this effort must be centred on two objectives: first, to achieve an increase in the endowment of the Regional Fund, and second, to ensure that the most effective use is made of its resources. At every opportunity Parliament stresses that the resources of the Regional Fund are inadequate. I must say that at its inception ten years ago the Fund was puny in scale but a cause for hope. In fact the rate of increase in the early years was very substantial, and one may say that had it continued we might have had, after a few years, a really effective Community regional policy.

Unfortunately — with the exception of the effort being put into the integrated Mediterranean pro-

grammes, which is still well short of completion — the prospects today are much less encouraging, because, as Parliament points out, both the rate of increase and the level of expenditure on regional policy relative to budgetary expenditure as a whole fall far short of what is needed. With expenditure on the regional policy standing at 5% of the budget, how can we possibly get to grips with the problem of income disparities, how can we respond even partially to the immense problem of unemployment? Assuming, then, that the resources available to the Fund will remain at this level in coming years — even though both Parliament and the Commission will always be striving for an increase — the weight falls mainly on the qualitative aspect, on making the best use of resources, that is. But here I must say quite clearly that the qualitative aspect is no substitute for the shortage of resources. No matter how great the resources we ought always to place the same emphasis on the qualitative aspect as we do at present with the scant resources available.

I think that on the question of quality the new regulation matches up well to many of the concerns set out in the Commission's report. This being so, we may hope that certain points of criticism in the report have been overcome, or at least dealt with in part. I say 'hope' because it is too early as yet for the positive results of the new regulation to show.

The criticism concerning the use of resources centres mainly on three points. The first concerns the greater geographical concentration of aid, as mentioned by a number of speakers, among them Mrs Lemass and Mr Barret, the second concerns the correct selection of sectors for intervention by the Fund, and the third concerns the better coordination of the activities of the various institutions and financial instruments.

With regard to geographical concentration, the Commission now has more power to its elbow by virtue of the higher percentage of funding for each project, a factor which will contribute indirectly towards the achievement of geographical concentration. Furthermore, the percentage contribution of each Member State to Fund-related support is now flexible and no longer fixed, and this gives the Commission more room for manoeuvre. Lastly, it is possible that the dialogue with the Member States in connection with the regional development programmes and the periodic report may facilitate the establishment of priorities amongst the various regions of the Member States.

I come now to the second point concerning the choice between infrastructure and productive investments. The report correctly stresses the very low level of funding, 11%, given to productive investments in 1983. The figure in 1984 was somewhat higher at 15%, but our aim is to get it up to 30% because this is the target set out in the regulation. This means that investments in this sector, especially in small and medium-sized undertakings and in the development of locally-sustainable potential, will have a certain

Varfis

precedence over infrastructure investments. In the report — and many speakers have voiced the same sentiment — productive investments are linked with job creation. I want to stress that the direct job creation criterion certainly is of great importance, but it cannot be the sole criterion. The fact, for example, that infrastructure projects in the longer term contribute to economic development and indirectly to job creation may be an equally valid criterion.

So, even though it may be difficult, to the figures given in the Eighth and Ninth Reports there ought to be added the numbers of temporary jobs created through the implementation of infrastructure projects and also the permanent jobs created in the medium term and indirectly as a result of infrastructure investments by the Regional Fund. And I want to tell you that I have instructed the Directorate-General concerned to make this calculation — which will, of course, be an approximation and not particularly exact because of the difficulties involved — and I hope that shortly we shall have some very interesting conclusions.

Here I would like to make a very general comment on what I have said. As regards both geographical concentration and choosing between productive investments and infrastructure projects, the Member States have a very large degree of freedom, and because of this our endeavour to develop a dialogue between the Commission and the Member States, especially in the area of the regional development programmes, with a view to achieving a common appraisal and agreement on the priorities is of great significance. The same applies to the studies. The Regional Fund does not have a special appropriation for these. The possibility of funding is open to each Member State, and all of them, apart from maybe one, have availed themselves of it.

The third and last element in the use of resources is the coordination of the activities of the institutions and financial instruments of regional policy. In order to promote this coordination, greater importance is now being given to the Community intervention programmes, which have replaced the old non-quota programmes. The report quite rightly stresses the importance of these latter programmes and just as rightly points out that in 1983, which was a transitional year, they were few in number.

Here I want to reply to Mrs Lemass concerning cross-border programmes between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. This delay has in fact been taken note of.

The Commission has studied ways of getting these programmes into operation in 1985 and of cutting to a minimum the times required for the relevant decisions. On this, I can say that we are already proposing to extend the deadline to the end of the year where there has been preparation at the Member-State level which

will allow the changes to the regulation to be given the necessary approval and therefore these programmes to be rapidly implemented.

The integrated Mediterranean programmes and the integrated operations mentioned by many speakers form another important objective of the Community. Here I would like to inform Mr Ulburghs that the Commission, taking account of the social and economic problems of Limburg, recently decided — on 16 April, if I am not wrong — to co-fund an integrated operations study for that area. These studies are particularly important precisely because they furnish the opportunity for increased contact with regional and local authorities. We want to see these authorities taking part in drawing up and implementing the programmes. We are prepared to help them, to provide them with all the necessary technical support. In recent months we have increased contacts at all levels, and already it is possible for financial support to be given to local or regional authorities, national legislation permitting. Financial support of this nature has in some cases already been disbursed. In the end what we want to achieve is for these studies to culminate in proposals, to be submitted to the Commission, for integrated programmes; no longer as fragmented and detached projects for financing by different funds, but as a unified whole with the Commission having an appropriate mechanism for their approval. This does not mean that there has to be a super-fund, but that the procedure for coordinating the funds must be improved. I want to assure Parliament that shortly the Commission will be announcing the procedure to be followed by the Member States in submitting these integrated operations programmes for funding.

I turn now to the specific case of Naples. The integrated operation for that city was initially of an experimental nature, and we believe that despite the difficulties, despite the undoubted deficiencies, the results have on the whole been positive. The concept of the integrated operation is now enshrined, moreover, in the new Regional Fund regulation, and this is important because it means that the projects included in an integrated operation have priority in the allocation of Regional Fund resources.

Anyhow, an integrated operation continues to be a means of intervention and not a formal action such as is the case with the approval of a programme. The Commission participates actively in the planning, the funding and the monitoring of the operation. The question asked is whether it is advisable or necessary to have a special provision for the Naples operation, or whether there should be one additional framework for all future operations. We believe that the fact that the results have been positive shows that a special regulation is not necessary for the time being. We also feel that the deficiencies and difficulties I have mentioned are not attributable to the absence of such special regulations.

Varfis

Coming now to the second question, on the allocation of appropriations, I want to point out that for Members who are interested we have available a detailed table of the allocation of funds by project and sector, with reference to both commitment and payment appropriations. I will be brief about this. In the period 1980-84, commitments were taken on amounting to 991 billion pounds sterling. Payments in this period were much lower, at around 300 billion pounds sterling, but this is because a large part of the commitments were entered into in December 1984. If this is borne in mind the percentage difference between commitments and payments then comes to around 40%, not a very satisfactory figure perhaps, but also not discouraging if we take into account that many of the projects are programmed for implementation over a period of many years. The payments were for the large part made through the Cassa del Mezzogiorno, and I must say in response to another remark that the Cassa del Mezzogiorno definitely will be taking on further commitments for the completion of projects for which commitments already exist.

I come now to the final matter, that of organization. The Naples integrated operation is an evolving process, not static, and this process is being achieved *via* a basic operational file which is periodically fed with information and adjusted. What do we mean by organization? We mean coordination, on a practical basis, between the authorities, the organizations and the financial instruments at the four levels: Community, national, regional and local. I have already mentioned Community-level coordination. Additionally, I want to say that the Commission already has the formal reports. Earlier I mentioned the ERDF regulation, which confers priority on these operations. There is also the special budgetary appropriation for the integrated programmes. Consequently, special provision for the integrated programmes does exist. Regarding coordination at the national, regional and local levels, there are in theory two possible avenues of approach: either to leave the distribution of responsibilities and the procedures for drawing up and selecting programmes as they are, with the problem remaining just as one of coordination between the various authorities, national, regional and local, or to set up an *ad hoc* structure with a legal identity. I will not go into detail about the advantages and disadvantages of each of these avenues of approach; what I do want to say is that the Commission will adapt its procedures to the national institutional framework within which its intervention is sought.

In Naples, the organization of the integrated operation is being conducted on the basis of deference to the jurisdictions and responsibilities of the various organizations involved. As I have said, deficiencies do exist in certain sectors, and I would like to mention some of these. We think, for example, that a strengthening of the technical structure — of the working-party and the secretariat — would facilitate better preparation and implementation of the programmes. We

also believe that an informatics system, such as the one used in the other integrated programme in Belfast, could improve the situation. Lastly, in cases where certain organizations are, for various reasons, unable to take decisions and there are long delays, it would perhaps be possible to devise a way of allowing the superseding of a higher institution in the taking of decisions.

President. — The debate is closed. We now pass on to the vote.

*Motion for a resolution**Paragraph 10: Amendment No 16*

Mr Newman (S), rapporteur. — Madam President, there are 15 amendments to the report submitted by Mr Schreiber on behalf of the Socialist Group. These amendments simply restore, in summary form, the original text of the report, so obviously the majority of the committee would be against them. I personally would be strongly in favour: I am therefore for.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Madam president, I would like to draw your attention to Rule 72(2), which says that

... the only Member permitted to speak during the vote shall be the rapporteur, who shall have the opportunity of expressing briefly his committee's views on the amendments put to the vote.

I therefore suggest to you, Madam President, that it is out of order to invite Mr Newman to express his personal views. If I might add a comment on that, I can think of nothing more boring than what Mr Newman happens to think, because he knows little about it.

(Protests from the Socialist Group)

President. — Mr Pearce, in this House of course we abide by our Rules of Procedure and the rapporteur gives the view of the committee, but it has always been the habit, rightly or wrongly, in this House that rapporteurs have frequently, regrettably, given their own personal view.

If the House feels strongly that at no time should the rapporteur ever give his personal view, I hope that another time this matter will be raised at the beginning rather than at the end of voting: then it will come to the Bureau of the Parliament for a final decision.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — I did have a point of order to that effect at the start of the speaking.

President. — Mr Beazley, I think the point you made was during the rapporteur's oral presentation, as opposed to what his view was on the amendments. As I informed you, Mr Beazley, your point was noted and will be taken up. But I think when you spoke it was on his speech in introducing the report rather than when he made his views known with regard to amendments during the vote.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — You are correct, but it was a question that I did ask whether the rapporteur was correct in referring to his own views as compared with those that he represented on behalf of the committee.

President. — Mr Beazley, once again, it has been the practice of this House that very frequently a rapporteur will speak on behalf of the committee and then use a certain amount of time, whether it be one or two minutes, to give his own personal views. It has always been the right of Members in this House to state their personal views, whether you like to hear them or not. As long as it is made perfectly clear when the rapporteur is stating his personal views and when he is representing the committee, I am not in a position to rule that he has no right to speak on his personal view.

I do not want to continue this because we want to get on with the voting. This matter will be taken up in the Bureau as to the right of a rapporteur to give his personal view both when introducing a report to this House and when stating whether he supports an amendment or not. I would therefore ask for no further discussion on this, but I will take this matter to the Bureau, because I think it is very clear what has happened. It has happened frequently before, and I am therefore not in a position to rule at this moment as to what line should be taken in future.

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — I should be grateful, Madam President, if you could inform me, as a member of this committee, whether your ruling also applies to a member of the committee who holds an official position as a vice-chairman of that committee?

President. — Mr Beazley, vice-chairmen also have their personal views. Considering each vice-chairman there are three political groups represented on the Bureau of that committee. I do not think you can expect every vice-chairman to represent the view of the committee. But, as I have said, I think it is a matter for the Bureau of this Parliament whether or not the rapporteurs, when speaking in this House, may also give their personal views. It has happened in the past, and for the time being I must abide by the precedents which have ruled so far in this House.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Madam President, when somebody in this House stands up to speak on a point

of order and makes an irrelevant and offensive statement, I would suggest that the Chair should refer to this and state that the statement is entirely out of order and an abuse of the rules and privileges of this House. I did not vote at any time with Mr Newman, but to make an offensive statement regarding what Mr Newman does or does not know — I am not aware of the extent of his knowledge on this subject — is offensive, unnecessary and unparliamentary.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you for your observations, Mr McCartin.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Madam President, I would remind Mr Newman that there is every opportunity for him and any other Member of this House to make a personal explanation of vote at the proper time. I would suggest, therefore, that he should exercise the same continence that generations of rapporteurs have exercised before him.

President. — Thank you, Mr Sherlock.

Paragraph 20: After the vote on Amendment No 19

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Madam President, it is becoming increasingly evident that we are not — unless you make some positive decision — going to finish the voting at this rate tonight. We have already voted on the agenda, and if you read the agenda it says 8 p.m. 'Close of play'. Could you let us know, Madam President, what you have in mind as to the further conduct of this matter this evening? I ask only that.

President. — I would hope, Mr Sherlock, that if we can proceed quickly, we shall finish the vote tonight. It is quite clear that we shall not be able to take the other report tonight. That will have to be taken tomorrow morning. I would hope that if there are no interruptions we can at least finish the voting on this item tonight.

Mr Eyraud (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, I should simply like to say that the second amendment to paragraph 20, Amendment No 9, is a supplementing amendment. In fact, it is addition to the original text of the paragraph.

Paragraph 34: Before the vote on Amendment No 27

Mr Newman (S), rapporteur. — A similar amendment, Madam President, was rejected in committee, although personally I am in favour.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — (NL) Madam President, on a point of order under Rule 54. You have said that the vote should proceed quickly, and I feel absolutely no need to listen to all kinds of personal comments from the rapporteur. In your capacity as President, Madam President, will you ask the rapporteur to answer simply 'yes' or 'no'.

Explanations of vote

Mr Balfe (S). — I wish briefly to draw the House's attention to the five amendments to paragraph 35 and explain why I shall be voting against the report because these were not accepted.

These amendments refer to the money that was paid to British Telecom in 1982, 1983 and 1984, the final *tranche* being an amount of 23 million pounds paid shortly before privatization. The purpose of my Amendment No 24 was to ask that those Members of this Assembly who have bought those shares — and remember, these shares were on sale all over Europe — declare the interest that they have in British Telecom before voting and, one may hope, pay back any speculative gain they have made.

There is, of course, a precedent for this. Stanley Baldwin, a distinguished member of your party, Madam President, did in 1919, as Financial Secretary to the Treasury, make a payment to the British Government in lieu of the profits which his company had made in the First World War. I would respectfully suggest to those Conservative Members of this Parliament and any others within this Parliament who have made money out of British Telecom that they should similarly first declare it and then consider donating it to a good cause. I will not specify what the good cause is.

What I will say is that it is surely totally unacceptable for us to be involved in voting for something which could have given rise to speculative gains by Members of this House.

Mr Huckfield (S). — I shall vote against the final outcome of this report because, though my colleague has obviously tried to stimulate a genuine debate on the European Regional Development Fund . . .

(Laughter from the European Democratic benches)

I am afraid that the effects of the treatment of his amendments and of others' amendments by this House is really to produce an overall totally unsatisfactory report. He has tried quite deliberately to raise some very important points in his report about the figures on job creation put forward by the Development Fund. He has tried also to raise the British Telecom share transfer issue, the question of additionality and, of course, the vast differences between the growth of

Development Fund money and the common agricultural policy. But all of these, unfortunately, are issues which have been stifled by the votes of the parties opposite.

The other thing that we have been prevented from raising — and I still have one-and-a-half minutes — is the fact that despite the money which regions like the one that I represent do receive from the Regional Development Fund, it in no way compensates for the damage done to regions like mine by other parts of the Community policy. I would have hoped that issues like this could be debated and could be raised in a report like this.

In short, I am sure that my friend has tried to raise the question very seriously of whether the Commission and whether this Community is serious about regional policy.

(Protests from the European Democratic benches)

Unfortunately, these votes tonight have prevented those questions being answered.

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) The Communist Party of Greece (interior) will vote for the excellent report of our colleague Mr Newman on the operations of the European Regional Development Fund. For the last ten years we have followed at close hand the efforts both of the Commission and of our Parliament to implement a vigorous regional policy with a view to narrowing the extensive gulf between the rich and poor countries and regions of the Community. Nevertheless, we can see that there are still obstacles which impede the Commission's work.

It is common knowledge that for three years the Council has not been able to agree on the revision and updating of the Regional Fund regulation proposed by the Commission and our Parliament. There has been delay, moreover, in endorsing two other regulations, on (a) the structural policy for agriculture and (b) the integrated Mediterranean programmes, which, if implemented together, would do a great deal to lessen the existing disparities.

What is more, it is obvious that efforts to widen the implementation of the European Monetary System will fail so long as the present sharp regional disparities in the Community continue to exist.

The Commission's first object must therefore be to achieve a substantial increase in appropriations to the Regional Fund, more than enough to cover inflation. Furthermore, I would like the Commission to be heedful of the following points:

a) in these difficult times of heightened unemployment, directly productive investments are not enough. Support must be given to infrastructure projects for the creation of new jobs;

Filinis

b) local government should play a greater part in the elaboration of regional programmes; and

c) more emphasis should be given to the financing of small and medium-sized businesses.

Finally, the Regional Fund should be genuinely regional and not support the industry of the more affluent countries, a task which must be left to the Community's common industrial policy.

Mr Hutton (ED), in writing. — Instead of a breath of fresh air and fresh thinking on ways to help the regions of this Community, we have been treated to a whiff of the stale air of those nasty little British Labour Party committee-rooms where the extreme left shut themselves away from real life and churn out the sort

of deadly ideas which would not just beggar the regions but take us further steps towards that sad Europe beyond the Iron Curtain.

Fortunately, the good sense of this House has turned us away from endorsing the twaddle we were offered in the amendments which we rejected. I am pleased that my group contributed to the sound of sense tonight, and we will vote for the report.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

President. — I would like to thank the staff for having carried on after the scheduled time of 8 p.m.

(The sitting closed at 8.20 p.m.)²

¹ The rapporteur spoke *against* all the amendments.

² For items relating to Membership of Parliament and the agenda for the next sitting, see Minutes.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 7 MAY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Approval of Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Balfe</i>	27	<i>erland; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Sutherland; Mr Herman; Mr Sutherland</i>	62
2. <i>Decision on urgency:</i> <i>Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Gautier; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr von der Vring; Mr Gautier</i>	27	• <i>Question No 4, by Mr Fitzgerald: Strip- searching in prisons:</i> <i>Mr De Clercq (Commission); Mr Fitz- gerald; Mr De Clercq; Mrs Lemass; Mr De Clercq</i>	65
3. <i>Iron ore — Report (Doc. A 2-21/85) by Mr Mühlen:</i> <i>Mr Mühlen; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Herman; Mr Cassidy; Mr Besse; Mr Mallet; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> . . .	28	• <i>Question No 5, by Mr Fitzsimons: EEC study on cot deaths:</i> <i>Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Fitzsi- mons; Mr Narjes</i>	65
4. <i>Budget 1985 — Report (Doc. A 2-30/85) by Mr Fich:</i> <i>Mr Fich; Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Dankert; Mr Pfennig; Mr Curry; Mrs Barbarella; Mr Cot; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Pasty; Mr Bonde; Mr Cicciomessere; Mr Pitt; Mrs Oppenheim; Mrs Hoff; Mr Alavanos; Mr Pordea; Mr Eyraud; Mr Woltjer; Mr Marck; Mr Provan; Mr Maber; Mr MacSharry; Mr Tolman; Mrs Jep- sen; Mrs S. Martin; Mr Adam; Mr Staes; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mrs Salisb; Mr Hutton; Mr Ryan; Mrs Ewing</i>	33	• <i>Question No 6, by Mr Barrett: ERDF:</i> <i>Mr Varfis (Commission); Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Varfis; Mr Clinton; Mr Varfis; Mr MacSharry; Mr Varfis; Mr Guerneur; Mr Varfis</i>	66
5. <i>Action taken on the opinions of Parliament:</i> <i>Mr Cryer; Mr Varfis (Commission); Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Varfis; Mr Cryer</i> .	61	• <i>Question No 7, by Mr Andrews: Con- vention for the protection of individuals with regard to automatic processing of personal data:</i> <i>Mr Sutherland; Mr Andrews; Mr Suther- land</i>	68
6. <i>Question Time (Doc. B 2-267/85):</i> • <i>Questions to the Commission:</i> • <i>Question No 1, by Mr Marshall: EEC Directive on the conservation of wild birds:</i> <i>Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mr Marshall; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Cot- trell; Mr Clinton Davis</i>	62	• <i>Question No 9, by Mr Guerneur: Euro- pean petrochemical industry:</i> <i>Mr Narjes; Mr Guerneur; Mr Narjes; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Narjes</i>	68
• <i>Question No 2, by Mr MacSharry: New technology competition for International Youth Year, 1985:</i> <i>Mr Sutherland (Commission); Mr Mac- Sharry; Mr Sutherland; Mr Seligman; Mr Sutherland; Mr Guerneur; Mr Suth-</i>		• <i>Question No 12, by Mrs Ewing: Spanish fisheries:</i> <i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mrs Ewing; Mr Andriessen; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mr Andriessen; Mr MacSharry; Mr Andriessen; Mr Guerneur; Mr Andries- sen; Mr Marshall; Mr Andriessen; Mr Falconer; Mr Andriessen; Mr Clinton; Mr Andriessen; Mr Møller; Mr Andries- sen</i>	69
		• <i>Question No 13, by Mr Pitt: Flag of convenience shipping:</i> <i>Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Pitt; Mr Clinton Davis; Mrs Ewing; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Wijsenbeek</i>	73
		7. <i>1985 Budget (continuation):</i> <i>Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Langes; Mr Fich; Mr Cot; Mr Andriessen (Commission);</i>	

<i>Mr Christophersen (Commission); Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Christophersen</i>	75	<i>Pen; Mr Arndt; Mr Bombard; Mr Muntingh; Mr Cassidy; Mr Sakellariou; Mr Ryan; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Balfé; Mr Provan; Mr Le Pen; Mr F. Pisoni; Mr Dankert; Mr de la Malène; Mr Dankert; Mr Klepsch; Mr Le Chevallier; Mr Galland; Mr von der Vring</i>	85
8. <i>Budgetary policy 1986 — Report (Doc. A 2-25/85) by Mr Christodoulou; Mr Christodoulou; Mr Papoutzis; Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mrs Barbarella; Mr Van der Waal; Mr Cornelissen</i>	79	<i>Annex</i>	90
9. <i>Votes</i>			
<i>Mr Gautier; Mr Welsh; Mr Patterson; Mr Brok; Mr Klepsch; Mr de la Malène; Mr Le</i>			

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)

1. *Approval of the Minutes*

President. — The Minutes of yesterday's sitting have been distributed. Are there any comments?

Mr Balfé (S). — Madam President, the excellent minute-taking service has recorded all of yesterday's exchanges very faithfully, with just one small exception.

The last item on the agenda for Tuesday, 9 May, which is on page 14, reads:

The following spoke: Mr Balfé, who referring to Rule 89 asked for an assurance that the address by the President of the United States would not be included in the minutes of Wednesday's sitting, and Mr Jakobsen.

I was not asking that Mr Jakobsen should not be included in the Minutes of Wednesday's sitting. However, I would point out that in the case of the other minutes, namely the minute on page 1, about whether armed personnel would be in the Chamber, and the minute on page 13 about the status of a formal sitting, the minutes also contain the President's reply. The President Jakobsen did in fact confirm that it would not be part of the Minutes of Proceedings. I think this should be added. It does say, for instance, on page 13 after my question, that 'the President put this interpretation of the Rules on Procedure to the vote'. On page 1 it says that the President gave an assurance that

this would not be the case. In other words I think the President's reply is also part of the Minutes.

President. — I take note of that, Mr Balfé. We shall do as you suggest.

(Parliament approved the Minutes)

2. *Decision on urgency*

Proposal from the Commission to the Council for a Resolution amending Regulation (EEC) No 3599/82 on temporary importation arrangements, as regards the date of its implementation.

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), Chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations. — Madam President, I would recommend the House to agree the request for urgency. I do not think that a report from the REX Committee will be necessary, but I would suggest, if the House agrees urgency, that the proposal should be voted on at the end of the week.

Mr Gautier (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, I have re-read yesterday's minutes, and I think I was listening carefully yesterday too. I haven't a clue what is going on here. Would you explain to me briefly what is at issue in this Regulation No 3599/82 on 'special use as regards the date of its implementation'? This really makes no sense at all, and I should like to know what I am supposed to be voting on.

Dame Shelagh Roberts, Chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations. — Madam President, the House approved the report on this regulation very recently. What the Council is now seeking to do is to postpone its implementation from August of this year

Shelagh Roberts

to January of next year which does not seem to me to be a subject of earth-shaking importance.

President. — This is a request for urgency. I can accept one speaker for and one speaker against, after which we shall vote.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Madam President, before voting on decisions of urgency we normally receive a recommendation from a Committee member. But perhaps the Committee too is ignorant of the content of this report. Anyway we should be glad to know what we are voting on.

President. — It was the Council that requested urgency, Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Madam President, we should have a recommendation from an expert member of the House as to whether we should vote for or against. In the absence of one I shall have to reject the proposal.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Madam President, I am not usually so fussy and finicky. But page 14 of yesterday's minutes says only that 'urgency was justified by the fact that the Council was required to take a decision on this proposal before 30 June 1985'. What I want to know is just what the proposal says. If no one can tell me, I would suggest we do not vote on it until 3 p.m. when we have had a chance to read this document.

President. — Mr Gautier, we have heard one speaker for and one against; I am now bound to proceed to the vote.

(Parliament rejected urgency)

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Madam President, perhaps this really is a matter of urgency. I do not think my Group voted against because it disagrees with the content. We just do not know what the content is. If you would like to try again and tell us what the content is all about we can probably vote in favour of treating the matter as urgent, if the reasons are adequate. But since we do not know what the content is, we have voted against.

President. — Mr Gautier, that is well understood.¹

3. Iron ore

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Mühlen, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on

Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on the production and supply of iron ore in the Community (Doc. A 2-21/85).

Mr Mühlen (PPE), rapporteur. — (FR) Madam President, nobody would have believed three decades ago that the iron ore industry, one of the three pillars of the first European Community, the Coal and Steel Community, was going to run into such serious economic and social problems in years to come. Despite all the care and attention that it has received from the authorities responsible for application of the ECSC Treaty, it is no longer the key industry that it once was. Only 18% of the iron ore supplied to the Community steel industry now comes from Community mines, and total EEC output of iron ore has fallen from 113 million tonnes in 1960 to only 17 million tonnes in 1985.

When I started work as a young economist for the ECSC, there were still 29 000 people employed in ore mining in Lorraine, the Community's largest iron ore field. Today, the iron ore mines have a workforce of only 2 900 and, as we know, this downward trend, which is very damaging in terms of both its economic impact and its social consequences, is still continuing. A further 800 jobs are soon to be lost in Lorraine alone, and this will be a further blow to the Community's iron ore mining industry. This trend, I hasten to add, is bound to have repercussions on the steel industry in the region, which originally grew up there largely because of the availability of local ore supplies. How right Mrs Vaysade was last August to table a motion for a resolution calling upon the Parliament and the Commission not to remain inactive in the face of this situation.

The report which I have the honour to present to you confirms the gravity of the situation now confronting the iron ore mining industry in the Community. Without wishing to go into the details of my report, I nevertheless feel that it is necessary to draw particular attention to a number of fundamental observations. The first point to be stressed is that, in discussing the problems of this industry, we are basically talking about the iron ore mines in Lorraine. With an annual output of 14 million tonnes, they account for almost 90% of the total tonnage of iron ore extracted in the Community as a whole. In this connection, the implications for the steel industry in this border region are not to be overlooked, since the decline of iron ore production in Lorraine means that this traditional steelmaking region is losing its mining base. The repercussions of this extend beyond the frontier since, although the level of iron ore output is falling, locally produced ore has continued to account for a considerable proportion of the supplies used by the steel industry in both Lorraine and Luxembourg.

Secondly, allow me to run through the main factors which have influenced the decline of the iron ore min-

¹ Topical and urgent debate (announcement): see Minutes.

Mühlen

ing industry in the European Community. The key factors are the low iron content in EEC ore, the lack of tangible results from research aimed at enrichment of ore from deposits in the Community and from Lorraine in particular, the sharp rise in workable iron ore reserves elsewhere in the world, and the steady fall in freight rates.

However, when making a judgment on the situation in the Community's iron ore mines, recognition must be given to the efforts which have been made to cope with increased competition from iron ore imported from other countries, and in particular to the improvement in productivity, which in Lorraine rose from 12 tonnes per man shift in 1960 to 48 tonnes per man shift in 1983, a fourfold increase in 23 years.

What conclusions should be drawn? Given the very high proportion of EEC output of iron ore accounted for by Lorraine, you will appreciate that I will be referring primarily to that region in my comments.

First of all, everything must be done to protect the workers concerned from the repercussions of the decline of this industry. Your committee accordingly considers that Community solidarity with the mining areas should take the form of wise use of the instruments available for this purpose under the Treaty, both on the social plane, with retraining schemes for the workers affected, and on the economic plane, more specifically in connection with the creation of new jobs and regeneration of the region's economic fabric. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy also believes that the Commission should be asked to examine the effects on the steel industry of changes in the pattern of iron ore supply. It appreciates that, in the case of supplies from Lorraine, for instance, this is a problem which transcends national frontiers and that it should therefore be examined in terms of the whole of this steelmaking area straddling national borders.

Clearly, a call for financial resources to be provided for retraining of workers affected by closures and the development of alternative industries in these areas is not to be interpreted as an admission that the iron ore mines there have no future. On the contrary, there is still every prospect for the maintenance of certain capacities. I refer to certain capacities because I am loth to use such terms as strategic reserve or security of supply, since the Commission has frowned on use of these expressions. This will be possible as long as no effort is spared in reducing operating costs to the minimum. Only if this is done will these capacities be profitable — a consideration which various committee members urged me not to overlook.

To this end, investment must be continued, especially in order to reduce operating costs. Following mine closures, these costs have risen considerably in recent years. Economic and social arguments have been advanced for requesting that the benefits of the ECSC

Treaty provisions be extended to this investment. It would be irresponsible if failure to carry out the investment required for sound operation at the lowest possible cost were to force the closure of further mines or cause planned closure dates to be brought forward.

Finally, the authorities should be aware that the imposition of abnormal charges on the mines, such as those enumerated in my report, will not be conducive to the mining of iron ore under optimum conditions.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, these are the considerations which I would ask you to keep in mind when you are called upon to adopt the conclusions set out in my report.

(Applause)

Mrs Vayssade (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, let me say first of all what a pity it is that the vagaries of our agenda have caused this debate to be carried over to today, because yesterday afternoon there was a party of iron ore miners' trade union representatives from Lorraine in the galleries, and they would have been interested to hear what is going to be said about their future.

Next I should like to express my satisfaction at the acceptance by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy of the motion for a resolution that I had tabled, and to thank Mr Mühlen for the thorough job that he has made of his report.

I represent a region, Lorraine, which now supplies 90% of the iron ore mined in Europe and which is therefore the last bastion of iron ore production in the Community. It seems to me that the iron ore mines have hitherto been the poor relations of the ECSC, whereas they must be an important part of any policy on steel and it was their very existence in Lorraine which provided the foundation for the development of the steel industry in the region.

I now wish to stress three points in particular in connection with the iron ore mines, which could really be described as three requirements.

First, the essential requirement to keep the mines open and producing ore. This is not merely to safeguard jobs but to maintain a minimum degree of security for Europe. Not, of course, irrespective of the costs and conditions. But I believe that when immediate profitability is the only criterion taken into account when considering this problem, many aspects are overlooked. As the rapporteur has just reminded us, ECSC machinery exists for aid to be provided to help finance the essential investment which is needed immediately. In this connection, I hope that Parliament will vote in favour of Amendment No 1 tabled by us, which confirms what Mr Mühlen has just been telling us.

Vayssade

Second, the requirement for a research policy to be pursued and intensified on the utilization of European ore reserves. The early research has yielded more fruitful results than we are being given to understand.

Third, a requirement to make provision for the future of the people affected, working or retired miners and their families, and for the future of their region and the mining areas. Having already suffered repercussions from the crisis and the restructuring of the steel industry, the iron ore mines are becoming a tragic problem for Lorraine. Aid for redevelopment should be provided wherever it becomes absolutely impossible to keep a mine open, and the arrangements for aid and redevelopment should be in place even before a closure occurs.

In order to deal with the problems of these areas it is necessary for the integrated development scheme planned for Lorraine to be brought forward and perhaps for other forms of action, such as transfrontier projects to develop new industries, to be devised.

I trust that the Commission will be giving clear answers and commitments on these various points. I also hope that the study to be carried out will include a review of the scrap market, because heading for a steel industry based on scrap is no solution either.

I urge the Community not to sacrifice these last few iron ore mines lightly, without having weighed all the consequences.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Mühlen's excellent report provides us with extremely valuable information on the subject of our debate today. Not only have supplies of iron ore become very abundant in the world — proven reserves have trebled in five years and are estimated to amount to over 100 times the current level of production — but in addition the producer countries are very evenly spread, with open-cast mines in Australia, South Africa, Mauritania, Brazil, Canada and Sweden, not to mention countries in Eastern Europe.

We therefore consider the chances of the formation of a cartel along the lines of OPEC to be very remote. Moreover, prices have been coming down steadily in relative terms. It is accordingly difficult to see how the efforts that we should be making on behalf of these mines can be justified in terms of security of supply.

In addition, the Lorraine minette ores are particularly vulnerable. They have lost all competitiveness, having an iron content of only about 35%, compared with between 60% and 65% in imported ores. They also contain phosphorus, which makes them unsuitable for use in electric furnaces, and all attempts at enrichment have proved either costly or unreliable.

Finally, using Lorraine minette ores in blast furnaces involves additional coke consumption of about 150 kg

per tonne produced. This is an insurmountable handicap.

I therefore believe that what we can do — and we have reached the stage when it must be done — is to organize an orderly withdrawal from these activities and above all make arrangements for the development of alternative industries, retraining and provision for the social costs, which will be substantial, I know, although there are now fewer than three thousand workers employed in this industry in Lorraine. Consequently, strongly as I would recommend action by the Community to assist industrial redevelopment and renewal and to help meet the social costs, money must not be wasted on industries which have no long-term future.

The French steel industry is under a considerable handicap in comparison to the German steel industry, for instance, because France imports only 65% of its ore supplies while Germany imports 99%. This makes a big difference in production costs.

I therefore believe that, in adopting the amendments that I have tabled, we can take account of the social needs while at the same time displaying political realism.

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Madam President, I should like to add my voice to those that have praised Mr Mühlen for this excellent report. Much of what I wanted to say has already been covered both by Mr Mühlen himself and by Mr Herman. However, I would just like to add two brief points. First, in response to the point made by Mrs Vayssade on the question of the availability of scrap. There has been a certain amount of misinformation in a recent hearing that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy held on the availability of scrap and the price of it. I am assured that there is no problem about the availability of scrap and that we should also regard this as an important and continuing alternative raw material for the steel industry. A raw material, incidentally, which can be converted into steel much more economically and flexibly than iron ore because, as you know, scrap is smelted in the electric arc furnace which can be turned on or off depending upon availability, whereas iron ore needs blast furnaces which are capital and labour intensive and need to be kept going twenty-four hours out of twenty-four.

I would agree that we need to ease the impact of industrial decline on those workers involved in the iron ore industry, particularly in Lorraine, but I would resist the amendments put forward by Mrs Vayssade, Mr Besse and others calling for the maintenance of minimum production to avoid the Community's being dependent on outside suppliers. As has already been pointed out, there is no shortage of iron ore in the world and indeed there is no shortage of scrap as an alternative to iron ore.

Mr Besse (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, I must begin by thanking Mr Mühlen for his report, which reflects his concern to take account of all aspects of the situation in the iron ore mines, as interpreted from the standpoints of experts, trade unions and users. It is also a report by a man who knows the region, who knows that there are workers, miners, who are winning the iron ore to keep steel plants supplied, and researchers who are working on improved enrichment processes. In short, I support or shall be supporting many of the points in this report.

My motive in tabling amendments, both in committee and at this stage, has been the fact that a notion contained in the first draft of this report no longer features in the version that we now have before us.

The Community, as you know, is dependent on imports of mining products. This applies in many areas, but iron ore is prominent among these products. The Community is the world's largest importer of ore, and this points up the extent of our dependence as far as mining reserves are concerned.

A few months ago one of our former colleagues in this Parliament, Mr Moreau, spoke on the problems of European security. He defined three categories: military security, of course, energy security, and also security in mining products, referring to various strategic ores, such as cobalt and titanium, but also iron ores. Mr Mühlen was reminding us of this a few minutes ago when he said that there were still 18% of mining reserves, in other words the largest metal resources in the Community. I should like to see an expression of this concern to maintain a degree of flexibility and to reduce our dependence incorporated into the final version of the report. This is why I have tabled an amendment.

Having heard it said that the Commission was not in favour of the notions of strategic reserves or mining security, and that these notions were not to enter into this debate, I put this question: how do we guarantee and maintain a degree of flexibility on the basis of Europe's existing mining reserves, which must continue to be exploited, since this is an issue affecting the Community's capacity for independence and diversification?

Mr Mallet (PPE). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly impressed by the quality of Mr Mühlen's excellent report and approve the policy lines that it recommends. I should nevertheless like to make a few comments on one passage in this report which has a particularly strong bearing on the future of Lorraine, a region in the throes of severe economic and social difficulties. I refer to paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution, which has been the subject of several amendments.

I personally share the rapporteur's view on the need to maintain a minimum level of production in the 'cap-

itive' mines, which are still able to supply the steel plants nearby under satisfactorily cost-effective conditions. Like him, I believe that other considerations must be taken into account as well as the objective of cost-effectiveness.

The first of these considerations is the social and human cost of closing down mines and the difficulties of retraining miners for alternative employment, bearing in mind, let us not forget, that their numbers have already been reduced by 90% since 1960.

The second consideration is the need to establish a minimum level of security of supply. For my part, I believe that we must think in terms of the fortunately improbable hypothesis of an international crisis posing a threat to our lines of communication by sea.

That said, the major problem is to determine the conditions and resources required for viable operation of the iron ore mines in the Community. This is why, taking a rational view, I shall be supporting the amendment to paragraph 5 tabled by my colleague Mr Herman, as long as his own sub-amendment is also adopted. I interpret it as meaning that a well planned Community programme of modernization and research would ensure that the iron ore mines could remain in production for many years to come, since it would reduce operating costs and improve productivity. In a word, we say no to open-ended subsidies, and yes to aid for modernization, aid for industrial redevelopment and, if necessary, for retraining of redundant miners. These measures should be incorporated into a long-term overall regional development policy aimed at the creation of new industrial activities and new jobs.

What is really involved here is the fate of an entire region which has been severely affected by unemployment. We have every confidence that the European Community will help it to make provision for its future.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the ECSC has in principle allocated 600m dollars for loans to the famous Carajas iron ore mines in Brazil and has already transferred some 400m of this amount. These are open-cast mines.

The reason given for these loans is that the Community needs to diversify its sources of iron ore supply. I am afraid this is a particularly unwise decision, firstly, because it is far from certain that the objective of a supply of iron ore to the European steel industry will be achieved and, secondly, because of the disastrous implications for the people and the economy of Brazil. On page 12 of his report Mr Mühlen rightly emphasizes that the Carajas project is being paralysed by its own gigantic size. It takes eight to twelve years before a large mine goes into operation. Production and infrastructure costs will go on rising. For example, 900 kilometres of railway will have to be built.

Van Hemeldonck

What is more, the Community is primarily involved in providing the transport infrastructure, while the large non-Brazilian multinationals — US Steel, Méridional, which is a subsidiary of US Steel, Esso, Nippon Steel and Compagnie du Nickel de Nouvel Calédonie — and Swiss and Canadian holdings will continue to control most of the actual mining.

Regarding the implications for Brazil itself, it is estimated that this project will cost more than the Suez Canal or the Siberian gas pipeline. It will impose an enormous debt burden on a country that is already sinking under the weight of its debts. It also has tremendous political implications. Regional autonomy is being completely cast aside, and the whole area is being militarized, so to speak. 82% of the state is now under the control of the central government. Only 7 000 ha was needed for mining, but the government controls 40 000 ha. The environmental consequences will be enormous. When the geologist dos Santos, who discovered the ore deposit, saw the effects the mining is having on the original inhabitants of the area and the devastation of the Amazon region, he said he was now bitterly sorry that he made his discovery known. And yet the ECSC was prepared to offer loans of 600m dollars. We might ask whether it would not have been far better to invest this money in the Community, in areas where iron mines can still be modernized given some investment.

Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) Madam President, I should like to begin by joining with all those who have expressed their thanks to the rapporteur, Mr Mühlen, for his circumspect, thorough and excellent report. We have nothing to add to it.

By way of introduction I would remind you that the Commission is very well aware of its obligations under the ECSC Treaty which says in Article 3(d) that the Community 'shall . . . ensure the maintenance of conditions which will encourage undertakings to expand and improve their production potential and to promote a policy of using natural resources rationally and avoiding their unconsidered exhaustion'.

As long as iron ore mining in the Community remains economically viable, every effort must be made to maintain it. The iron ore mining companies cooperate closely with the domestic steel industry and know very well the minimum quality requirements of iron ore and the costs of extracting and processing it up to the pig iron stage. Annex II of the report details all the measures taken to keep the Community's iron ore mining industry competitive.

Unfortunately the report does not make clear that nearly all these measures, particularly those concerned with iron ore research, have in the last thirty years been financed and initiated with the help of the ECSC, especially under Article 55. To make my point let me

remind you of just two projects. To reduce production costs, for example, studies were conducted on new winning machines not previously in common use in the iron ore industry, so that special production per man and shift was increased several times over. Or transport costs were significantly reduced by means of underground links, thus reducing the closure of pit areas located away from iron and steelworks.

In addition, repeated efforts were made, sadly in vain, to solve the phosphorus problem. My view is that the physical possibilities are largely exhausted, and to this extent I expressly agree with the report's assessment. But personally I still retain some hope that chemical and metallurgical possibilities may still in the medium term lead to changes and improvements in mining and production technology. And so if there should be opportunities in future of making the Community's iron mining industry competitive, the Commission will do everything it can to seize all recognizable chances. Corresponding projects, suggestions and investment and research applications under Articles 54 and 55 of the ECSC Treaty must, however, come from the industry itself.

I think I should point out that in addition to aid measures under Articles 54 and 55 the Commission has also always given consideration to the social and regional problems connected with the closing of iron mines in the Community. The miners affected by mine closures are in exactly the same position as the steelworkers affected by steelworks closures. Thus primarily small and medium-sized industrial undertakings can qualify for reduced-interest conversion loans under Article 56(2)a for investment, provided this investment creates new jobs and that these new jobs are as far as possible given to former ECSC workers. The interest subsidy for conversion loans, which may be up to 5%, can be granted out of the ECSC budget funds available at the time.

In Member States affected by iron mine closure aids for social measures are also constantly granted under Article 56(2)b of the ECSC Treaty. Since 1979, for example, over 7 million ECU have been made available for a total of 2 317 workers affected by closures in France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Luxembourg.

Those affected are also largely, under the special measures for ECSC social measures, — the so-called *volet social* — entitled to receive assistance in the steel sector. Repeated references have been made in the debate to the question of ensuring supplies. Perhaps I could add this: the ensuring of adequate ore supplies at competitive prices is first and foremost a matter for the companies concerned. They will have to bear in mind — and this is relevant to the present case — the advantage they are currently able to draw from the high rates of the dollar, the fact that Community ore sales are not transacted in dollars and thus do not follow the cost increases suffered by ores invoiced in dol-

Narjes

lars. The Commission does not deny the political and strategic aspects of dependency for supplies, and attendant price risks, which could arise if all world supplies or a large part of them were to fall into the hands of an oligopoly over whose decisions the Community had no influence. Considerations on the maintenance of a degree of European self-sufficiency or minimal production also belong in this context, of course. But this idea is only realistic if the objective can be achieved at acceptable economic costs. At the moment this is open to question.

But the Commission is prepared to follow every possible avenue of research if it leads to an even semi-plausible hope that such an objective might be achieved. In the case of Lorraine we are also bearing in mind that according to the report deposits there will not last longer than fifteen to twenty years. For strategic reasons we must also assume that ore deposits in Sweden and Norway offer a comparatively better guarantee of supplies for us than ore deposits in other continents.

Furthermore — and this too falls within the present context — the Commission regards it as an ongoing duty attentively to monitor and if necessary to promote continuing geological exploration throughout the continent of Europe, and I should point out that we shall in the foreseeable future no longer be six original Member States but twelve Member States with a correspondingly larger area of territory. Indeed, more intensive exploration for other minerals which is already under way has already yielded interesting results. From platinum in the Shetland Islands to copper at several locations in the Community, on a scale previously unimaginable.

I would, nevertheless, like to rule out the idea of using trade measures to achieve our objective. Any form of protectionism would increase the cost of raw materials supplies for more than 80% of the ore used, i. e. all the ore which has to be imported, and this at a time when the European steel industry will be exposed to fierce competition for years, if not decades, to come. Above all in social terms it would be indefensible to jeopardize further the competitiveness of the European steel industry by adding further costs generated somewhere in Europe.

Ensuring supplies from outside the Community thus means diversifying our sources of supply as far as possible. Ideally in such a way that even in the worst possible case there could be no serious threat to our supplies. Consequently I should like to comment, in connection with No 8 of the motion for a resolution, that the question is not one of 'either/or' but of 'both/and'. Diversification thrives on tapping as many politically, geographically and economically separate and independent sources as possible and opening up the transport routes to and from them. This is why the Community has been busy in Carajas and why it is currently examining more closely the possibilities of opening up additional rich ore deposits in west Africa.

Discussions are currently under way between the Commission, Community iron ore consumers, the mining companies concerned and west African governments.

President. — The debate is closed.

Next vote will take place at the next voting time.

4. Budget 1985

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Fich, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the new draft general budget of the European Communities for the 1985 financial year (Doc. 1 2-30/85).¹

I have just learned that Mr Fracanzani, who was to have been here as President-in-Office of the Council, was in a car accident last week and has suffered this week a relapse. As a result of which he cannot be here this morning. He sends his apologies. In sending him our sincerest wishes for a speedy recovery I think I am speaking on behalf of us all.

(Applause)

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — *(DA)* Madam President, if we reopen the budget debate, it is important to remember the political climate in which we do so. We are in a more optimistic climate than we were when we last debated the budget, in last autumn. We are now in a situation in which the enlargement of the Community is a reality, integrated Mediterranean programmes have been adopted, action is being taken on the internal market and we now see a more positive development in a large number of fields than we did before. It is important for Parliament to contribute to this positive development, since it is now clear that we shall have a budget. I should stress that we also wanted one in the autumn of 1984, but we rejected the budget at that time because what we were presented with was not really a budget at all. It was — as has been said — a budget covering 10 months, not a budget for the whole year, so that we had no alternative but to reject it.

We now have before us what we understand as a budget for 12 months. The expenditure covers 12 months, and the budget is financed. Thus I think it is important to note that the rejection of the budget had a positive effect. Even though I was not among those involved in throwing out the budget, I must say today that progress has been made as a result of that move.

¹ Also included in the debate is the oral question with debate by Mr F. Pisoni and others, to the Commission, on the review of the Common Agricultural Policy and its budgetary implications (Doc. B 2-282/85).

Fich

If I am to review the individual areas, I should like to start with expenditure on agriculture. The Council of Ministers has now followed up the Commission's proposal and has increased the expenditure on agriculture by 1.9 billion ECU, so that it covers 12 months. But it is clear that this is subject to certain conditions: to begin with, price increases must remain limited and secondly there must be a constant effort to prevent the continued production of surpluses. Generally speaking I feel I can say — and Parliament's Committee on Budgets has already said so — that Parliament is satisfied with the increase in agricultural appropriations.

The second area I wish to refer to is the question of repayments to Great Britain. Here there is still no agreement between the Commission and the Council on the one hand and Parliament on the other. This is a long story, and it may be surprising that we have reached the position we are now in, for most of us here know that nobody — apart from the British Government — is really happy with the decisions which have been taken in the Council of Ministers on refunds to the United Kingdom. Even so, that one government has managed to push through a solution which everyone is dissatisfied with.

The Committee on Budgets yesterday evening decided that it cannot accept the Council's position on refunds to Britain and adopted two resolutions on the matter: on the one hand the Committee on Budgets wishes to scrap the VAT-related correction mechanism which will mean a repayment of 1 billion ECU to Great Britain. On the other hand we have entered a pm on the expenditure side of the budget under which the expenditure for the repayments to Great Britain — and we support the plan to let Britain have 1 billion ECU in 1985 — can be defrayed. It should be remembered that in November there was not just a pm at that point in the draft budget; the amount which was to be repaid to Great Britain was shown. The reason why we have now opted for a pm alone is that the funds are not available. So far the Council of Ministers has not been prepared to release the funds necessary to enable compensation to be paid via the expenditure side of the budget. But as soon as the appropriations are available, the accounts can be itemized, and the repayments to Great Britain can take place.

The reason why we so emphatically reject any adjustment to the VAT rates is that, if we accept such an adjustment now, it will mean that, instead of having a common VAT rate, we shall end up with three different rates: one for the United Kingdom, one for the Federal Republic of Germany and one for the other Member States. Then we shall soon have, not three, but four, five or perhaps one day ten or twelve different VAT rates, and that will mean the end of financial solidarity in the Community. It will mean absolute chaos on the revenue side of the budget and an annual fight between the Member States over who is to pay and, in particular, who is not to pay.

A new element with respect to the budget we had before us in November-December 1984 is the inter-governmental agreement. The Member States have agreed that an amount of 1.9 billion ECU should be appropriated, which is not to be repaid. It is in its way a positive factor that we have this extra appropriation. It was necessary to provide the means for a 12-month budget. But Parliament emphatically rejects the proposition that the size of the amount should be decided at the present stage. This in fact turns the budget procedure upside down. If we read the Treaties, we note that there are two budget readings in the Council and two budget readings in Parliament and that, once these readings have been concluded, it is possible to determine the extent of expenditure and then the amount of revenue required to cover it. But what the Council has done here is to fix a ceiling in advance on the resources which are to be available to the Community, ie — to put it somewhat bluntly — the Council has imposed budgetary discipline on Parliament. By this decision, the Council has restricted the legal prerogatives of Parliament as they are laid down in the Treaties.

A second new element is the question of own resources, on which the Commission has revised its position. It estimated that there would be 232 million ECU in own resources additional to the estimate available at the end of 1984. Unfortunately the Council of Ministers has not adopted this estimate and has reverted to the original figure of autumn 1984. But Parliament's Committee on Budgets has decided to go back to the Commission's proposal, because we think it is the right one. We feel that the Commission is best placed to assess income; it is our administrative machine, which can provide us with the figures we need. If the Council of Ministers continues this policy of making unilateral adjustments to the revenue side of the budget — and that is indeed a policy which already began in 1984 — the revenue side will no longer be a neutral, administrative matter, but will develop into a battlefield for deciding what should and should not be entered. This would be a very unfortunate development. Parliament therefore intends to reinstate the 232 million ECU which the Commission had proposed to increase own resources.

Then there is the question of the deficit from 1984, amounting to 417 million ECU. It will not come as a surprise to anyone here, because Parliament already said at the time the supplementary budget for 1984 was being finalized that it was not enough. We already made it plain then that the budget was about 500 million ECU short, and events have shown that Parliament was right. But the Council of Ministers stubbornly insisted at the time that it was not the case.

I now have to point out that we were right and the Council of Ministers was wrong. But that will do little to help. We are stuck with a deficit of 417 million ECU for 1984. In the view of the Committee on Budgets this sum should be cleared now: it should be

Fich

entered as a loss in the budget. There is no reason to carry this 417 million forward to future years; we may just as well pay it off now. We shall not do better by waiting till next year to pay it. It is plain that it cannot be done within our 1% margin, and the Committee on Budgets therefore proposes that the deficit be covered by the intergovernmental agreement and that the sum provided be increased by a corresponding amount. Since it is the Council of Ministers which has created this deficit, it is only fair that the Member States should cover it.

Apart from those points, I should like to say that the Committee on Budgets has reaffirmed the priorities we already adopted when we discussed the 1985 budget last autumn. The priorities are still the fight against unemployment and the fight against hunger in the world. This was manifested in concrete fashion, since the Committee on Budgets voted *en bloc* to readopt all the amendments which were adopted here in this Chamber on 14 November 1984. These motions for amendments — about 200 in all — reflected this order of priorities: priority for the fight against unemployment and priority for the fight against hunger in the world. Apart from these motions for amendments, which were already on the table on 14 November and were adopted by the full House, the Committee on Budgets has only recommended a few others. I will review them very briefly.

To begin with, the Committee on Budgets recommends that we make an extraordinary contribution of 100 million ECU to food aid. That will not surprise anyone; we all know that developments have gone in the wrong direction and that the need for food aid is even greater than it was in the autumn of 1984. We are in a manner of speaking using all the additional resources we have received since the autumn of 1984 to increase food aid, ie resources amounting to 100 million ECU. I must stress that it is still not enough. It is still not a sum which responds to the need, but we are not responsible for that because, with the limited margin of manoeuvre we have, there are no better possibilities open to us. We are limited to a ceiling of 1% and, regardless of how great the political will is — and I think it is great in Parliament — there is simply no scope for more increases, and that is something I deeply deplore.

The second area in which we are adding something new is the question of the integrated Mediterranean programmes. Here we think that the Commission's proposal for 140 million ECU in appropriations for commitment is reasonable. We are greatly surprised that the Council of Ministers does not support it. The Council of Ministers, which itself adopted the integrated Mediterranean programmes, is not prepared to support the Commission's proposal. But Parliament takes the view that the integrated Mediterranean programmes should be launched now, and there is therefore a need for 140 million ECU in appropriations for commitment.

Finally we allocate smaller increases of 15 million ECU for the Social Fund and advances for the development of Polish agriculture amounting to 5 million ECU. These are also motions for amendments which were adopted yesterday evening in the Committee on Budgets.

It is a special pleasure for me to be able to announce a new measure which the Committee on Budgets adopted yesterday evening, namely the withdrawal of the third financial protocol with Turkey. That was a proposal which was not adopted by the full House on 14 November 1984, but the Committee on Budgets yesterday evening recommended — and with a large majority — that we should now take the consequences. As we did in connection with the special aid to Turkey and the fourth financial protocol, we now propose to cancel the amount which is to be paid out via the third financial protocol to Turkey. I will not hide my personal satisfaction over this decision taken by the Committee on Budgets yesterday evening, and I hope that the full House will follow it on Thursday when we vote.

Otherwise it only remains for me to add a very small amount of about half a million ECU for the delegation in Angola. According to my information, Angola has now signed the Lomé Convention — a very positive step — and there is therefore a need for the Community to act quickly and immediately to set up a Community delegation in Angola. That of course requires a corresponding appropriation.

My last point, Madam President, is that the entire budget, as most of us know, is less than 1% of the gross national product of the Member States. The resources with which we have to work — even though we sometimes feel we are dealing with large sums — are really quite limited compared with the resources available in the Member States. The reason why this budget procedure nevertheless attracts interest is that, each year, it is a political undressing of the Council of Ministers. There is no doubt that, generally speaking, the Council is stripped naked. And what does the budget procedure reveal each year? It reveals that all the resolutions passed by the Council of Development Ministers, the Council of Industry Ministers, the Council of Ministers for Employment and Social Affairs are apparently resolutions the finance ministers have never heard of. And when we come to the question of appropriations, the finance ministers are apparently not aware of what the specialized ministers have decided. Indeed they do not even seem to be aware of what the heads of state and government have decided at their various summits because, every single time, we see that the finance ministers do something entirely different.

In my opinion it is an intolerable situation. Surely the Council of Ministers in one composition should do the same as the Council of Ministers in another composition. I therefore call on the finance ministers to talk to

Fich

the ministers holding other portfolios in the various countries, so that we can get a coherent policy from the Council of Ministers, and a concrete proposal is that the Council of Ministers, when it comes to its second reading of this draft budget, will for the first time follow a coherent procedure of this kind.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DA)* Madam President, the Commission when it took office inherited a political conflict which was in deadlock over the budget for 1985. Political changes have since taken place such that the Community is now on the way back to the normal budgeting procedure. The Council has recognized the need for a budget to cover a full year, on that basis the Commission has been able to revive the budget procedure, and Parliament is making its contribution today with a very helpful and disciplined effort to assist in the rapid finalization of a budget.

The Council has completed its second reading. The results are not satisfactory on all points, seen from the Commission's point of view; on the other hand they do not prevent us from moving on. Parliament is now having its first reading. The Commission will no doubt not agree with Parliament in every respect, and I shall be returning to this a little later. But we shall be continuing to move in the right direction. I should like on behalf of the Commission to express my gratitude for that.

Although there is still disagreement between the institutions involved in this process on specific points, there are no signs of a new political crisis. Disagreements are to be expected and are unavoidable: it is an inevitable consequence of the way we have built up our institutions. But alongside the institutional seed of disagreement we have also sown an institutional seed for final result. This consists in the decision-making and consultation procedures which in the last analysis determine how the final budget is to look. On the way through this process the Commission of course reserves the right to make its own independent interpretation of the opinions and proposals which come from the two wings of the budgetary authority. The Commission does not enter into any agreement with either the Council or Parliament. I shall therefore speak frankly and openly of our views on the Council's first reading and on the wishes which are now being expressed in Parliament and which emerge in particular from the report of the Committee on Budgets.

The Commission is in broad agreement with the financial framework which emerged from the Council's first reading. In essence the Council fully accepts the Commission's estimate of expected expenditure for the EAGGF, thereby making provision for a budget which will really cover twelve months. The amount has moreover received strong support from Parliament, and we therefore note that, in the key area which constituted the main grounds for the rejection of the budget last December, all three institutions are in agreement.

In other important areas, however, the Commission's demands have not entirely been met by the Council. These relate mainly to the appropriations for food aid and the coverage of the Community's net financing requirement in consequence of the 1984 deficit. I should like to make a few comments on these three problems and, in that connection, say something about the views to which I understand the Committee on Budgets wanted to draw particular attention in its report.

As I have said, the Council agreed to our demands in the agricultural policy field although, as you know, it did not happen without a fight. The position taken up by Parliament coincided with that of the Commission, but I would take this opportunity to state that the figures on which we have now agreed, the figures put forward by the Commission, constitute an absolute minimum. Developments in certain of the high-expenditure sectors indicate that the estimates we have made are conservative ones. Everyone must therefore be prepared for the Commission to apply great restraint and discipline in administering these appropriations, so that we can be sure of getting through the current budget year in a reasonable manner. We do not of course know at present whether the estimates for expenditure over the rest of the year will be adversely affected by external factors, such as the rate of the dollar, world market prices and the harvest, but on the basis we now have to go on I conclude that, subject to restrictive, prudent and disciplined management, we have in the Council's budget proposal and with the support of Parliament reached a sound basis for a budget in the agricultural sector.

I may be said that the farm prices for the 1985-86 production year have not yet been adopted. Here I would emphasize that the Commission sticks to its moderate price proposal, which it thinks is right in the present situation. It is true that the Commission used its prerogative during the Council's first reading to issue a further letter of amendment in the course of the budget procedure. But I am concerned that the nature of this statement should not be misunderstood: we were not asking to be handed a blank cheque. It was a general statement not specifically concerned with the agricultural policy or any other sector, and the Commission only seeks to make use of its right of initiative if it considers it necessary or justified, and we do not see any grounds for that at the present time.

Christophersen

The financing which the Council wishes to make available under the intergovernmental agreement, as has been said, necessarily implies tight control. This applies not only to agricultural expenditure but also to important areas such as the Social and Regional Funds, where appropriations for payment must coincide precisely with the appropriations for commitment. Thus we must call upon all the institutions on a broad front to show forbearance; the Commission is ready to play its part.

Those were the more positive or acceptable elements in the Council's budget proposal. I shall now turn to the points on which the Commission is critical of the Council and, on a few points, I shall also be obliged to express criticism of what I understand to be the proposals of the Committee on Budgets to Parliament.

The first point I want to raise is food aid. In our letter of amendment concerning food aid, there is an additional appropriation requirement of 63 million ECU. This constitutes an absolute minimum, since it is in reality only an adjustment for grain price increases without any increase in the quantities disposed of. During its first reading the Council only decided to dispose of 26 million ECU extra in relation to last autumn — in other words in relation to an appropriation already drastically cut back. This is not only inconsistent, it is also politically very wrong for the Council to take that line. On the one hand, the Council is capitalizing on the effect of the grain price rises in its EAGGF budget and, on the other hand, it will not follow the same line in relation to food aid, where grain price increases mean an increase in expenditure for the Community. It is also a politically untenable position on the part of the Council — I have also said so in the Council — because it is in stark contrast to what the heads of state and government said at the European Council meetings in both Dublin and Brussels on the need for an increased effort in food aid and with what they said in support of the Commission's active food programme. It is also indefensible in relation to the actual needs as we now see them developing. For the food shortages in the hardest hit areas have plainly become more acute since last year. The Commission must therefore point out that full financing of the quantities proposed in the preliminary draft budget of June 1984 — ie the Commission's earlier proposal — can only cover the bare essentials and may not even be enough for that, if the present trend in the hardest hit areas continues.

If Parliament does not take action to correct the situation which the Council has created by its restrictions, we must expect that food aid will come to a halt early in the autumn, with all the political consequences that will have for the Community and its Member States and for the Community's reputation. Of course it is satisfying to note in this connection that the views of the Committee on Budgets — and this was also reflected in Mr Fich's speech — coincide to a large extent with the Commission's wishes. But I must point

out that even the proposal of the Committee on Budgets is at least 25 million ECU below the figure which the Commission in its letter of amendment indicated as the absolute minimum, and I find that both surprising and unfortunate. I hoped that Parliament would envisage a somewhat different order of priorities — and I still urge it to do so — because this question is one which eminently affects the Community's credibility in the world at large. I refer you to a recently published FAO report which shows that the situation is even worse than was previously thought. I therefore urge Parliament not to go below the Commission's already very modest estimate.

I should like now to pass on to another problem which I consider to be serious and important to this debate. It is a problem in connection with which the Commission is also dissatisfied with the Council's budget proposal, but we are also dissatisfied with Parliament's approach to it. It is the question of how we are to deal with the deficit for the 1984 financial year, finally adding up to about 419 million ECU. Here the Council has simply chosen to ignore the existence of the deficit. It has instead opted for a more general approach according to which the problem will be cleared up during the course of the year through the Commission's efficiency and ability to exercise tight control over spending. In that connection the Council has also ignored estimated additional revenue of 208 million ECU. In other words in the way the Council has dealt with the matter we see quite simply a large additional expenditure item and a smaller additional revenue item eliminated, so that we are left with a shortfall of just over 200 million ECU. It is the kind of administrative principle which I, as an official responsible for budgetary matters, find repugnant. Hiding a deficit by denying its existence is not a reasonable way to administer resources. But I am also disappointed on this point by the report of the Committee on Budgets and by Mr Fich's remarks. The solution proposed here is also one which I consider to be irresponsible or unrealistic. The report of the Committee on Budgets does indeed include the estimated additional revenue to the Community of 208 million ECU but wants to use it for additional expenditure. It is not to be used to cover some of the deficit but for *completely different* additional expenditure. On the other hand the report wants the entire deficit of 419 million ECU to be covered by asking the Member States — not the Council of Ministers — to increase the sum provided in the intergovernmental agreement by precisely that amount.

If, Madam President, I may be permitted to pose a rhetorical question, which does not need to be answered now: is it truly realistic, does it truly represent a realistic assessment of the possibilities to expect, not a vote in the Council, but agreement among all ten Member States to alter something which they had great difficulty in hammering out in the first place? Is it realistic? I put the question, because I think it is a reasonable one. The consequence at all events from

Christophersen

the Commission's point of view is that, while the Council by omitting to make good the difference between the deficit in 1984 and the estimated additional revenue in the current year has left us with a shortfall of just over 200 million ECU, the proposal of the Committee on Budgets leaves us with a shortfall of over 400 million ECU. That I think is the realistic consequence. The Council for its part expects that the sum it refuses to provide will be cleared by the creation of a surplus. I do not know that such a surplus is in the pipeline for this year, so I cannot say what the Council has in mind. And Parliament says that the Member States must come up with the money. I also do not know whether the Member States are ready to do so. This attitude on the part of both institutions thus forces the Commission to apply a tighter policy than is desirable in administering the budget for 1985 and will force it to present a more restrictive budget proposal for 1986 than it actually wished to. That is the consequence. In the final analysis you cannot just tuck a deficit away in a corner somewhere.

I wanted to say this in order to forestall subsequent criticism from Members of both the Council and Parliament. I merely wish to inform you of what the consequence of this approach will be. Clearly it can be done, and we shall have to do it if the vote turns out that way. It will not stop us having a twelve-month budget, but I do not find the way the two institutions have chosen to deal with the problem to be particularly helpful. The Council should have backed the Commission's proposal for an intergovernmental agreement involving an overall figure of 2 225 million ECU, instead of letting it rest at 1 981 million ECU, and Parliament should have refrained from increasing the sum by a further 200 million ECU. If both had accepted the proposal, we should have had the sum we needed.

Now I should like to comment on the remaining problems. First and foremost, the integrated Mediterranean programmes. Here the Commission, in its draft budget of last June, had already anticipated the adoption of a proposal in 1985; our letter of amendment for the 1985 budget does not therefore contain anything on the integrated Mediterranean programmes. We stick to the 140 million ECU in appropriations for commitment. The Council has cut these appropriations down to half the amount. Although there is still the possibility, following the Council's current deliberations, of an increase over what was decided last autumn — then the cutback was even more drastic — the appropriations are still not enough according to the Commission's estimates, if the proposed regulation on the integrated Mediterranean programmes is adopted before the end of June this year, and that is the date set in the conclusions of the European Council in March. The Commission considers it very important to stick to this deadline and is therefore very happy with the line taken by the Committee on Budgets on this point, having regard to the very great expectations in respect of these programmes and the significance they will have

for the development of the Community's southern Member States. The size of the proposal put forward by the Commission is right. It should not be any less.

I should like now finally to express the hope that we shall soon see the adoption of the budget for 1985. It is the Commission's hope that over the next month and a half we shall be able to conclude the work on the budget for 1985. We do not want to rush anybody, but it is important to normalize the situation. It will not help us if the process is delayed, and I can round off the remarks I have presented here on behalf of the Commission by saying that, despite the disagreement which is inevitable between the institutions, it has so far been possible to note that the process is keeping to the deadline agreed between the institutions. I express the hope that the debate to be conducted today will make its contribution to ensuring that the final decision taken will lead to the normalization of the Community's situation, on this point too, before the end of the first half year.

(Applause)

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(NL)* Madam President, it is obvious that the debate on the budget is closely linked to and influenced by the course of events on — if I may put it this way — the agricultural front, particularly with respect to the fixing of farm prices for the 1985/1986 marketing year.

It is equally obvious that the Commission's price proposals for this marketing year are partly influenced by and are important in the context of the study the Commission has undertaken into new prospects for those affected by the production limits that are now unavoidable.

On this latter subject Mr Pisani and other Members have suggested that certain specific aspects should be covered by the study: guarantees for the future where a change is made to different products, better information for farmers who make this change, a careful cost analysis if products have to be taken off the market during the various stages they then pass through, and so on. I can assure you that the mandate the working groups have received is broad enough for these aspects to be covered by the study, but I will draw their attention to the specific points the honourable Members have raised.

As regards the price situation, I should like to say the following. Firstly, it is extremely unsatisfactory that this Parliament should still be discussing the state of the negotiations in May and that no decision has yet been taken on prices for the coming marketing year. This is unacceptable to the farming community. Let us hope that the presidential compromise or the various stepping-stones towards a compromise that have now been proposed enables a final decision on prices to be

Andriessen

taken at the next meeting of the Council of Agriculture Ministers, which is to be held on 13 and 14 May. This does not alter the fact that the decision will be taken late and that our farmers cannot be left waiting any longer for this matter to be brought to a proper conclusion.

I think I can say that the stepping-stones laid in the President's document largely comply with the principles underlying the Commission's price proposal. As regards the level of prices, these ideas are generally based on the prices proposed by the Commission, the exception being, of course, the main issue in these negotiations, the price of cereals, where the Presidency proposes a far smaller reduction than the Commission.

As for the production thresholds that have been adopted in the past, it can be said that they remain intact even though their application in this initial phase is causing some problems in various sectors.

Where the milk sector is concerned, the decision taken last year remains in force: milk production in the next marketing year must be reduced by one million tonnes to bring production more closely into line with consumption.

The relative balance between what I will call for convenience northern and southern products will also be maintained in the package. As regards cereal prices, the Commission's position is that it cannot agree to the proposal made by the Presidency. The Commission still believes that there must be a significant reduction in cereal prices because of a policy adopted by the Community in the past, and this for both internal reasons, to influence the future activities of producers, and external reasons, to make it clear that, as a large exporter, we mean to continue playing a reasonable part in the world market.

So much for prices. I should just like to add that, where cereal prices are concerned, the situation in the Council is that some delegations feel the 1.8% now under discussion does not go far enough and thus tend to agree with the Commission, while other delegations believe there should be no reduction in prices at all in the cereal sector. I am not betraying any secrets when I say that this is particularly true of the German delegation.

The Commission believes that the stepping-stones that have now been proposed include so many positive elements that a final compromise price proposal can be put forward on Monday and will, I hope, be accepted by the Council. The Commission will stick to its original position — and this is important in the context of this debate on the budget — that the prices finally adopted must not, in general, have an adverse effect on the budget. If it should be decided to increase prices, there must be compensation in some other way and the Commission will therefore have to propose

compensatory action. What precise form this will take, it is impossible to say at the moment. It largely depends, of course, on the nature of the decisions eventually taken by the Council.

What I can say about the likely trend in these price decisions is that they will differ from the average prices advocated by a majority of this Parliament. We have had a long and tiring debate on this subject. I can only say that, in view of the problems we face, such pricing is unavoidable. As for the study on future prospects, which we have discussed and which was launched at the same time as this price policy, I think I can say that it will be possible at the end of the first half of this year to submit an option paper as a basis for serious discussion, so that these prospects as a whole can be included in the Community's price and market policy on some future occasion.

(Applause)

General considerations

Mr Dankert (S). — *(NL)* Commissioner Christophersen has just been good enough to indicate where our difficulties lie at a time when budgets have to be financed not only with own resources but also under intergovernmental agreements. We find that the Commission is asking Parliament to eliminate the 1984 deficit and at the same time to set aside more for food aid. The question is whether this can be done under intergovernmental agreements, and I do not think the Commissioner gave a clear answer to that question.

Madam President, I shall do no more than touch on a few points. Other speakers from my group will be discussing food aid, the regional policy, the social policy and agriculture. I shall confine myself to a number of more general aspects. I must start by saying that I hesitated for a very long time and was in fact originally opposed to this budget being debated this week, mainly because of the problems Commissioner Andriessen has just mentioned, but also for another reason: as I believe the meeting of the Committee on Budgets last night showed, Parliament can only have a reasonable debate on a budget if reasonable procedures are applied and if the necessary time is available. I do not think there should be a repetition of the hasty procedure which the Committee on Budgets was forced to adopt last night. But then I suppose we shall have to avoid rejected budgets in the future.

Madam President, from a political point of view I believe there are reasons — as Commissioner Andriessen has in fact just confirmed — for discussing this budget today. Firstly, there is no doubt that in one important respect the Council's draft has responded to the Parliament's criticism that the budget we rejected in December would not have covered the Community's expenditure in 1985. I believe Parliament has

Dankert

scored an important point with the addition of almost 2 000m under an intergovernmental agreement.

I know, of course, that the Council had already promised last year that it would use intergovernmental financing over and above own resources, but it also fixed a date, October of this year at the latest. And if the Council fixes a date, you can take it for granted that precious little will be done before that date, and in view of the ratification procedures that would then have had to be completed, I believe there would have been serious payment difficulties this year. In this respect, my opinion is that we have gained considerable ground by rejecting the draft budget.

But, of course, there is still the problem of financing the agricultural policy, the question of a possible supplementary budget, the implications this year and next. If Commissioner Andriessen manages to stick to his line, we can, I believe, get through the first reading this week without any trouble. If he does not manage to do so, the problem of the deficit, which Mr Christophersen has already mentioned, will be joined by the problem of farm prices, and we shall then have an extremely difficult situation in 1986, starting with own resources.

Alternatively, we shall, of course, have a situation of continuing irregularity as a result of a deficit being carried forward to 1986. That is a course which I have just said is possible but one which should be rejected. I have also heard some Members — two, I think — say that you might as well include a favourable balance in the 1985 budget. By what budgetary and formal means this could be done is completely beyond me.

But there is another way of undoing what Parliament is doing, and this rather shows how the whole business of dealing with budgets is deteriorating. I recall that in 1980, in connection with a supplementary budget, we had an almighty row with the Council over the old problem of the annuality of the budget, when the full Council spoke to us in a very admonitory tone about not respecting the principles of annual budgetary policy. But, Madam President, what we did at that time to solve our internal problems was child's play compared to what the Council is now doing to solve internal problems, and I intend to be at least as admonitory about this. Perhaps this shows that we must all obey the rules so that we can at least be sure that budgetary procedures are applied in a normal way, with the rights of both parties respected.

It is at any rate clear, Madam President, that it would be unacceptable if the Council tried, as it did last year — with some pressure on the Commission, I think — to use artificial means to save on expenditure entered in the 1985 budget. That would infringe existing rights and run counter to a decision that has already been taken.

I thus felt uncertain, Madam President, about the budget being debated this week, what with all the

problems connected with farm prices. I have been largely reassured by Commissioner Andriessen. This also means, of course, that the majority of the European Parliament will not get its way where farm prices are concerned — all the more reason, I feel, for having the first reading at this time.

Madam President, why so strict an approach? I think mainly because a number of major problems are slowly emerging. Firstly, it is clear that intergovernmental financing above the own resources ceiling is gradually leading to the serious erosion or undermining of the European Parliament's powers, which in turn means a recurrence of the manipulations needed to deal with the 1984 deficit.

I am also slightly worried that the way in which we deal with deficits and the like, perhaps the farm prices too, plus the problems connected with the structural deficit that has gone on for several years, plus the Mediterranean problems and all the rest of it, Spain and Portugal, that all this is helping to lead us little by little into a situation in which the Council upholds the principle of own resources only as a matter of form and, by making gradual increases, creates for itself a situation where it in fact no longer needs to submit to budgetary discipline at all but ensures it by increasing own resources from time to time. That is a situation which will strike at the very heart of this Parliament's rights.

I am also concerned about the trend in the budget — Mr Andriessen has in fact referred to this — in view of the effects which possible changes in the American agricultural policy will have on the agricultural part of the Community budget, and I am not talking about the dollar, simply about certain measures to stimulate production which might be the outcome of cuts under Farm Bills and the like. It seems to me that this is another element we should bear in mind when formulating longer-term policy if we want to avoid serious trouble.

And then there is the interesting problem mentioned by the Court of Auditors of the entry in the Community's budget of some 10 000m — that is the figure this year, I think; when the Court of Auditors worked it out, it was still 8 500m — in commitment appropriations which are not matched by payment appropriations. In other words, if this is another of the problems, I think it would be a good thing for Commissioner Christophersen to keep the promise he made during his inaugural speech that he would waste no time in putting forward proposals for what I would almost call sound multiannual planning of the Community's finances.

Madam President, I will conclude with a few words on the British contribution. One of the reasons for the rejection of the budget in December was, as you know, the European Parliament's refusal to agree to the entry of the adjustment and the United Kingdom's

Dankert

contribution on the revenue side. Since we abide by the principle that the Community's own resources are this Community's own resources and no one else's, there is no alternative but to enter imbalances on the expenditure side where they concern countries with a lower than average per capita gross national product. It is important that this principle should be established because we may soon be facing comparable situations with Portugal and perhaps Spain, and it is important that the Community should have a clear policy on this. Fontainebleau frustrated our plans in this respect. The Fontainebleau package is likely to be submitted to the national parliaments in draft treaty form in the near future, but until that time, the European Parliament has no cause to try and deprive the national parliaments of their freedom to ratify it if they so wish.

The majority of my group therefore endorses the view taken by the Committee on Budgets last night that the European Parliament cannot at the moment agree to the British problem being settled on the revenue side. It is a matter for legislation which does not yet exist. At the moment, then, we believe there is absolutely no reason to take the Fontainebleau agreement into account. It is a step backward from the position we adopted in December, but sometimes it is wise to take backward steps if they produce better results. I also think it may help to make the national parliaments more aware of the fact that, in view of the problems connected with intergovernmental financing, they now bear a large measure of responsibility for the establishment of a European budget.

Mr Pfennig (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the treaty enlarging the European Community to include Spain and Portugal, approved by the Council, has cleared the way for a series of financial decisions. The most important of these is the decision to improve the Community's income by raising the proportion of value added tax from 1% to 1.4%. Its incorporation into Community law by decision of Parliament and the Council, and its subsequent ratification by the national parliaments has now begun, so that the increase in own resources and the accession of Spain and Portugal will both occur on 1 January 1986.

This development has also meant progress over the question of the 1985 budget. The provision by Member States of non-refundable advances ensures that money will be available to cover all current costs for the 1985 budget year. The Council has finally conceded that its original choice of a budget covering only part of the year was not tenable, and in so doing it has confirmed that in throwing out the budget in December 1984 Parliament was doing the Community a service. Even so the solution the Council has now found to cover expenditure for 1985 still leaves a series of questions unanswered. The views of the Council and Parliament's Committee on Budgets continue to differ on the questions of covering the 1984 deficit,

the amount of additional revenue for 1985, the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, research funds and food aid. The amount of possible extra spending as a result of farm price decisions remains unclear, and there is violent disagreement on the form which the refunds to the United Kingdom and Germany should take. These problems must be settled in the budget procedure, however much Parliament welcomes the basic improvement reached in the Community's financial position. I must echo the President of the Commission in saying that despite this improvement the Community's finances will remain most inadequate to the tasks required of it under its policies.

Does anyone really seriously believe that a Community of twelve Member States with 320 million inhabitants can in the long term carry out its appointed tasks with an annual budget of 35 000 million ECU? The 1985 budget has a shortfall of over 2 000 million ECU compared with regular income, which can only be made good by extra funds from the Member States. In 1986 we shall have extra expenditure for Spain and Portugal. Thanks to first steps towards reforming agriculture, agricultural spending will no longer rise as sharply as hitherto, but in the best case it will still be 20 000 million ECU. Then there will be new costs such as that of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes and the extra compensation to Greece. In addition, money must be found for new policies, particularly research and development. Just how all this is to be paid for out of duties, levies and a future VAT proportion of 1.4%, no one yet knows. Least of all the Council of Ministers!

I fear that the Council which, because of its inability to take decisions, is not in a position to transform the present Community into a political, European union in all areas, will fall back on its tried and tested solution of getting the national governments to finance Community tasks. First indications of this are already discernible, unfortunately, in the area of research. Just how short the Community's regular own resources are going to be in future only in fact becomes clear when we look more closely at the Council's proposed solution to the question of the refunds to the United Kingdom and Germany. According to the Council the United Kingdom is to be allowed to decrease the Community's income over an unlimited period because it will get a refund of 1 000 million ECU and will not have to pay a corresponding level of VAT to the Community, which means that for the other Member States the 1.4% VAT ceiling will be reached very quickly. This solution actually means that only 1.3% VAT will be available to the Community.

The European Parliament has rejected this financial procedure as fragmentary and detrimental to the future development of the Community. It offends against the elementary principle that the Community, in order to fulfil its tasks, must also have the money to spend on them. It is particularly annoying that the institutions of the Community, viz. Council and Par-

Pfennig

liament, are prevented from securing the necessary revenue by means of tax legislation because the Member States have not as yet been willing to transfer legislative powers for certain types of tax other than VAT and their proceeds to the European Parliament and the Council as the responsible Community institutions. Consequently the European Parliament has no alternative but to reject the Council's proposed refund to the United Kingdom, with a reduction of the Community's income from VAT, and to demand a possible raising of the VAT ceiling to 1.6% as soon as the current amendment of the own resources system becomes effective.

If this constant bickering over Community finances and the Community's share of VAT is to cease — and I would stress that Parliament regards a period of budgetary calm as necessary — then other consequences have to be accepted. Legislative powers for certain types of tax should be given over to the European Parliament and Council as legislator and budgetary authority, and the Community should be given full powers over revenue and expenditure. The Community should at last be freed from its status as financially dependent on the Member States. Not until this becomes reality will there be true budgetary discipline and the corresponding responsibility which is needed as regards the taxation of the Community's citizens and as regards spending.

I can only appeal to the Council once again to abide by Parliament's proposals regarding amendment of the Community's financial constitution. The forthcoming Milan summit will provide an opportunity of making the necessary funds available in addition to rounding off the political and economic structure of the Community.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr Curry (ED). — Madam President, nearly a year ago there was a Summit Meeting at Fontainebleau which laid down the ground rules for ending the paralysis which had overtaken the Community, insofar as the Community revenue was concerned, insofar as the British contribution was concerned, insofar as enlargement was concerned, insofar as agricultural expenditure was concerned and, even in the margin, VAT compensation for German farmers for having swallowed the quota system on milk. In the last few months those ground rules have started to be translated into action. We do have an agreement on enlargement. We are now waiting for the ratification

of the new decision on own-resources, on revenue which may even now be in the bag for all I know. We do have the Commission proposals on farm prices which represent a sensible and serious step towards bringing that sector into balance.

In the next few weeks another stage will be completed when the Heads of State or Government decide what sort of future the Community is going to have. They must decide whether we are moving towards a union by way of a new treaty or by way of implementation of the treaties which exist. But the main point is that we do actually have momentum. After a long time of people talking about paralysis, that it does not work, that the whole thing has just ground into the sand, we have momentum.

However, I am afraid to say that Parliament, because of its particular predilection for political necrophilia as represented by the British budgetary rebate issue, is threatening that whole edifice. It is Banquo's ghost at every single feast to which we are summoned. I am fed up having to discuss this issue. We spend our life at home saying 'Who is afraid of Dooge? Who is afraid of Spinelli? Get in there. Have a look at it. See what we can get out of it. Participate!' Yet when we have to face the sort of decisions taken in the Budget Committee last night, we might just as well not bother, because we will not have an audience so long as we have this permanent guerilla warfare which takes place on this very sensitive issue.

If the decisions of the Budget Committee are adhered to — I assume Mr Fich is tooting his tin trumpet for the first reading, but if he decides to tootle it for two readings then we really are in a serious situation — the increase in own resources is threatened. I am not threatening, Mr Fich, I am forecasting I forecast that it threatens the increase in own resources. I forecast that it threatens the amount of money which will be available in the inter-governmental agreement. I forecast, therefore, that there will be immense difficulty in financing the farm price settlement. And Mr Andriessen has just worried me rather considerably with his talk of presidential compromises with which he might not agree but on which he will no doubt allow himself to be raped in the time honoured fashion of the Commission.

Finally, it actually threatens this Parliament's own future. Parliament talks about its own incompetence. How we must have enlarged responsibilities. Can you conceivably imagine the Heads of State or Government saying in the light of the sort of discussion we are having at the moment: 'Well, the Parliament is a sensible sort of body. Let's give it this, this and this'.

There are only two logical consequences of what Parliament is proposing. One is a rejection of the budget — and I notice nobody is tabling a motion of rejection, which makes me think that the trumpet is a tin one — or we have a disputed budget. But that has

Curry

exactly the same consequence as a rejection. Either of these solutions spells chaos just when we are moving into a period of hope and positive action. Now I understand Parliament's preoccupation with own resources and the rebate. I understand its fear that a temporary solution can be engraved in stone. We have only to recall the income tax introduced by William Pitt to finance the war against the French (I am rather fed up with the wars against the French) nearly 200 years ago. We still have it now — and it proved a very popular innovation, having been widely emulated.

You say, let us have the solution on the expenditure side. Well, let us just look at the prospects. First of all, we have the Farm Ministers meeting today. We all know that a more balanced pattern of expenditure is necessary. Will somebody inform the Farm Ministers that a more balanced pattern of expenditure is necessary if we are to reform the budget. Second, we are told in today's *Financial Times* under 'New guidelines for the Social Fund' that the rules are likely to mean a cut in cash for Britain. Is this a means of reequilibrating expenditure towards the expenditure side? In other words, every single trend is actually hostile to what you are seeking.

If you do want this, let us do it. I am willing to do it. Let us put down a motion saying that the United Kingdom should get a bigger share of the Social Fund and a bigger share of the Regional Fund. Let us put down a motion calling for restraint in farm prices. Let us use our budgetary powers not to make great declarations about what we hope somebody else will do, but what we can do ourselves by the introduction of these new policies which everybody is so enthusiastic about in principle but so dilatory in producing in practice. Help us achieve a free market in goods, services, insurance and know-how. In this way you will provide for the United Kingdom those macro-economic advantages which derive from her strength in that sector which the Federal Republic has got from her strength in the physical goods sector. That is a very important element in balancing the budget.

If you will help us do this we can find our way to a solution. Instead of just saying that we do not like where we are now and we wish we were somewhere else, we can actually chart the path to get there. If we do that, not only can we render a service to the Community, we can actually prove that this Parliament has something substantive to say and that it is prepared to put its money where its mouth is and its convictions where its rhetoric is.

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — (*IT*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in the second draft budget that the Council has put before us there are still some open questions, even if some progress has been made. Our rapporteur has already spoken about these open questions, and I do not wish to return to them, in as much as the Italian members of my Group are anyway in agreement.

I should like therefore to raise a specific point which, in my view, is the saddest point in our debate — as indeed was apparent from the words of Mr Curry — namely, the question of the refund to Great Britain.

On this point — which, in my view, is at the present time the political crux of the budget — I should like to make three observations. At the risk of repeating myself I should like, first of all, to reaffirm what has always been the position both of Parliament and of our Group: we do not question — and I am afraid it must seem boring of me even to repeat it, but I think it should be repeated anyway — we do not question the need for compensation to Britain; we know that there is a budgetary imbalance, we know that that is something that needs adjusting and we — like Parliament — know that this imbalance should be adjusted by controlling agricultural expenditure — we are most of us in agreement on that — and by the proper enlargement of the Community's common policies. We are also convinced that, in order to do this, a greater increase in own resources is necessary than the ridiculous increase of 1.4%, which has not yet come into force. This is my first, repetitious and boring observation, but it is one that I think must stand above any other consideration.

My second observation concerns an appraisal — and this, again, is repetitive — of what the Fontainebleau agreement amounts to. The Fontainebleau agreement is of course important, but it is also an agreement that we, the Parliament, have denounced for very precise reasons. We denounced it because the solution that was found as regards compensation for Britain is a solution that distorts the principles of the Community, one that is extremely dangerous and that, in fact, does not resolve the problems, because it introduces mechanisms that, starting with Great Britain and Germany, may reflect and have increasing repercussions on other Member States, cutting in this way across all the basic principles of the Community. And, remember, all of this new machinery that has been invented, with its distorting effects, is linked to an increase in own resources that goes from the very outset against what the governments themselves said at Fontainebleau, namely that compensation for the British was to be achieved through the enlargement of the Community's policies, since in reality the increase in own resources is limited to 1.4%.

I think that this should be borne in mind in order to find a realistic solution, which Mr Curry himself said he hoped for a few minutes ago. And that brings me to my third observation, regarding the 1985 budget. I think it would be unfair and unwise of Parliament to reject the 1985 budget. It would be a mistake not to take account of the fact that today, after the last Summit, and having regard to other political indications of a general nature, signs of receptiveness to new ideas are apparent at Community level: there are still not enough of them, but at least they are there, and our Institution must not be responsible for blocking

Barbarella

mechanisms that are moving forward — it must make them go forward.

But, my dear colleagues, although this is a fundamental fact, we, the Parliament, cannot on the other hand forego certain principles. It is not because we value the principles as ends in themselves, but because we are convinced that certain principles represent the basis, the only possible foundation for the balanced development of the Community, which we wish to develop.

For this reason we believe — and this is the proposal that we are making, partly in agreement with the rapporteur of the Committee on Budgets, and partly from a rather different standpoint — that the British problem as regards the 1985 budget cannot be solved in the manner put forward by the Commission — that is, on the revenue side of the budget: this is on legal and constitutional grounds, because the new level for own resources has not yet come into force, and you cannot take into account, on the revenue side, a mechanism that does not exist. When this mechanism does exist — even during the course of the year — it will then be possible to alter the manner of distribution of VAT. But until that time it will not be possible — and the Commission knows this, it calls itself the Guardian of the Treaties — and I shall therefore continue to express my surprise that proposals should have been put forward that undoubtedly are in line with Fontainebleau from the policy standpoint but which run totally counter to the most elementary law of the constitution of the Community. I am therefore fully in agreement with the amendment presented in this connection by the Committee on Budgets, because it is a distortion that should be eliminated. That does not mean however that we should not find a balanced solution to the question of the British refund.

I have put forward a proposal that is in some respects the same as that proposed by the rapporteur, that would remove the amount of the British contribution from the expenditure side and put in simply a p.m., since, like the rapporteur, I consider it of fundamental importance that the British refund should be made on the expenditure side, which is, moreover, what the Fontainebleau agreement says. Where I differ — as does the Group that I represent — is over the need to find, whilst sticking to these principles, a solution that will in some way take into account the real state of affairs today.

And since I believe, my dear friends, that the real basic problem for the Community today is to overcome the blocking of the 1.4% increase in VAT and provide the Community with the funds that it needs, it seems to me that, as a question of basic policy, we have to provide a stimulus, a spur, a pretext, even, so as to re-open the financial mechanism as soon as possible at European level, so that new rules of procedure can be put in hand, and this aspect of the Community's finances discussed afresh.

Everyone in this Chamber knows that 1.4% will cover 1986 expenditure, and that from 1987 onwards we shall need a VAT rate of at least 1.6%. This is where I can see how the question of the British contribution can be solved — through the connection between this increase, which is necessary, and the British compensation. What I mean in actual fact, ladies and gentlemen, is that we shall be true to our principles if we stick to the principle that the British refund must be an item on the expenditure side, whilst accepting for the time being that it can, for two years, be included on the revenue side. What counts is the dynamism, the life of the Community, the Community's ability to have resources available. As for the rest, the Fontainebleau agreement was wrong and remains wrong: let us keep it only for so long as is necessary — and in my view that will not exceed two years — and let us undertake, starting from the first of January 1987 — that is to say, the date from which 1.6% will be necessary — automatically to post the British refund to 'Expenditure', and let us unblock a situation that I believe, politically speaking, should be unblocked.

I repeat, ladies and gentlemen, and on this I make an appeal to everyone — let us find a solution that does not run counter to the principles of Parliament, and that will allow us to stand firm on those principles that represent the balanced future of the Community; but, at the same time, let us not burden ourselves for a long time with a problem that should be solved as quickly as possible, a problem that must only be a transitory one, and that must therefore be disposed of as quickly as possible.

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) It is traditional for the Chairman of the Committee on Budgets to attend all budgetary debates. That is as it should be. However, I wish to tell honourable Members that I have to go to the Struthof concentration camp, for reasons which some will appreciate, and I have asked the first Vice-Chairman, Mr Ryan, to stand in for me during my brief absence.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to stress, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, that the conclusions reached by the Committee on Budgets have our general support.

Is there any need for a further reminder that the European Parliament has succeeded in securing what it considered to be the essential objective, which was a budget which could be described as decent, a budget providing cover acceptable to each of the Member States, by which I of course mean a budget covering twelve months? This is a success for our Assembly, one which confirms that the weapon available to it in its power to reject the budget has been used judiciously by a major institution acting responsibly. It is also a bitter pill to swallow for the detractors who have been

Scrivener

making determined efforts ever since the first direct elections to destroy the image of the European Parliament in the eyes of public opinion.

I therefore do not think it necessary to stand on principle and continue fighting a battle which we have already partly won. Admittedly, the draft budget forwarded to us contains no reserve for any increase in farm prices exceeding the Commission's proposals. But let us be realistic: no such provision is ever made in the budgets on which we vote, under normal circumstances, in the month of December; indeed, the prices are not fixed until several months later. On the other hand, it must be clearly understood that any increase in farm prices must be accompanied by commensurate financing, which in this particular case implies an increase in advances from the States. We note that as matters stand only the Commission has so far given an undertaking to this effect.

Clearly, the necessary funding could not be found by making reference to savings which could possibly be made against the ordinary budget during the course of the year, since that would take us back to the situation which we rejected last December, that of having a budget which would probably not see us through to the end of the year.

Madam President, I will just mention the points on which we are also in full agreement with the Committee on Budgets: the inclusion in the budget of an entry for the deficit carried over from 1984, provision for additional revenue in 1985 (in which connection I would mention that I was listening attentively to Commissioner Christophersen's words), a vote confirming all the amendments already adopted by Parliament on the first reading, and in addition the enhanced provision for food aid, to which we attach particular importance, not forgetting the integrated Mediterranean programmes.

I would also draw honourable Member's attention to the fact that, even though it had wished to table a number of further amendments, the Liberal and Democratic Group has agreed to abide by the commitment given in the Committee on Budgets not to go beyond the amendments voted at the time of the first reading.

I have left the matter of reimbursement to the United Kingdom until last. We agree with the aim that the Committee on Budgets is trying to achieve, and moreover this accords with the position which the whole House has held consistently for several years. Any budgetary imbalances affecting particular Member States should be corrected through the expenditure side, not by rebates on payments made towards revenue, VAT payments in particular. Such rebates are incompatible with the principles on which the creation and development of our Community have been founded.

In these circumstances, therefore, we support the move to open a line in the statement of expenditure with a *pour memoir* serving to keep this requirement on the record. We are nevertheless somewhat sceptical as to the feasibility of meeting the timetable called for in Mr Fich's commentary. Let us be realistic. We know that there is no prospect of specific measures on the expenditure side being put into effect during 1985, and moreover we prefer the wording proposed in Mrs Barbarella's amendment, which tolerates a transitional period until 1987. This is not a matter of compromising on Parliament's traditionally held positions but, to my mind, of making an objective assessment of what we can realistically expect to achieve.

Turning to the revenue side, while we appreciate the concern of the Committee on Budgets to eliminate all reference to the matter of compensation to the United Kingdom, we nevertheless believe that it would have been preferable not to have an amendment to the statement of revenue deleting references to the compensation mechanism. What we are dealing with here is an intergovernmental agreement. It is an agreement which we dislike, but it is the chosen means of settling this issue, an agreement to which the Community rules do not apply. I would also remind you that this agreement has not yet been ratified by the national parliaments. It therefore does not make the necessary resources available for inclusion in the Community budget. In fact, it is as though Parliament was adopting a position on funds which the Community does not have at its disposal. We are therefore outside the bounds of the budgetary procedure. It is this that persuades us that we should not be involving ourselves in such arrangements. We should therefore be clear in our minds, ladies and gentlemen, that it will not be possible to go back on this position when the time comes for the second reading. And all of us, it seems, are anxious to ensure that we get a budget.

I of course hope that my comments on this point will not be misunderstood: this is a case where realism should perhaps take precedence over matters of principle!

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, these were the comments that I had to make on behalf of my group.

(Applause)

Mr Pasty (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in a manner of speaking the House is today engaged in its third reading of the draft budget of the European Communities for 1985.

After the second reading, which was followed by a resolution to reject the draft budget, passed by a very large majority, some of our colleagues, only a small number, prophesied that Parliament would not hold firm to the principles which it had proclaimed and that

Pasty

the Council would eventually have the last word. Some even went so far as to describe the vote by the House as 'irresponsible'.

It has to be acknowledged now that the very clear stance adopted by Parliament on a matter of capital importance to the future of the Community has paid dividends and that the Council has at last come a long way towards Parliament's position by adopting a draft budget which covers all the Community's financial commitments for the whole of 1985, subject to one admittedly essential reservation relating to the financial impact of the level at which farm prices are fixed. It is therefore a budget covering twelve months, and in particular it should allow the common agricultural policy to function normally, with an overall appropriation to the EAGGF Guarantee Section of almost 20 billion ECU, as against only 18 billion ECU in the draft rejected by Parliament.

Given the exhaustion of own resources, these increased commitments will be covered by contributions from the Member States, and Parliament must be delighted to learn that these contributions will not be reimbursable and therefore will not be a burden on the budgets of future financial years, which will still be very difficult, as we all know.

I would just say in passing that it is regrettable that, because of a failure to take a political decision in good time, the Community is now confronted with the exhaustion of its own resources, the only solution to which is to resort to intergovernmental agreements, which by their very nature are contrary to the spirit of the Community. Realization of this should prompt us to evolve a lasting and more *communautaire* solution to the own resources problem, since otherwise we shall be facing the same difficulties again in the very near future.

Although Parliament can take satisfaction from the Council's change of position on the need to cover expenditure for the whole of 1985, it must nevertheless, precisely because we are confronted with the exhaustion of own resources, show that it is concerned about certain specific points, and in this connection I wish to mention the financial impact of the fixing of farm prices, the financing of IMPs and funding for food aid.

The Commission has been logical and consistent with itself in proposing a budget entry corresponding to the figures arrived at on the basis of its proposals for farm prices. The Council of budget ministers has accepted this figure, but the agriculture ministers have not yet taken their decision. This decision would have differed appreciably from the Commission's proposals. It would necessarily have had to be accompanied by a modification of the budget forecast, since the presentation of any supplementary budget would evidently necessitate recourse to further contributions from the

States, which the Governments of the Member States are manifestly anxious to avoid.

For its part, Parliament cannot entertain the prospect of another financial impasse which would put the Commission in the difficult position of being unable to implement the budget as adopted by Parliament or would mean that a substantial deficit would have to be carried over to 1986.

Parliament must also be consistent with the opinion that it has expressed on farm prices, and it is for this reason that our group has introduced an amendment calling for the entry of a provision of 500 million ECU to cover revaluation of farm prices.

On the subject of food aid and the campaign against hunger in the world, our group regards this as a budget priority, one which has been constantly reaffirmed by this House, and we shall be supporting the amendments aimed at increasing the effort made in this area.

The appropriations for the integrated Mediterranean programme must also be commensurate with the political commitments entered into, and our group is accordingly proposing an amendment specifying the entry of an appropriation of 228 million ECU.

I come finally to the problem of financial compensation to the United Kingdom. Our group has consistently refused to accept the principle of a permanent standard correction in favour of a single Member State. This principle is totally in conflict with the notion of financial solidarity, with the very spirit of the Community, and flouts what is called the 'benefit of membership'.

We therefore cannot accept the solution proposed to us of a VAT rebate to the United Kingdom alone, nor can we accept the adjustment in favour of the Federal Republic of Germany alone, with the resultant additional financial burden on the other Member States. In the latter case one cannot fail to be surprised at the justification for this abatement, which in practice allows the Member State concerned to pass on the benefit of this lower contribution to its farmers by distorting the rules of competition of the agricultural common market.

Our group will be voting against the budget entry sanctioning such a corrective mechanism, which should not in fact have been submitted to this House since, as was said earlier, it is an arrangement arrived at on the basis of an intergovernmental agreement.

In conclusion, in the context of financial crisis currently prevailing in the Community, we are prepared to adopt a realistic approach and accept the broad lines of the draft budget submitted to us, but at the same time we can only once again deplore the fact that it has left so much to be settled by intergovernmental

Pasty

agreements, since this represents a setback — and an appreciable one at that — for the *communautaire* spirit.

(*Applause*)

Mr Bonde (ARC). — (*DA*) Madam President, the Community's treasury obviously attracts Danes. We have a Danish rapporteur for the budget, a Danish Commissioner and, to complete the trinity, I am quite willing to provide a little Danish opposition.

Once again the battle lines are drawn for a power struggle between the Council of Ministers and Parliament. It begins to look as though that is what the budget procedure is all about. What Community money is really used for is irrelevant to this discussion, because the Commission and the Council of Ministers by and large use the money just how they want to in any case. Only a very few percent of the resources applied by Parliament through its margin of manoeuvre have anything whatsoever to do with reality.

It must make a competent politician like Ove Fich feel frustrated. Efforts are made to get more money for Community food aid, but his speech on the budget will ring hollow in the empty bellies of the hungry. There is no connection between Parliament's resolutions and reality. In the budget debate we are in a space-ship without any contact with the earth. It is therefore quite logical for Mr Fich to launch into a fight with the Council to get real power for Parliament. He concentrates systematically on the revenue side of the budget, so that Parliament can acquire the right to levy taxes in the Member States. The only snag about his method is that it requires a completely new Treaty of Rome. I therefore assume that the much talked about thorough-going consultations between the social democrats in this Chamber and the social democrats in the Folketing have resulted in something on the lines that Ivar Nørgaard back home has put forward draft legislation for an amendment to the Danish Constitution or an amendment to the Treaty of Rome which may legalize all the clever Fich proposals on the revenue side of the budget.

The rapporteur is also trying to instigate the usual move to exceed Parliament's margin of manoeuvre by writing cheques which none of the ten Member States will honour. The budget which finally emerges from all this will — as far as I can calculate — cause the Danish contribution to exceed 5 billion kroner or 1 000 kroner per Dane. To conclude on a positive note, I should like to congratulate the rapporteur on rounding off a round figure.

Mr CiccioMessere (NI). — (*IT*) Madam President, I think that there is a majority that has already decided the outcome of this debate: it is the absent majority, those who moreover certainly do not intend to take part in this ritual that is taken somewhat for granted.

True, there is an element of resignation where the results are concerned, but there is also quite obviously a refusal to take part in a ritual in which — and this is the truth of it — Parliament falsely opposes the decisions of the Council, only to adopt, at the second reading, in a very orderly and obedient manner, the decisions of the political summits.

Why is this? And this brings us to the heart of the question. It is said that the crux of the matter, politically speaking, is the problem of British compensation. I think that Members who are not present at this debate have already given their assessment of the central nature of that political crux. It is in no way true that this is the problem concerning the people of Europe today. It was no mere coincidence that Parliament should have set for itself, for the Council and for the Commission two separate priorities, two real key political questions — the key questions of employment and hunger in the world. And 'priority', Madam President, must mean 'budgetary priority' and not empty words.

Well now, on the first point — employment — what are the priorities reflected in our budget as far as employment is concerned, seeing that the majority of the budget is used for the so-called common agricultural policy — a bankrupt policy, that is, and a protectionist one? Is it possible to imagine a farming industry, in the future, outside the international market? Of course, I would be the last one to think that these guarantees could be abolished overnight; but what action is being taken and has been taken to try to bring European agriculture out into the international market? Is there any desire and determination to do this? I am not madly pro-American, Madam President, but this is certainly an unacceptable situation. And what type of measures are effectively envisaged to boost employment? Outside this Assembly there is talk of Eureka. I am particularly against certain military aspects of Eureka, but there is at least one proposal, one attempt, to identify sectors of advanced technology in which investment could be made to produce jobs. This debate is absent from our Assembly — we are talking instead about compensation for Britain, and about other things of no interest to anyone, or that interest only those few people immediately involved!

The problem of hunger in the world, Madam President, is the key political question, and the political role that the European Parliament and Europe can have in regard to questions of security. We cannot ask the 'Great Powers' to be allowed to take part in the debate on Euro-missiles, or on strategic security measures: our voice would have no effect. But we can, on the other hand, make ourselves heard on questions such as hunger. But what are we in fact doing, Madam President? Nothing! All around us people have been writing and talking about food aid: but for this to be of any use, integrated plans and structural plans are necessary.

Cicciomessere

Madam President, time does not permit me to outline my amendments. I ask honourable Members, however, to read the explanatory statement contained in the letter that I have sent them.

(Applause from the benches of the European Democratic Group).

Mr Pitt (S). — Madam President, may I begin with an historical perspective and then a brief personal perspective?

Twelve years ago, a now long-forgotten British Prime Minister called Edward Heath brought Britain into the Common Market on the promise that it would guarantee the job security of the British people and that the Common Market could be changed from the inside. That was the promise in 1973, when Britain debated the momentous issue of joining the European Community.

Of course, in those days the British Government was not in the hands of right-wing-extremists. As recently as Thursday of last week, the only remaining moderate in Mrs Thatcher's cabinet said that according to present trends Britain's standard of living in the year 2 000 would be lower than that of Vietnam or Thailand. That is the historic perspective, which I think we should bear in mind as well as the arithmetic minutiae before us today.

In personal terms, in my first speech as a newly-elected Member of this House, I said — and I make no apology for repeating it — that I found Britain's membership of the common market intolerable for so long as we spent over 70% of the budget on 10 million people engaged in agriculture whilst doing so little for the hundred million people engaged in industry *and* forgetting almost entirely the 13 million people who are unemployed.

Since then we have had quite a number of developments in the budgetary field. We had, for example, the report from Mr Price last month showing that one country, Italy, was undercollecting VAT by 400 million pounds. Yet here we are scratching around trying to find the odd 10 or 12 million here and there to help the starving world. Last month, too, the President-in-Office of the Council, no less, reported that unemployment now stands at 13.6 million in the Community and is still rising. Thirdly, we have endless cases, especially in the discharge debates on the accounts for the years 1982 and 1983, of the Commission — and the Council of course, but the Commission in particular — paying scant, if any, regard to Parliament's amendments to the annual budgets of the EEC. And now, in the last seven days alone, we are, in my view, being hijacked into a politically motivated, not a judged decision, but a politically motivated stampede to adopt yet another farmer's budget. I would echo and expand on what an American Treas-

ury official said last week, that the common agricultural policy is the biggest protection racket, for I would add, since Al Capone, and we are doing little about it.

To speak further in hijacking terms, we are being asked to approve a budget for which we were given 36 hours only to table amendments. We are being asked to approve a budget in which the Council has cut every spending programme except agriculture to the bone, to keep down the intergovernmental agreement. Perhaps almost the worst decision is that we now require almost certainly a third intergovernmental agreement after the farm-price review, a third intergovernmental agreement in seven months. That is almost the worst aspect of what the Council is deciding, but certainly morally the worst was their decision to cut the 40 m ECUs for food aid down to 26 m ECUs.

I will end by answering Mr Curry's very valid question: what can we do today? I hesitate, because this is a forlorn request. Of course I do not expect this House to do it; I just hope in its own interest that it will do it. I think that what we can do is vote for a better balance in the budget. The amendments put down by myself and my colleagues from the British Labour Party are supported by others from other political groups and, taken as a whole, would cut 1 000 million pounds from agriculture, as the Stuttgart Summit in 1983 wished to do, and as indeed proved to be the outcome of the 1983 actual expenditure, in order to free the 600 million pounds proposed in other amendments for spending on social progress and on industry.

I think we could do that. I would urge everyone to do that and put the ball firmly back in the Council's court. If you cannot do that, Madam President, then I think the only resort is to do as I shall and vote against the budget as a whole.

Mrs Oppenheim (ED). — *(DA)* Madam President, as the rapporteur, Mr Fich, indicated in his intervention, it was not an empty gesture by Parliament when it rejected the proposed budget for 1985 last December. I agree that there have been a few improvements with respect to the position Parliament was in last year. Perhaps we have not had satisfaction on all the views we presented, but we have had satisfaction in a large number of key fields, not least on the vital question of principle, which moreover was the reason why most of us voted for the rejection of the proposal. That is, we have an annual budget, a twelve-month budget, not one which covers some shorter period, which we rightly felt was a makeshift solution from the beginning. There is no reason why we should not have proper solutions worked out at the earliest possible stage.

We are now in a situation in which we all feel that it is high time we got the institutions of the Community to work. We must make sure that the money necessary to

Oppenheim

make them work is there, and that is why it has been a source of satisfaction, at least to the Danish conservatives, to follow developments over the past few months. We agree with the Fich report, and we are disposed to vote for the proposal which is now on the table.

I also think that it is important for us to view Parliament as a source of inspiration when it comes to budgeting for the somewhat longer term. It is of vital importance that the Community should be able to operate on the basis of longer-term and palpably strategic budgetary planning. I think that emerges particularly clearly from Mr Christodoulou's proposal for budgetary policy in 1986, which deals not only with the budget for the agricultural sector, which is of course very important, but also sets priorities in many other crucial sectors, in which Parliament would like to be involved.

(Applause)

Mrs Hoff (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, today's budget discussions are unsatisfactory for a number of reasons. Only the fact that progress is being made in other Community areas leads one to accept some things which ought really to be unacceptable.

For example it is totally pointless for us to be holding discussions when we have not the faintest idea what agricultural spending for the current year will be. Commissioner Andriessen indicated as much this morning with great restraint when he spoke of an unsatisfactory situation.

The fact that the cost of the common agricultural policy is about 75% of the total budget shows on what shaky ground we find ourselves in the first reading. And the farm prices were supposed to have become effective on 1 April this year. But contrary to all claims the agriculture ministers cannot agree; at their last meeting of 2-5 May they were again unable to agree on decisions.

The most important issue is doubtless that of cereal prices. The Commission had proposed a cut of 3.6%. Given the paucity of budget funds and the growing cereals surpluses this suggestion represented certainly a sensible and vital saving. Our self-sufficiency in cereal is after all 130%.

Agreement is being blocked in particular by the Federal German agriculture minister Ignaz Kiechle.

He is implacable, rejecting any idea of a cut and thus any chance of economy. It remains to be seen whether the ministers will reach agreement on 13 May, one day after the North Rhine-Westphalian state elections. No connection, of course!

The consequences of the farm price decisions for the budget are hard to assess whilst the total package is

still not available. Even so it can already be stated that the costs will far exceed the funds proposed by the Council, at a rough estimate by about 60-80 million ECU for the current year and by about 250 million ECU for the 1986 budget year.

The Council stands accused of not increasing the funds by enough, although it is aware of these figures, for it knows that the increase of 1 900 million ECU bringing the guarantee and structural fund to a total of 206 000 million ECU will not suffice. The Council lacks the courage to own up to the cost of its misguided policy.

One possible consequence is that we shall have a supplementary budget for 1985. But that is pointless and a waste of time given that the 1985 budget will probably be approved in June or July, followed immediately by supplementary discussions.

But it may also mean that the Council will again propose carrying over a sizeable budget deficit for 1985 to the 1986 budget year. We have already accepted that this year. In this way we shall offload on to the following year deficits which continue to grow year by year. But that circumvents the principle of annuality and is also illegal.

A deliberately short budget may also mean, however, that funds are saved in other budget lines and are then transferred later in the procedure to the agriculture budget. I wonder, though, where further savings can be made except in the agriculture budget.

I note once again that a disproportionate amount of money, levied from all Community's tax payers, is unilaterally channelled into agriculture. The farmers, especially the small farmers, get very little of it. In view of existing surpluses, this has to change. The injustice must stop, and when funds are short thrifty use of them is the first priority.

The present draft again contains insufficient money to combat unemployment and world hunger, and it is to be feared that the money saved will be used to encourage surplus production further.

I have the impression that the Council is trying to put out a smokescreen to hide its true misconduct of economic policy. All the gratifying new trends in the Community, particularly influenced by the new Commission, must not stop us from showing up this misconduct and then putting an end to it.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Madam President, I will not dwell on the general orientation of the budget, because that was debated at the end of last year, whether in connection with increasing austerity mainly by means of financial discipline, or with the transfer of resources from the less well to the better developed countries of the Community, mainly in the

Alavanos

form of rebates to the United Kingdom and West Germany, or finally with the support of political integration according to the demands of the Community's great monopolies.

I would like to deal with three points concerning the new development in the Common budget for 1985. The first relates to the IMP's. In our opinion the amount of 70 million ECU proposed by Council is quite unacceptable, as is the fact that Council rejected the Commission's proposals for 140 million ECU, the sum also favoured by Parliament's Committee on Budgets. This attempt to drip-feed the Mediterranean programmes, coming just a few weeks after the agreement at the Council of Europe, provokes in us many serious reservations about just how much the Council of Europe's decision to grant 2 billion ECU to Greece over a 7-year period is worth, seeing that in the first year of implementation of the IMP's all three countries together are to receive 70 million ECU.

The second matter relates to the expenditures by the EAGGF — Guarantee Section, which with the new proposals, now amount to some 19.9 billion ECU. However, while on the one hand Council is making some concession by accepting an increase in the expenditures it originally proposed, on the other hand — and we stress this — the new sum presupposes that Council will accept the Commission's proposals on agricultural prices, which are either nihilistic or negative, and consequently entirely unacceptable in our opinion. We are also taken aback by the attitude of the Greek Government, because on the one hand its Minister at the Council of Economic Ministers accepts the new draft budget in its entirety, while on the other hand its Minister at the Council of Agricultural Ministers is seen to be fighting valiantly for the rejection of the Commission's proposals on agricultural prices.

A third point I wish to raise is the subject of national contributions, which are to amount to 1.98 billion ECU and which, moreover, will not be repaid. In our opinion it is not just the amount that matters, it is also the principle, and I do not think it is acceptable that the Greek Government, over and above its obligations under the treaty of accession or the Treaties of Rome, should undertake new commitments for the financing of the budget. All the more so when we see that our country's position within the framework of the budget is losing ground, and when net revenue to our country in 1984 was 14% less than in 1983 when calculated in dollars, or showed no change when calculated in ECU.

Finally, Madam President, I would like to say that yesterday the Committee on Budgets adopted an amendment tabled by Members of the Greek and French Communist Parties, relating to the 3rd financing protocol to Turkey. I believe the House will support that amendment unanimously, as well as two other related amendments by the Committee on Bud-

ets concerning the 4th financing protocol for special aid to Turkey.

Mr Pordea (DR). — (FR) Madam President, having taken note of the Commission's Letter of Amendment No 3, the Council has reached its decision on the draft budget for 1985. This draft budget forwarded to Parliament covers twelve months, unlike the one submitted to it at the end of last year.

The Council has undertaken to cover the full amount of EAGGF Guarantee Section expenditure, 20 billion ECU, and this will release Europe's farming industry from the severe drawbacks of the provisional twelfths system.

The Council has also fixed the amount of non-reimbursable advances from Member States at 1 981 million ECU, which is the sum that it considers necessary to ensure that all budgetary expenditure for 1985 is covered. These advances are less than the Commission's forecasts: 2 903 million ECU for commitments and 2 331 million ECU for payments.

The setting of a figure by the Council leaves the European Parliament little scope to use its margin of manoeuvre on noncompulsory expenditure. Are the amounts proposed by the Council going to be enough? In order to find the answer to this question, it is necessary to consider the matter of new own resources.

In this connection, the VAT take-up rate is not to be increased until 1st January 1986, and no sooner has it been increased than the 1.4% ceiling will be reached.

Under these circumstances, how can yet another deadlock be avoided in 1986, when the 1986 budget will have to accommodate:

First, the cost of enlargement, which Mr Delors has put at 6.5 billion ECU;

secondly, the cost of financing the IMPs, which is expected to be 7 billion ECU over 7 years;

and thirdly, the one billion ECU in reimbursement of contributions to the United Kingdom, if it is not entered in the budget for 1985 with a proportional increase in VAT payments by the other nine Member States (in the case of the Federal Republic of Germany, two-thirds of its additional VAT share).

Now is the time to be thinking in terms of new own resources which will enable the Community to make progress by launching new programmes and new or appropriately modified common policies.

The Group of the European Right wishes to return to the idea which it suggested during the debate on the Pfennig report, the idea of introducing a criterion taking account of industrial and agricultural wealth which

Pordea

would make for fairer national contributions and eventually avoid the imbalance working to the disadvantage of the United Kingdom. This concern for justice and solidarity should be the inspiration for the governments' efforts.

I must emphasize the key needs for better management of resources and better forecasting.

Everything must be included in the 1985 budget, both the 1984 budget deficit, which has been put at 417 million ECU, and the increase in own resources for which provision had not been made, estimated at 232 million ECU. Carry-overs from one year to the next should be avoided so that a balanced budget can be presented.

In addition, the budget should encompass all expenditure and revenue items, including the EDF and the ECSC budget, to bring it into line with the general principle of budgetary universality applied to public finances.

There is also a need for more reliable forecasts, both for the purposes of the EAGGF and in the area of economic growth, and the EEC experts should adjust their forecasts to take account of fluctuations in the dollar exchange rate and world prices.

Finally, my group supports the proposal made by Mrs Scrivener concerning compensation for the United Kingdom. To ensure that there is no conflict with the Council, we consider that it would be wise not to enter this compensation in a line on the revenue side of the budget for 1985 but to wait for the increase in own resources, when the finance will be provided by the Member States. This would be the exception proving the rule.

The prospect of new own resources and better budgetary management should not blind us to the uncertainties which remain. There are several areas where the sums proposed by the Council seem insufficient to us, notably food aid and integrated Mediterranean programmes. Research and innovation are particularly weak areas, where the provision that has been made does not measure up to the plans envisaged by the Community or Member States.

The problem of enlargement is one which must be considered in all its aspects, including the financial and budgetary dimensions. Welcoming Spain and Portugal into the Community is not just a matter of making promises to them and settling for general agreements, but also entails giving them financial guarantees, especially for their agricultural products.

A further point: the fixing of agricultural prices for the 1985/86 marketing year. The EAGGF appropriation for 1985 — 20 billion ECU — takes account of the Commission's proposals for freezing prices. However, if farm prices were not fixed at the first reading of the

budget, or if they were higher than those proposed by the Commission, a supplementary budget or carry-overs to 1986 would become necessary.

Finally, how can Europe's dynamism be restored through new policies, especially promotion of advanced technologies and a much more active policy on cooperation and development aid, when no further increase in VAT revenues is scheduled until 1988, when it will have to be approved unanimously by the Twelve?

In conclusion, since we have been presented with a proper budget covering twelve months, the Group of the European Right will be voting for this 1985 budget in order to bring an end to the latent institutional crisis and the deadlock in the Community, and to bring a calm approach to the forthcoming important stages, beginning with enlargement.

All parties must face up to their responsibilities and at long last tackle the substantive problems which condition the future of the Community.

That future begins with the vote on the 1985 budget.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

Mr Eyraud (S). — (FR) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the deadlock in the procedure for adoption of the budget for 1985 was broken when the European Council eventually acknowledged, following the European Parliament's resolution rejecting the draft budget for 1985, that such a document should cover all the revenue and expenditure for the full financial year.

The French Socialists are delighted at this, not because they see it as a 'victory' for one institution over the other but because they regard it as reflecting a certain feeling that the European Community is on the threshold of a 'fresh start'.

The performance of the new Commission under the presidency of Mr Jacques Delors, the conclusion of the negotiations on accession by Spain and Portugal, and the will displayed by the Council to progress towards European Union on the course plotted by the Dooge committee were all seen as positive developments by the French Socialists, although the recent Bonn Summit Meeting dealt a severe blow to their optimism.

This budget, as adopted on 24 April by the Council, is still far from satisfactory, even though the appropriation for the EAGGF Guarantee Section is 1 955 million ECU more than in the original draft.

Eyraud

This additional amount takes account of the agricultural expenditure which would result from the proposals for prices submitted by the Commission — 350 million ECU — but not of the resolution passed by Parliament in March calling for a 3.5% increase over the 1984/1985 marketing year, which would involve roughly the same volume of expenditure.

We note with satisfaction that should the Council decide to accommodate Parliament's resolution — and it is disappointing that no agreement was reached in Luxembourg last weekend — the Commission would submit another letter of amendment.

I suggest to the Commission that it should add the extra 232 million ECU in own resources estimated for 1985 to the statement of revenue, which it failed to do in its last letter of amendment.

I also have other suggestions to make to it, which would enable it to achieve large savings in agricultural expenditure and significant reductions in the structural surpluses of milk, beef and cereals, while at the same time making for greater justice. I refer to limitation of the guaranteed volume of production per holding, graduation of the levies, the milk coresponsibility levy in particular, and application of the principle of Community preference, which is widely treated with contempt, even by people in this House. I also refer to reduction of the stocks of powdered milk by means of massive distribution through welfare agencies, which would give assistance to those bearing the brunt of unemployment and to needy elderly people. I refer, finally, to aid to the developing countries.

The Community would earn credibility in the Third World by improving its aid to developing countries which have fallen victim to catastrophes of various kinds. I am of course thinking of those where the problem is hunger, but also of India, for instance, which urgently needs to replenish its livestock following the Bhopal disaster. Would it not be more intelligent — it is a pity that the Commissioner responsible for the budget is not listening — for the reduction in Community dairy herds necessitated by the milk quotas to be achieved by selling cows cheaply or even giving them to India rather than slaughtering them and increasing the meat stocks still further.

It costs 1 470 ECU a year to store 1 tonne of meat, while cows are fetching an average of 1 500 ECU per tonne live weight, so even if they were given away, there would be virtually no cost to the Community budget.

The French Socialists have other grounds for dissatisfaction with this budget:

First, because of the presentation of what is really revenue as negative expenditure, a case in point being the co-responsibility levy. While it is true that the purpose of this levy is to finance promotion of dairy prod-

uce, revenue and expenditure should be shown in their proper places.

Similarly, the cheque to the United Kingdom or the VAT rebate to the German farmers cannot be entered as negative revenue. We expect clarity in presentation of the budget, and in that we are strictly in line with the decisions taken at the Fontainebleau Summit Meeting. If we are going to accept budgetary rigour, let us make a start by being rigorous in the drafting of the budget.

We are also dissatisfied with this budget because it does not incorporate various expenditure which would advance the construction of Europe more significantly by promoting job creation, aid to the developing countries, new technologies, research.

It is true that a severe blow was dealt to European research and technology in Bonn last week, and perhaps we need look no further for an explanation.

We Socialists are not prepared to allow Europe to become the jobbing subcontractor of Japanese or American industry.

Those countries have nothing but the deepest scorn for a Europe which is incapable of joining to mount a research project.

The damaging blows to European industry, coming on top of those dealt to the CAP by the United States, are being compounded by the disruption caused by the dollar's fluctuations.

When the Commission prepared its draft budget, was it not anticipating that the value of the dollar would be between 1.25 and 1.35 ECU? Well, it is now standing at 1.4 or even 1.45 ECU. This is why promotion of the ECU as a real trading currency is clearly necessary. The Community should be showing its solidarity and cohesion through its budget and monetary decision-making.

What is needed is a fresh impulse, which should come from this Assembly, to build a strong Europe, able to resist the unacceptable economic pressure exerted on us by the United States.

On this the eve of the 40th anniversary of the end of the last World War, in which I had the sorry privilege of taking part, I am not forgetting the invaluable help that the American people gave us in restoring freedom and democracy. Gratitude bids us to remain on friendly terms with them.

However, we have the right and the duty, in the name of friendship, to show them that we intend to remain the masters in our own home, in Europe, that we mean to deal with them on a footing of equality and that we will allow nothing to be imposed on us by

Eyraud

force, whether by the weight of technology or the weight of currency.

I trust that this message will be brought home to President Reagan tomorrow!

Agriculture and Fisheries

Mr Woltjer (S). — (NL) Mr President, I do not really have a great deal to add to what other members of my group have already said about the general part of the agricultural budget. I too am seriously concerned about the amount involved and also about finding so much money, because this depends on so many different external factors — the dollar exchange rate, external policies, yields, the harvest and so on — that it is impossible to make any kind of forecast at the moment on whether the 20 000m will be enough to finance agricultural expenditure. All we can say is that we simply assume the Commission has done its utmost to include in the budget estimates based on genuine expectations, and that is what we must work with.

What I will say is that no price proposals have yet been put forward, which my group finds deplorable. There should have been a proposal, the Council should have taken a decision, and the farm year should have begun on 1 April. The question I wanted to ask the Commissioner in this context — since he has just indicated in his statement that the compromise proposal made by the President of the Council contains many elements that he finds acceptable in the final analysis — is why, in that case, he did not put it forward as a final proposal last week rather than wait a few more weeks. It seems to me that it would have been very important for the credibility of the policy for us not to have to wait, with clearly audible references to elections, but to have received a final proposal from the Commission so that the matter could be settled. Now it looks more like the wheeling and dealing with figures I mentioned at the beginning and in fact amounts to a policy out of control, with the farmers not knowing where they stand.

1 April is the date on which farm prices have to be fixed, and in the past I have often asked whether this price-fixing operation should not be related more closely to the establishment of the budget. But the argument has always been that prices have to be fixed on 1 April for the simple reason that that is the beginning of the agricultural year. Seeing that six weeks have now passed since 1 April and a great deal of grain has meanwhile been sown, all I can say is that next year farmers will not be able to take prices as a guide. In short, the debate that is now going on in the Council is a purely budgetary affair, and I find that regrettable and would not have wished it on this Commissioner.

The Commissioner also referred in his speech to the study on future prospects. I should like to issue a stern

warning in this connection. Here again, the farmers are led to believe that they must accept a reduction in prices this time, that a study on future prospects will be completed by September, or let us say June, and that this will give them more scope, and many are thinking of a return to the old situation, possibly with a few alternatives. Clearly, a policy of this nature would have budgetary implications. I find Mr Andriessen's proposal lacking — and I should like to stress this — because what are needed are not just prospects but a definite change in the present policy with a view to further reducing the surpluses and eliminating them altogether, because they are to blame for this policy costing so much that we are having to set aside 20 000m in 1985. That is the main criticism. I welcome the prospect Mr Andriessen has held out, but I also say that it must be placed in its proper context: surplus production must also be reduced. The context is therefore the overall picture that we shall shortly be seeing.

Mr Marck (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, as the rapporteur of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and on behalf of my group I should like to voice some of the anxiety felt by European farmers and market gardeners.

Firstly, it must be clear to everyone that we shall not allow ourselves to be shackled by budgetary discipline specified by the Finance Ministers. The normal procedures must be followed, and they must produce solutions that satisfy the needs and requirements of every European policy, and the common agricultural policy in particular. We are not opposed to adjustments to this policy, but we shall never agree to the basic achievements of the past being dismantled for purely budgetary reasons. It is with this in mind that we are preparing ourselves for the dialogue to which Commissioner Andriessen has referred. To undermine this dialogue in advance by setting purely budgetary imperatives would be to do a serious injustice to the farmers and market gardeners who believe in Europe and are still prepared to accept the Community's only common policy. They are aware of the financial limitations, they realize that unlimited production is an impossibility if products cannot be sold, and they are therefore prepared for adjustment, but they will not agree to the policy being dismantled.

Secondly, we endorse the desire clearly expressed by Parliament for a proper budget covering twelve months. What we want from the Commission and the Council, therefore, is an assurance that the draft budget will meet this requirement. Can the Commission give an assurance that the expenditure figures entered for the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF will cover twelve months' expenditure? Can the Commission give the same assurance where expenditure on dairy products is concerned, with account taken of the virtual abolition of the superlevy as a result of the recent quota agreements and of the additional expenditure that will be needed to dispose of butter stocks

Marck

over 18 months old? In this context, I would refer to the considerable expense of disposing of this old butter in the past. As 3 000 tonnes still remain, I hardly think the amounts now entered in the budget will be enough.

And can the Council give us an assurance that the draft budget it has drawn up takes full account of the Council decisions already taken this year and more specifically of the consequences of the wine compromise and the structural measures?

Thirdly, I urge the Commission to make a greater effort than in the past to ensure the strict and above all more dynamic management of the markets. This means that stocks should be disposed of as soon as an opportunity arises, not left in store because that is better for the budget in the short term. The heavy expenditure we are now facing in the dairy sector is the result of inflexible and short-sighted management.

Finally, a word or two on farm prices. Like Mr Woltjer, I consider it unacceptable that the farm prices should not be fixed until mid-May or even later. Farmers and market gardeners are being punished not only by the Commission's drastic proposals but also by the delay in the decision-making process. I do not really understand what Commissioner Andriessen meant when he said that, if expenditure was increased, the Commission would have to look for compensation. Does this mean that the Commission will not be submitting an additional draft budget in the autumn as it has always done? Does it mean fresh cuts through the suspension of payments, which is already disrupting the market? The Commission owes us an explanation here.

Mr President, this debate is clearly only the beginning of a long discussion. We are ready for this discussion, but it must be conducted with complete frankness and with the determination that the Community's only common policy will not be abandoned.

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, first of all, may I thank Mr Fich for being present this morning during this debate. After the discussion that we had on the agenda yesterday, I would like to thank him for being here and not going off with his group. I think it is important that he is here, and that is worth noting.

I think it is time that we stopped living from hand to mouth. We as a Parliament rejected the original draft budget because it was not for a full twelve-month period. The first paragraph of Mr Fich's report points out that there is an increase in expenditure of 1 955 million ECU to cover agricultural expenditure. We as a group advocated right through the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, the necessity for a full twelve-month budget, and I hope that we are now in a position to support this report of Mr Fich's. Let me say, however, that the determination of farm prices

has not yet been concluded for 1985, and it is obviously questionable whether this budget will last for the full twelve-month period. I hope that the Commissioner will not withdraw the proposals that he has currently got on the table before the Council of Ministers. I believe he must stand firm and I hope that we get a majority vote in the Council very quickly so that we can actually get the farm prices decision determined for this year. It would be wrong to have a further letter of amendment to the budget for this year. We are now almost six months into the budgetary year 1985 and it would be wrong to have a further letter of amendment. However, times may change; attitudes may change, and the financial parameters with which we live — like the American dollar, for instance — now still have a considerable effect on our finances. It does make nonsense of budgetary control and the consequences of the Fontainebleau agreement are not yet really with us in real terms.

Mr President, I have an amendment before Parliament — Amendment No 52 to Article 387 — which I believe is extremely important. I have written to Mr Fich about it and I hope he will understand the consequences of Parliament doing something which I believe would be unconstitutional if this amendment is not passed. We are asking the Commission to spend 8 million ECU on monitoring the olive-oil situation. If they grant it to a Member State, the European Community will for the first time be granting money to a Member State for something that that Member State is meant to do already. If the Commission is not satisfied with the current arrangements, it is up to them to finance their own officials to go and inspect these arrangements and not pay a Member State to continue a situation which we all find intolerable.

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, I think it is clear that the decision of Parliament to reject the original budget was the correct one. At this stage, in spite of the fact that the ministers of agriculture have regrettably not come to a decision, I believe we should approve of the budget.

It should be understood that this question of the delay in fixing farm prices is not unique. It is not the first time it has happened. It is not the first time that these decisions have been delayed because somebody had to achieve a victory in some country or another, some political party in Germany, France or wherever it might be. I think this is intolerable, because in all cases, since prices are fixed at Community level, farmers have to pay the price. It should be said, in fairness, that this only applies to some farmers, dairy farmers in particular, because they produce a product every day. It is not so bad for grain farmers, because their harvest happens to be towards the autumn and not in the spring. It is the farmers who market their products all the time who are losing. I would claim that for them these prices should be fixed retrospectively and that any changes should go back to 1 April, so cancelling

Maher

out any failure of the ministers to agree on the prices in time.

I want to correct another fallacy. I have done it before, and I am sorry that this time my Socialist friends are missing and, in particular, the British Socialists, who constantly talk about the gains made by farmers as if the farm prices applied only to farmers. We are not talking about fixing the income level of farmers but about fixing the prices of commodities. Generally speaking, the experience of farmers is that they get what is left after everybody else down the line has taken his profits — the workers in the processing industry, the management and all the others, the cost of marketing the product. Whatever is left goes to the farmer, and I think it is time we began to see exactly what is left and exactly what goes to the farmer.

My second point is that these prices support the whole fabric of rural life in the villages and towns. All benefit as a result of what is going into the farm: the local garage, the local doctor, the local shopkeeper, the people working in the industries upstream and downstream of agriculture, all benefit. You are not talking about 10 million people. You are talking probably about 150 million or more people who are directly dependent upon what happens on the farm and inside the farm gate. It is time we began to understand that more clearly.

I am often amused by people who try to destroy the CAP and tear it down in the same voice talk about the problems of world hunger. Would it not be wonderful if the Third World countries had a CAP that was as successful as the CAP of the European Community? There would be no world hunger! Nobody here is hungry, not even the Socialists. They all look very well fed indeed. But what about the people in the Third World who do not have the kind of structures that we have? They do not have the kind of organization that we have. They are hungry. So let us at least acknowledge that the CAP has been a success!

Finally, I agree with Mr Eyraud, who is absent now, that we should not be dictated to by US economic policy. We want to be friendly with them, but remember that they support their farmers at about the same level as we do.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — Mr President, once again we are faced with a situation where this Parliament, the joint budgetary authority, is forced into a corner by a *fait accompli*. Let us stop fooling ourselves and face up to the fact that we have no control whatsoever over the income side of this budget. Need I remind Members that less than two months ago a majority of this Parliament voted for a 3.5% increase in farm prices. Yet again, our opinion has been totally ignored. There is no provision in the draft budget to allow for any farm-price increase in the 1985/86 marketing year over and above the derisory and totally unacceptable initial proposal from the Commission.

In November of last year I condemned the Council's disgraceful financial planning in presenting an annual budget that only covered 9 to 10 months. I must say I am pleased that at least on this point the Council has come to its senses and reinstated in the EAGGF Guarantee Sector the necessary amounts to cover ongoing expenditure in the Guarantee Sector for a full 12 months. I am proud to have been associated with this amendment from the outset, but let there be no mistake in anybody's mind, the Council's deliberate omission of any provision to allow for realistic price increases is clearly illustrated by the fact that the Agriculture Council has been incapable of fixing the 1985/86 farm prices because of the strait-jacket into which their finance colleagues have put them.

How often do these people have to be reminded that the common agricultural policy is the only real policy that exists? How often must they be told that the common agricultural policy is the cornerstone of Europe? How long will they continue to undermine this policy? While I agree that there is need for a realistic approach to problems which exist, I totally reject and denounce any attempt to destroy this policy. The solutions to their problems, in my view, have been tackled in the wrong way. We have ignored the problem of cheap food imports like manioc and maize gluten feed. We also continue to allow the import of foods that are in surplus here, such as New Zealand butter. And it is ironic that we find any entry whatsoever, either on the revenue or the expenditure side, for a refund to the British because, if we just take one example — and I do not have the time to go into all the detail which I would like, Mr President — although it has now been reduced to 70%, 90% of Community expenditure on the CAP was, until a short time ago, going to Britain, the only country importing lamb from a third country, namely New Zealand. Some careful examination needs to be done on that aspect of expenditure as well as many more. We have not, in my view, tackled the major underlying causes of the surpluses in the agricultural sector because we still continue to import huge quantities of food.

It is not only the expenditure on the agricultural policy that has broken the EEC budget. It is also the British refund and the German refund. How can anybody in the entire Community of ten, soon to be twelve, have any confidence in the development of any future policies, be they regional, social, energy or whatever, when they see the only fully developed policy, namely the common agricultural policy, being totally undermined and when in recent years the rich have been getting richer and the poor, poorer. People are losing confidence all over Europe. We have heard a lot of talk in recent times about European Union and the new Treaty. In my view it will get little support when people recall the failure of the existing treaties.

Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr President, that unless there is significant and indeed massive transfer of appropriate resources from the inner circle to the

MacSharry

outer peripheral triangle of our Community there will be genuine cause for concern for the very continuation and existence of this Community.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Tolman (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Pisoni was to have spoken in this debate and to the oral question that has been answered by Mr Andriessen. Owing to circumstances beyond his control he is unable to be present, and I am forced to fill the breach with a few comments, which are not, however, entirely spontaneous.

Mr Pisoni's questions were prompted by serious concern about the reform of the agricultural policy and the resulting interim situation. I fully appreciate that no one can give a definitive answer to these questions. Mr Andriessen has reacted very positively and said that the working groups concerned with the reform of the policy will take account of these suggestions and comments. I feel that goes far enough for the moment. I think I can assume that full account will be taken of the questions put by Mr Pisoni and his Italian colleagues.

Mr President, I will take this opportunity to refer to a few of the Commissioner's comments on farm prices. I am glad the Commissioner did not try to make excuses for the fact that a decision has not yet been taken on these prices. He simply said quite openly: the decision will be taken late, and that is wrong. I find such things must be said openly. It means that the Council, the Agriculture Ministers are simply not doing their duty at the moment. It is unacceptable, Mr President, whatever the reasons may be, that the discussions should go on and on, on an issue where, as I too have said in the past, the margins are very narrow, narrower than ever before. It is unacceptable that these discussions should go on and on when only a few points are at stake. Once again, as the Commissioner has clearly stated, there has been unnecessary delay, and this is a bad thing.

The Commissioner also said that, whatever the outcome of the price talks, it must not affect the budget. I take this to mean — and others may disagree with me — that the agricultural policy and the prices on which a decision is now to be taken at present form the closing item of the budget. The budget must not be affected. I would rather this was said openly, then we know where we stand. We shall undoubtedly be talking about this again because many major changes are about to be made.

Mr President, the Commissioner has said that Parliament will not get its way where a solution to the price problem is concerned. That is bound to lead to conflict. A clear majority in Parliament has delivered an opinion on farm prices. Mr Andriessen and I both have

enough political experience to know that a parliament does not always get all its own way in every situation. I do not therefore intend to go into this further for the moment. Let us wait and see what the Council of Agriculture Ministers decide, and when we know what their decision is and have analysed it sufficiently, we can perhaps revert, if need be, to the difference between Parliament's and the Commission's positions.

Mrs Jepsen (ED). — (DA) Mr President, it looks as though the Members of this Parliament are beginning to realize that a reorganization of the Community's agricultural policy is necessary. It says in the report before us that the output of agricultural products must match demand. Now that is something we Danish conservatives have been saying all along. When we see even more of our views reflected in the next report on the agenda, which is to be discussed this afternoon and deals with the guidelines for 1986, I really feel we have come a long way. What we are discussing here is the need to recast the agricultural policy with the aim of avoiding the accumulation of stocks which only serve to undermine the effective functioning of the markets, the need to reorder priorities in production, to improve our competitive ability and to encourage technological development. It concludes with something which is of such great importance to us, namely the maintenance of decent living standards for the farmers, which is embodied in the Treaty. Yes, we entirely agree.

It is very regrettable that the agriculture ministers were not able to reach agreement on the new farm prices, and following on from that I feel it important to stress that we must endeavour to get out of our internal disputes in the Community over the problems of agriculture. What is needed is an intelligent and constructive dialogue between the USA and the Community. Otherwise we shall find we have a damaging trade war on our hands.

Mrs S. Martin (L). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, like others before me, I shall begin by saying that I am delighted that the Council has listened to the voice of Parliament, the voice of reason in fact, and decided to bring forward a budget covering the full financial year.

I am especially pleased that, in doing so, it has increased the appropriation to the EAGGF Guarantee Section by 1 955 million ECU. But I cannot agree with the Committee on Budgets where, in its motion for a resolution which was no doubt the subject of a hurried vote late last evening, it calls for yet further efforts and savings on the agricultural policy. That is neither reasonable nor realistic. Considerable efforts have already been asked of our farmers and the industry, and no attempt is being made to measure the consequences.

A study is in progress with a view to determining the new direction to be taken by the CAP. The Com-

S. Martin

munity has a duty to state clearly what sort of farming industry it requires and then to translate its conclusions into budgetary terms: the budget should reflect decisions, it should not determine them.

But I am worried, as are all the producers, especially stock breeders, at the delay which has arisen — for electoral reasons, as my colleague was saying — over the decision on farm prices, a delay which will have to be taken into account and allowed for, as indeed was promised by President Pandolfi to the meeting of farmers in Luxembourg. I was particularly pleased to hear Commissioner Christophersen state that the Commission was prepared to submit a second draft letter of amendment if necessary. The same commitment on the Council's part would be most welcome. For the Council to do what it did in 1984 and propose to finance these decisions out of possible savings would be unacceptable. As we have seen, that merely leads to a carry-over of the deficit to the following year.

If the Council wishes to win back credibility, it must therefore make proper budgetary provision for the consequences of its decisions.

Energy, research and technology

Mr Adam (S). — Mr President, the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology is one of the few committees that has had an opportunity of looking at the new draft budget that we have before us. We accept the basic premise that we should stick by Parliament's decisions of last November, because quite frankly we are now so far into the financial year that any hopes that we can use the budget as a policy means, in the terms of the 30 June declaration, are now very marginal.

There has only been one significant change since last December: that is that the Council has agreed seven research programmes. Therefore, the amounts which were in Chapter 100 have now been transferred to the line. We have not had the opportunity to go into the detailed figures for each of these programmes. Therefore, I enter the reservation this morning that we may need to come back later in the year to transfer money from one budget heading to another.

The other point that needs to be mentioned is that on Amendment No 309 we have been able to make a small staff adjustment to take account of that Council decision and that is something that the Committee on Budgets agreed last night. We have also adjusted the amounts to take into account the staff awaiting assignment, which was a point of disagreement between ourselves and the Council last December. The various budget headings have been adjusted to take that into account.

I am sorry that the Committee on Budgets did not approve Amendment No 308, whereby our committee hoped that we would make provision for staff for the RACE programme which we very much hope will be agreed by Parliament and Council by July of this year, and we were hoping in this way to be able to move straight ahead with the programme. I do hope that the political groups will look at Amendment No 308 between now and Thursday to see whether or not support for that could be forthcoming. I very much hope that it will be.

Finally, I wish to dissociate the committee from the draft joint declaration which has come out regarding the undertaking of further research on contributions financed by the Member States on their own. This is a matter which requires a great deal of thought. I am not saying that we are totally against this approach, but it is something that is far too important to be slipped through on the basis of a relatively short meeting and a declaration issued by Council, Commission and Parliament. As far as I am concerned, Parliament's representatives had no authority to agree to such a declaration. I do hope that before anything formal is decided there will be full discussion in Parliament.

Mr Staes (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, everyone should know that the factors that caused the European Parliament to reject the draft 1985 budget in December cannot be counted among my group's top priorities. We are concerned about totally different matters, not about the principle of whether or not a budget can be proposed for ten rather than twelve months.

The draft budget is a political vision, expressed in cold figures and venerated by the dominant forces in this Parliament, of the European Community's priorities and tasks. And we totally reject this vision because it does not benefit democracy, human rights, the Third and Fourth Worlds, the ecological structure, defensible social aims or détente and peace in the world but above all else supports the forces which, among others, are directly responsible for this world coming off the rails and sinking into aggression, pollution, injustice, armament, threats and insecurity.

This has again been demonstrated by a number of recent events, like the report of the Dooge Committee, the world economic summit in Bonn, which tried to strengthen the belief in destruction, the plans for Star Wars, Eureka and other sickening projects in which technology and militarization have a stranglehold on each other, and the American President's visit to this Parliament. The same man who, with his policy on Nicaragua, for example, rides roughshod over the democratic principles of the sovereignty of nations and refuses to recognize the elementary right of people to live as they please can do no more than refer to the already so imposing guilt-ridden hope of a misguided flush of prosperity which will not benefit anyone, not even the President, one iota.

Staes

The discussion of this draft budget and all the figures it contains will result in a destructive round of arguments over whether the emphasis should be placed on the agricultural policy, massive support for nuclear energy and nuclear fusion, the murderous war of attrition known as technological competition, the senseless race with such countries as the United States and Japan to be the first to the finishing line in a power bloc policy which takes less and less account of humanity, real culture and civilization and so drags a whole planet into the abyss under the slogan of 'God, freedom and fatherland'. You cannot make up for this by paying totally inadequate attention to alternative forms of energy, for example, by emphasizing the importance of democracy, a theory that is on the whole rarely translated into daily practice when it really matters, or of a policy towards the Third World which reveals the good side of the European Community better than certain other political attitudes but shows its true colours very clearly when it comes to giving the Third World the elementary means of surviving and developing into an autonomous, self-sufficient and basically democratic society. The constant references by so many elected Members of this Parliament, members of Councils of Ministers, Commissioners and spokesmen of committees and delegations to solidarity with the Third and Fourth Worlds, efforts to help the unemployed, an environment worth living in and the need to improve the social position of the weaker members of society are incompatible with their cheerful approval of a budget which will largely achieve the opposite of what they say is so urgently needed. For obvious reasons, Mr President, my group will not therefore vote for this motion for a resolution.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the budget provides for 25m ECU in commitment appropriations for alternative energy, and in my opinion this amount is far too small when compared to the funds set aside for nuclear energy.

And yet we have repeatedly adopted reports here in the European Parliament on the potential inherent in renewable sources of energy, the reports on biomass and solar energy, for example. I do not believe the Council is drawing the necessary financial conclusions from these reports. I also feel I can detect an inconsistency: on the one hand, both the Commission and the Council call for an integrated policy, Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, for instance, which presupposes the coordination of the Agricultural Fund, the Regional Fund, the Social Fund and also energy resources; on the other, we find preference being given to nuclear energy, which is inconsistent with an integrated policy in every way, because it will have a centralizing effect.

The conclusion to be drawn, therefore, is that, although there are ideas, they are not being translated into a decentralized and alternative energy policy,

which I believe is an essential element of an integrated policy. I am therefore afraid that both the regional policy and, soon, the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes will be taking the wrong direction and will ultimately become a fiction. Hence my grave reservations about this budget.

Social Affairs and Employment

Mrs Salisch (S). — (DE) Mr President, I am in fact speaking in a dual capacity, firstly on behalf of the Social Affairs Committee and secondly as a stand-in for our rapporteur, Mrs Dury, who is attending this morning's ceremony of remembrance in Struthoff.

I will begin by saying that we are of course happy to have a budget draft to consider. It is also certainly a good thing that the Budget Affairs Committee has got the Social Fund back into some kind of balance *vis-à-vis* the rest of the Community's budget expenditure and that changes suggested by us in the Committee have thus been acted on. However, the fact remains indisputably that the agricultural spending provided for in this budget will inevitably continue to rise, which means *de facto* a conflict between this spending and the money available to us to tackle the miserable social circumstances of a lot of Europeans.

This conflict, and those colleagues who support the agricultural policy here must take note, is becoming increasingly dramatic. In putting it this way — I am speaking on behalf of my Group too — I mean that we do not on any account want to make farmers redundant as well. But it makes no sense to have millions tossed around here which do not mean work and an income for the mass of farmers, whilst on the other hand no money is available to tackle the problems of more than 13 million unemployed people in Europe.

We have no illusions regarding what the Social Fund can do to help in view of the difficult situation prevailing in the labour market, but we should make no mistake about it: the European Social Fund is an instrument we can use to show which models can be truly effective on the labour market, in training, qualifications and retraining. It could also offer completely new incentives for national policies and open up new fields, if those in positions of responsibility would seize the chance. We have certainly got the matter in perspective in acknowledging that we cannot solve the entire problem by means of the European Social Fund, even if we get additional money, and that it continues to be the ultimate responsibility of the Member States to tackle the problem of unemployment.

We ought also to keep our minds firmly fixed on the following point. The so-called 'silicon valley fever' we are currently seeing in Europe — perhaps we should call it 'silicon valley delirium', as some people fall into a real delirium at the mere thought of the new tech-

Salisch

nologies — this fever should not seduce us into getting our priorities wrong, i.e. abandoning the social policy in favour of the new policies we are pursuing in the Community. It would really be a fatal error if we thought we could combat unemployment by means of the new technologies. I will say again what I have always said in this House: it may be right to strive to be competitive, but we may have to pay for this competitiveness by pressures on the labour market and by rising unemployment.

I should like to say another word or two on my Group's request to have a further 20 million ECU added to the social budget to combat youth unemployment. This too — no one can deny it — is a drop in the ocean. It will not achieve much, it may help a few young people to better their chances. But at the first budget reading the House was not even prepared to pass a majority vote in favour of increasing these funds.

The Socialist Group hopes that there will be greater comprehension this time of the need, and more money available, for what good is it to us if the President of the Council of Ministers for social affairs states that the resolutions passed by the Council of Ministers are hardly worth the paper they are written on because basically they lead to nothing, and that we need to launch a European Marshall Plan to combat youth unemployment, if there is no positive reflection of this in the budget? As politicians we might just as well resign, if we could, and as we cannot, we should at least support the Socialist Group's political demand, this additional request, in the budget discussions.

It is a sinister fact that some Member States of the European Community on the one hand deplore demographic developments which mean that the population of Europe is steadily declining but declare on the other hand in connection with the youth unemployment problem that it is merely due to the 'bulge' and that once this so-called youth bulge has passed the labour market will be easier again. This is simply not true, because we have to assume that the number of the employed will continue to decline in future and that we shall have fewer jobs. And so what appears today as bare-faced cynicism, i.e. speaking of youth as an inconvenient 'bulge' to be got rid of will in the longer term be shown to be a false prediction, for technological advances will bring changes to the labour market which will mean that fewer and fewer people can be employed.

The extra 20 million ECU which the Socialist Group is demanding to combat youth unemployment is a very small drop in the ocean and is very far from that which Mr De Michelis has demanded for a European Marshall Plan to combat youth unemployment. We hope that Parliament will back us up this time, and we hope against hope that the Council of Ministers will agree on additional funds truly worthy of the name Marshall Plan.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Mr President, I think it would be fair to say that the members of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning are very disappointed indeed with these new budgetary proposals. After fighting very hard to increase the share of the budget taken by the Community's most important structural fund, the European Regional Development Fund, we now see the rapporteur and his committee proposing that we should calmly accept a reduction in the budget share from the second reading at the end of last year.

Commitments are down from 8.1% of the budget after the Council's second reading to 7.5%, and payments are down from 6.2% to 5.7%. This is a disgrace which anyone who has any care for the regions cannot accept quietly. It reflects extremely badly on the Parliament. We have been told our goal is to double the Regional Fund in five years, and every time we try to achieve it we are told, not yet! Mr Cot, chairman of the Committee on Budgets, told us that we should forget 1985 and concentrate on 1986! We have only woolly pious statement in Mr Christodoulou's report. It is not Mr Christodoulou's fault, it is the fault of the Committee on Budgets. I suppose they are trying to tell us in woolly pious language, not yet in 1986!

The Commissioner spoke of the very great expectations regarding the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, but in rejecting the Regional Committee's amendment we feel that the Committee on Budgets has missed an important chance to show how much importance this Parliament attaches to these programmes. This is an extremely disappointing day for the regions of Europe. Every one of us who has any care for them will, I think, have very great difficulty in giving this budget any kind of approval.

Mr Ryan (PPE). — Mr President, there seems to be total incapacity on the part of the Council of Ministers to even listen to this Parliament. There would be a major political crisis in any member country were the government blatantly to break the law as the Council of Ministers stubbornly attempts to do in this Community.

One per cent of VAT and all customs duties on goods imported into the Community from outside are the legal property of the Community, and I fundamentally and strongly disagree with my Irish colleague Mr MacSharry when he says that this Parliament has no power over revenue. Neither the Council of Ministers nor the extramural body calling itself the Heads of State or Government can relieve Britain or the Federal Republic of Germany of their respective legal obligations to remit all customs duty and all revenue of 1% VAT to the Community. Ministers who by their continuing illegal action appear unable to comprehend basic legal principles of this Community show their unfitness for office. I know there are some who think my language is too strong. But they should remember

Ryan

that any worthwhile politician must speak the truth and leave evasion, duplicity and soft talk to the diplomats. Parliament cannot allow the EEC's revenue to be thrown into chaos because of Britain's intransigent refusal to accept any budgetary remedy other than a reduction of the cash payable by it under the law to the Community.

Parliament is not hostile to Britain's case for additional relief but this must be given, as we have said and still say, by extra expenditure on EEC programmes such as infrastructural development leading to additional economic activity and more jobs in the poorer regions of the United Kingdom such as Northern Ireland. This Parliament would not be doing its job properly if it merely gave relief to the British treasury or the treasury of the Federal Republic of Germany or any national treasury. Our priority must be to direct financial aid on the Community policies to where it is most needed. For instance to areas where unemployment exceeds the scandalous level of 20%.

A certain prime minister whom refinement of parliamentary procedures prevents me from naming is often referred to as the Iron Lady. I know nothing about the dear lady's metallic composition but she is certainly the queen of irony. She is reported as having said at Bonn last week that there was no need to reform the EEC's institutions and decision-making procedures because the existing ones can be made to work much better. That comes strangely from a person whose persistent attempts to violate Community laws has created the controversial financial crisis of these last two years and who refused to reappoint as Commissioner the last British Commissioner who was in charge of the budget purely because he was a good European, or so it appears.

It is high time that the deeds of Ministers matched their wonderful words. Sympathetic utterances about the problems of deprived regions are no substitution for real help. The gap is growing, not diminishing, between living standards in the rich centre and those in the poor peripheral regions. This development is at variance with the underlying objective of the Community to uplift all citizens to better and equal standards of living. Even if regional development and social fund financial assistance were doubled in the case of Ireland, living standards there would still be only one-quarter of what they are in parts of the rich centre. The pending and welcome arrival of Spain and Portugal in the Community will aggravate existing imbalances. Above all, we must ensure that the need assist our relatively impoverished Portuguese and Spanish friends does not result in any reduction of the present insufficient level of regional development and social funds to Ireland, Scotland, Southern Italy, Greece or any underdeveloped region of the existing Community. It is therefore imperative that the long-promised Integrated Mediterranean Programmes be launched in 1985. To do so, as has been pointed out, not less than 140 million ECU must be made available

by June. For this, and many other reasons, it is highly desirable that the EEC soon adopt a budget for the current year in which we are now in the fifth month.

Parliament wants the budget, but not at any price. Certainly not at the cost of democracy itself. Parliament is an equal and essential — and for some Ministers an inconvenient — arm of the ambidextrous budgetary authority. There will be no budget unless Parliament agrees to it. It was never intended that the European Community be ruled by intergovernmental agreements reached behind closed doors. We must operate the first rule of parliamentary democracy, rule by consent reached in public. The Budget Committee stands by its principal objections to the defects in the draft budget, not yet remedied by the Council. We have no wish to be in conflict with the Council, nor are we ready to surrender on the Council's term. We trust therefore that the Council will even at this late stage enter into sincere conciliation with Parliament so as to find a solution which respects European solidarity.

Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport

Mrs Ewing (RDE), *chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport*. — Mr President, it is a big job for two minutes, but very briefly I would remind this Parliament that the stated aim for culture — to take culture first — is 1% of the whole budget. Of course, this whole project is really fiddling while Rome burns — an appropriate expression for Music Year; we are not taking it seriously, and yet that is what the citizen will take seriously, that is how he will partly judge us — not just by things like agriculture but by food for the spirit, and this we are falling down on lamentably.

I have not had the advantage that I have heard others have had of discussing the new situation with their committees; I have only got it at second hand. However, I understand it is not too bad in that we are not being further knocked back on the amendments we have put forward. We certainly would object to seeing this happen, because we were not entirely satisfied with the previous situation. We must take culture much more seriously as far as youth is concerned, and this is Youth Year.

There was confusion when the Commission came before us in my committee last time about various lines in the budget. It is vital that we take the non-governmental organizations of youth very seriously, because after all, this is where young people themselves organize their participation in the affairs of society. This is the democratic face of youth, to which we must be much more attentive. We are only paying lip-service to youth exchanges, it is just a drop in the bucket, for what we do does not reach vast numbers of youth. They must be interested, because many of them voted

Ewing

last time by staying away from the polls, and that is a highly unsatisfactory situation. So, we are not succeeding in what we are doing is quite good, but we need more of the same, if I may quote ex-Commissioner Richard. We must inform young people or they will stay away the next time, and they represent the future for all of us.

With regard to education, if we do not have a significant increase for new technologies we shall fail the young people again in another way. We must have greater mobility of teachers.

With regard to information, we are going into the video and film age. There must be co-productions. I put forward the perhaps controversial suggestion that we combine the information offices of Parliament and of the Commission, because it is very hard for the public to understand why there should be two; it is not good for the essential interest of the public and it would, of course, mean a financial saving.

Let there be a line in the budget some day for tourism and for sport. If we do not have that, we shall again fail to interest the citizens at large.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

*Vice-President*5. *Action taken on the opinions of Parliament*

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

Mr Cryer (S). — I would like to ask about page 5 and the amount of cereals sent as aid to Ethiopia. In March, the Commission reported to us that they had decided to send 70 000 tonnes of cereals. In April, they reported to us that they were going to send 34 000 tonnes of cereals and promised a special report to the Committee on Development and Cooperation and an additional page which had not been provided for this Assembly.

Now this month, on page 5, they do not seem to be sending any cereals at all to Ethiopia, and I wonder what the explanation is. The problems of Ethiopia and the other countries are still pressing and tragic, and some of us would like to see some of the cereal stocks

in the Common Market shifted to those starving people. If there are hold-ups in Ethiopia, what is the Commission doing about that?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) There are at the disposal of Members full facts and figures concerning the aid given to Ethiopia in 1984 and in the first few months of 1985, whether in the form of cereal shipments or in any other form. These statistics are extensive, and as I say, are at your disposal.

As for the more general point, the competent Commissioner will give an account of the matter here, to the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

Mr Christopher Jackson (ED). — A great deal of food aid has been given to Ethiopia and the Sudan, and the Commission has recorded this in the statement which we have in front of us. We have been hearing over the past few weeks, however, that transport is now the absolutely vital need, because, although the food is there, the transport is not present to get that food to the people who are starving.

Secondly, now that the rains have come a further great need is not just grain to eat but seed to be planted. I realize the Commissioner may not be able to answer at this juncture — perhaps he would prefer his colleague to answer later on — but I would like to ask whether the Commission would tell us now what they have done in terms of increasing the amount of transport and seed available. If they are not able to say that, would they agree in future editions of their statement, where they do, fortunately, give some room to what has been done to help the starving in the famine areas, to put in more detail of things such as transport and seed and not simply amounts of grain?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) The text distributed to you, concerning action taken following the opinions expressed by Parliament, contains an attached supplement giving facts and figures on the aid granted to various countries. I do not think that those statistics on the granting of aid should form the subject of debate at this time.

As I said earlier, the competent Commissioner Mr Natali will be here on Thursday to answer questions that relate to his area of competence. I would like to say that what matters now is not just whether the Commission can answer your questions, but mainly that there is no point in offering explanations about the granting of aid, when the relevant figures are before you in the attached table.

President. — I should like to suggest to the Commission of the European Communities that Commissioner Natali be notified of the questions that were asked

¹ See Annex.

President

today so that he can prepare himself to reply fully to them on Thursday.

Mr Cryer (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, may I point out that the agenda is set out with the approval of this Assembly and the present item is a statement by the Commission on the action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament.

It seems to me that the Commission are answerable to the full Assembly, and for future guidance my own view is — and I am sure it is yours, Mr President — that it is not sufficient to say that information will be given to a committee when the responsibility is to the whole Assembly and maybe only a handful of Members of the Assembly are on the committee concerned. I hope that that guidance will be accepted for the future.

President. — I take note of your remarks, Mr Cryer, but I must point out that questions asked by Members of this House may, of course, concern any subject which the Community deals with and that we have not, so far, had the custom of having every Commissioner here in order to answer in detail every question that might be put. In any case, Mr Natali will be in a position on Thursday to go into the specific questions that were asked by yourself and Mr Jackson.

6. Question Time

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-267/85).

We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr Marshall (H-268/84):

Subject: EEC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds

Is the Commission aware that the French Government authorized the shooting of turtle doves in S.W. France in May for the third year running? Is the Commission aware that in 1984 Greece repealed its ban on spring shooting of birds? As both of these cases were against the EEC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds, what action does the Commission intend to take?

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — I welcome the opportunity to respond directly to the specific points raised by the honourable Member and to comment briefly on the Community's role in the conservation of wild birds.

First, the Commission is of the opinion that the shooting of birds in south-west France and Greece is con-

trary to the terms of Directive 79/409 on the conservation of wild birds. Indeed, pursuant to Article 169 of the Treaty, infringement procedures have already been initiated by the Commission against the Member States concerned in relation to these two cases and also to other apparent violations of the directive.

Secondly, let me add that I am fully aware that these are issues deeply felt by many honourable Members, as well as thousands of people across the Community, as is exemplified by the large number of representations received both by myself and by my services. It is a regrettable fact that in too many instances this directive seems more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Thus, in addition to the infringement procedures to which I have referred, I propose to write directly to all Member States reminding them of their obligations in this matter and to underline the fact that the existence of wild birds represents a cherished part of our environmental heritage.

Finally, let me remind the House that following the decision taken by the European Council, 1987 is to be the European Year of the Environment, in which wildlife preservation will be a major focus of our work. Accordingly, I invite all honourable Members with a particular interest in wildlife to raise with me any ideas they have about how this opportunity could stimulate even greater awareness on the part of governments and the public at large of the need to protect endangered species. I shall, of course, be inviting the closest participation of the Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

Mr Marshall (ED). — First of all, I thank the Commissioner for that very positive answer. May I, secondly, refer him to an article in *The Sunday Times* of 14 April 1985 which referred to widespread violations of the directive, not only in Greece and France about which he is taking action, but also in southern Italy.

May I ask him to look into that particular problem and assure him of the support of the House and, what is more important, of the people of Europe, for any action he takes to deal with this international scandal?

Mr Clinton Davis. — We are, in fact, taking the action which the honourable Member requires, and I think that he will be joined by many thousands of people in applauding that fact. It is, of course, essential that Member States do honour their obligations. Too many seem to take a permissive attitude towards them.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — I join my colleague, Mr Marshall, in thanking the Commissioner for his intelligent and helpful statement on a matter which causes great concern not only to my constituents, but to many others in Europe who feel that the issue of animal wel-

Cottrell

fare is increasingly important. Would the Commission not agree that the correct approach on this occasion would be to take those countries which are clearly in breach of the directive — and obviously in breach of the directive — to the Court in Luxembourg immediately and not to rely so much, as I understand from the Commissioner's statement is the case, on a letter to the individual national authorities concerned.

Mr Clinton Davis. — The honourable gentleman must have misheard what I said. In fact we have initiated the steps that are required for proceedings. The letter does not exclude that in any way. It is supplementary to the proceedings that have been initiated.

President. — Question No 2, by Mr MacSharry (H-361/84):

Subject: New technology competition for International Youth Year 1985

Will the Commission outline its proposals for the organization of a competition for the best software at Community level, in the context of International Youth Year 1985 and the need for such an initiative to make young people more aware of new technology thereby contributing to the development of a Community strategy in this field?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — I am grateful to the honourable Member for raising the important issue of youth and new technology in this question. The Commission has decided, after consultation with the Member States, not to go ahead with its original proposal for a new technology competition which we first presented to the Education Ministers last June. Instead the Commission is organizing, in collaboration with the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, a week-long seminar on young people and new technologies which will take place in July near Turin and will be supported by the regional and local authorities.

Some 120 young people from all of the Member States will participate with each Member State selecting its own group by means of a national competition on the basis of age, technical competence and ability to communicate in at least one Community language, apart from their mother tongue. Thus the element of competition which was envisaged in the original proposal, to which the honourable Member refers, is preserved though on a quite different basis.

The Commission found that the full implementation of the original scheme would have created substantial management problems on some Member States. The alternative which has now been chosen is, I believe, an attractive and realistic way of encouraging young people interested in new technologies and marking our support for International Youth Year.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — I would like to thank the Commissioner for his reply, but I have to say that I am very disappointed. I believe the new scheme he is talking of now barely scratches the surface or, to put it another way, is just the tip of the iceberg, in view of the great interest among young people, the concern evident in this whole area, and the employment potential arising from such competitions. I would urge the Commission to look again, notwithstanding the difficulties that he has just mentioned, because I think it is just another example of how the Community at large is falling behind in this whole technological area. I would make a strong appeal to him, in view particularly of the fact that in my country 50% of the population is under 25, to look again, or at least following the seminar which he has just mentioned to make sure that the matter will be taken further.

Mr Sutherland. — There are two matters to which I think I can refer which may give some consolation to the honourable Member. In the first instance he will be aware that a new emphasis, and very substantial emphasis, has been given to the area of new technologies, particularly with regard to the training of youth, in the Social Fund guidelines for 1986 to 1988, which have recently been adopted. 75% of the fund is reserved for young people and there is a very clear and substantial relationship between new technologies and the training which is now required under those funds. I think this will provide a clear stimulus for the development of new technologies where youth training is concerned.

With regard to the point which was made by the honourable Member in regard to the fact that the competition proposal has been changed, I also would have preferred — and the Commission would have preferred — the original procedure to have been adopted by the Member States. Ultimately, however, it is necessary for the Member States themselves to participate and to agree with the formulation. In the light of the apparent difficulties which the Member States would have had in organizing a Community-wide competition such as that originally envisaged, the next best alternative was that which has now been provided for and which will, at least, give a focus for a number of young people from all Member States and will provide for competitions in each Member State in order to select the 120 young people who will ultimately attend the conference in Turin.

Mr Seligman (ED). — The Commissioner said that 75% of the Fund would be devoted to youth training. I am not quite sure what that means in ECU. I would like to know. But is there money available for a wider distribution of conferences — not just the Turin Conference — in each Member State on the lines of the recent Windsor Conference which bring industry and the education authorities together in each region? That seems to be the priority — to get industry involved.

Mr Sutherland. — I can refer the honourable Member in the first instance to the work programme of the Commission which will indicate that one of the major priorities in the area of education for this year is a communication which will be available by the end of this year in the area of industry/university cooperation. The process of drafting such a communication is now well advanced. As early as yesterday there was a meeting of a panel of industrialists and university experts discussing that particular issue with a view to completing this communication. There will be a conference in the later part of the year dealing specifically with the issue referred to by the honourable Member. It is therefore, a major focus of attention for this Commission that there should be a development in the area of the relationship between higher institutions of education and new technologies. This will be a major focus of activity during the forthcoming year.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — (*FR*) I am grateful for the opportunity afforded by Mr MacSharry's question to raise the subject of new technology training for young people. Only very recently, the Summit Meeting of the Seven demonstrated that this was one of the most important issues for the future of Europe and the developed world as a whole. I am also grateful to the Commissioner for his evidence that the Commission is taking an interest in this matter, but I am most disappointed by his reply, which seems to indicate that, once again, the Member States are holding back a highly commendable initiative. I wholeheartedly support what Mr Seligman said when stressing the importance of involving industry and educational establishments in this activity, and I should like to put this question to the Commission: do you not think, Mr Commissioner, that it would be possible for the Commission to dispense with the States' involvement and use the available funds to set up a much more flexible operation with local authorities? I am thinking in particular of decentralized authorities which have their own budgets and could make a very valuable contribution to the attainment of the objective which the Commission has set itself.

Mr Sutherland. — First of all I should point out that 1.5 billion ECU is designated for youth under the Social Fund in the course of 1985. The situation which has developed as a result of the adoption of new guidelines is that there is a requirement that new technology training should be part and parcel of the training schemes under the general guidelines which have now been adopted. So, far from there being brakes being put on this development, as far as the Commission is concerned, there has been a very positive approach to the introduction of new technologies which will be part and parcel of the Community's policy during the course of the next year.

The funding of projects will, of course, be subject to the management guidelines to which I have referred.

Provided that applications for funding from the Social Fund comply with those guidelines — part and parcel of which, as I said, will be the requirement of 200 hours training (40 hours being devoted to the area of new technology application) — then applications will fall within the guidelines and can be adopted as a result.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — While welcoming the fact that Commissioner Sutherland has somewhat widened his reply to encompass the new rules for 1986-1988 on the operation of the Social Fund, would he comment on the report in today's *Times* that, despite the concentration of the new Fund on employment black spots, the priority operation of the Social Fund under the new guidelines will still apply to 57% of Community citizens as opposed to 64% hitherto? Does he not think that that is still far too wide a spread of Community citizens if we are going to concentrate on black spots?

Mr Sutherland. — First of all I should say that I did not widen my reply to deal with the area of the Social Fund. The question was widened to raise that issue — and I answered it!

With regard to the question raised by Mr Tomlinson, the reduction from 64% to 57% is a step in the direction of concentration which, I think, has been asked for by this Parliament. In addition, there has been, under the new guidelines, a specific reference to certain qualitative changes which are required in the submission of schemes. This also should have the effect of concentrating applications on the most worthy. It may be argued, of course, that the 57% is itself too wide, but we are dealing with a situation of 14 million unemployed. We have also provided in the new guidelines for specific opportunities for black spots outside the 57% in order to deal with isolated districts within the larger area of the Community which do not fall within the regional qualification to which reference has been made.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (*FR*) We do not doubt that the Commission is doing a great deal for young people and their training, and that it is spending a lot of money. My question is whether Mr MacSharry's suggestion, which has not met with a positive response initially, might not be taken up later. It really would not cost very much and would inspire a great deal of motivation. It would be an inexpensive way of achieving worthwhile results.

Mr Sutherland. — I wish the Community was spending a lot more, but we are spending as much as is available in the area of assisting youth.

With regard to Mr MacSharry's question, the difficulty is that whilst the Commission was in favour of that competition, it could not, of course, implement

Sutherland

the competition itself without the actual involvement of the Member States. There were management problems which apparently precluded that, and there was no power in the Commission to enforce the competition itself. So the next best thing has been achieved, I think, in the competition which has been organized, and I hope that it will be successful. Certainly the Commission will continue to focus on the area of new technologies and the importance of new technologies to youth training.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 3 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 4, by Mr Fitzgerald (H-499/84):

Subject: Strip-searching in prisons

Is the Commission aware of the growing disquiet and concern about the resort to strip-searching in the prisons of the North of Ireland and the UK and does it intend to seek the banning of this degrading and humiliating procedure?

Mr De Clercq, Member of the Commission. — (NL) My answer will be very brief. As I have said in the context of other questions, I can only reiterate that the conditions under which people are detained in prisons in the Member States do not fall within the Commission's terms of reference.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — I am afraid that unlike the other questioners I cannot thank the Commissioner for his reply. This is a matter that is causing widespread concern, and the practice appears to be on the increase. The figures available, for example, from Armagh Women's Prison in Northern Ireland for the month of March show that 59 such strip searches took place.

The reason for the supplementary is the increase, by 24 from January to March; and in the period from 1 November 1982 to April 1983 a total of 772 such searches took place in a population of 40 women. I can give statistics for England and Wales where 1430 such searches took place on a population of 1400 with the same increase. Would the Commissioner not agree with me that the time has come for him and them to condemn this degrading, demeaning, archaic and outdated practice and that this practice should be discontinued forthwith?

Mr De Clercq. — (NL) I can well understand the questioner's emotion, but this does not alter the facts, and they are more respectable than a Lord Mayor, as Mr Fitzgerald will certainly know. I can therefore only say that this subject does not fall within the Commission's terms of reference.

Mrs Lemass (RDE). — Even though the Commissioner has stated that it has nothing at all to do with him, may I ask him if the Commission is aware of the humiliating and degrading experience that women prisoners in our prisons have to endure? There have been cases where women have been subjected to strip searches, for up to a hundred times while on remand. Then they have been released, not having been charged or convicted of any crime. But they are subjected to a strip search each time they leave the prison to attend the court, and also on their return even though they have not been out of sight of the prison officers accompanying them.

Is the Commissioner aware of what is happening? I am particularly concerned about women being strip searched and all that that implies. Does the Commissioner understand what is happening? Is he aware of what is happening in those strip searches?

Mr De Clercq. — (NL) The fact that this subject does not fall within the Commission's terms of reference does not, of course, mean that the Commission does not have an opinion on the matter, let alone condones such practices. But that is not the point. The crux of the matter is this: What can the Commission do? All I can do is repeat that this does not fall within the Commission's terms of reference.

President. — Question No 5, by Mr Fitzsimons (H-547/84):

Subject: EEC study on cot deaths

In view of the continuous and very real concern about cot deaths and their cause and in view particularly of two recent reports in the UK, one of which considered that such deaths could be caused by accidental smothering, while the other pinpoints overheating as a common risk factor in cot deaths, will the Commission state whether to date it has supported any research into the causes of cot deaths and if not will it now give a commitment to fund a study on cot deaths in the Community?

Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) During preparation of the Community's medical research programme up to 1986, on research and development policy measures, the problem of cot deaths was considered as a possible research topic for the Community programme. As early as November 1979 the Commission organized a seminar in Sheffield to which medical officers of health, pathologists, forensic scientists, epidemiologists, paediatricians, etc. from all the Member States were invited. The results of this seminar were not encouraging and revealed that there were great difficulties in attempting to clarify and quantify the causes of such deaths.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Narjes

The main difficulties in investigating the causes of death included the relatively small number of cot deaths, lack of autopsy reports or accounts of the attendant circumstances, the wealth of possible causes and not least the high cost of local investigations. On the advice of the Medical Committee and of medical circles in association with CREST this problem was thus not included in the concerted programme of medical research. Furthermore, total research costs under the programme are being financed out of the national budgets, with the Commission merely coordinating the research work, for the Community has no powers in respect of health and the Member States have given no hint that they wish to allow it such powers.

Mr Fitzsimons (RDE). — I am not too happy with the Commissioner's reply. Despite all the advances in medical science, this is a problem that we still have all over the world. Would the Commission agree to funding a study aimed at establishing the frequency of cot deaths within the Community and attempting to identify common factors within the Member States with a view to further research?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) There is by no means any reluctance to carry out studies which may yield new knowledge. According to the statistics we have, for every thousand live births in the Community at present there are ten children who die before they reach the age of one year. Of these ten children six die before they are 27 days old, and four thereafter. Of the four children who die between the age of 28 days and one year only one comes into the category of cot deaths. We have discussed this problem in depth and have not found enough support from the Member States for a Community initiative on it.

If meantime — you quote two reports in your question — new scientific material has come to light which adds to the extent of the knowledge I have outlined, I should be glad to receive it and I would also be prepared to try again to get this subject raised on a Community-wide basis. The knowledge available to us at present causes the Member States to be lukewarm over this issue.

President. — Question No 6, by Mr Barrett (H-548/84):

Subject: ERDF

Is the Commission aware that £12 million awarded from the resources of the European Regional Development Fund for the electrification of the Howth to Bray railway line in Dublin were in fact diverted to the National Exchequer in Ireland and is the Commission further aware that CIE was obliged to borrow £76 million from the EIB to pay for the project, plus £10 million in

VAT and is the Commission satisfied that this procedure conforms with the rules and intentions of the ERDF?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) First of all I would like to quote certain figures: In 1980 and 1983 the European Regional Development Fund contributed to the capital cost for electrification of the railway line from Howth to Bray in Dublin, in amounts of 11.3 million Irish pounds in 1980 and 5.3 million in 1983. Furthermore, the work was supported with a loan of 54 million Irish pounds from the European Investment Bank. 18 millions were provided in 1981 and 36 millions in 1983. I would like to say that to combine aid from the Regional Development Fund and from the EIB is usual practice with investments of this type, and takes place on about the same scale. The proportional contribution of the two Community bodies to the total work is fairly high, but is at any rate within the scope of normal practice for regional policy.

The aid provided by the ERDF was in fact paid to the Irish Ministry of Economics, as happens with all Irish investments and as a rule with investments in any other Member State as well. This is primarily a matter of national legislation. Besides, I want to add that Article 36 of the new ERDF Regulation states that the ERDF's contribution can either be added to whatever public funds are granted for the investment, or be retained by the public purse in partial settlement of the grant in question. In either case, of course, the purpose of the aid is to supplement the national expenditure on regional development. At any rate this raises the more general matter, repeatedly considered by Parliament, of the supplementary or additive nature of national expenditure and Community aid. There is no absolute guarantee of this supplementary nature, and that is a problem of some concern to us. The best guarantee of supplementarity is complete openness about how the fund's resources are used. The Regulation provides for a series of relevant directives, one of which stresses that Member States must take the necessary steps to ensure that sums received from the ERDF shall appear as separate items in their budgets, and in a way that corresponds to the special features for which they were estimated. In Ireland the Fund's aid has indeed been recorded in the national budget separately from the aid granted by the Government itself for the same project.

Consequently, the Commission considers that in the instance in question the application for aid from the Regional Fund, and the payment of the aid itself, satisfy the formal and essential requirements provided for by the Regulation governing the Fund.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Does this not raise the very important question of additionality? I was rather disappointed with the Commissioner's answer

James Scott-Hopkins

on this. Surely it is time that the Commission really got to grips with this question and that Member States added the Commission's contributions to their own financing for their various projects instead of substituting them for their own contributions. Will the Commissioner take much stronger action than he has proposed to do in his answer just now to see that this is done?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) I said just now that the only guarantee nowadays is openness. The new Regulation contains various directives about this, some of which I will mention: Financing plans for the programmes must give separate details of the various national and Community sources of finance. The directive I spoke about earlier provides that Member States are obliged to take the necessary steps to ensure that sums received from the Fund appear as separate items in their budgets, and in a way that corresponds to the special features for which they were estimated. In addition, at the Commission's request Member States shall supply the Commission with informative figures concerning how they used any sums received from the Fund. Again, any reports concerning implementation of the programmes must state, for each region that received aid, what resources were used, whether from the Community or from the Government. Finally, disposition of the Fund's resources is decided on a combination of the priorities and criteria defined by the Regulation, and in particular the consequences of the ERDF's action for the economic development of the regions. Consequences which are of course greater when the Fund's intervention is added to the financing effort by the Member State, rather than acting as a substitute for it. Those are some of the measures and possibilities open to the Commission nowadays, perhaps more so than in the past, to ensure up to a point that aid will be supplementary — and I recognise that you are right to say that the guarantee is not absolute. The Commission can do no more than apply the Regulation. Earlier, I referred to Article 36, according to which the ERDF's contribution can either be added to the support granted from public funds, or retained by the government in partial settlement of the aid granted by the Member State. It is envisaged that at the end of this year or the beginning of the next we will examine what weaknesses may transpire in the application of this Regulation, together with both Parliament and Council.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — The Commission is, of course, fully aware that all moneys due to Ireland under the European Regional Development Fund are paid directly into the Irish Exchequer. These moneys are only paid when they have already been spent on specific projects and when the Commission is so satisfied. However, is the Commission also aware that CIE, the Irish Transport Board, is a semi-State body that is subsidized from the Irish Exchequer to the tune of no less

than 100 million pounds each year? Bearing that in mind, it should not be unexpected that there might be some confusion about funds. If there is any shortage, it is of course paid by the Irish Exchequer. Would the Commission please tell our Irish colleague, Mr Barrett, that Ireland gets no money from the European Community under false pretences and never looks for such money?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) I said earlier that from every point of view, both formal and essential, the finance was granted normally. We are aware that rail transport is deficient, but the same is true, I think, in many Member States. Besides, support for the railways is often a social measure. The present transport deficiency is not an obstacle to the granting of loans, especially when this aims to improve transport works.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — I wanted to come in after the Commissioner's reply because the impression could be created — well, it might be misunderstood — that the sum of IRL 65.3 million that he talked of all came from the Regional Fund. Would he confirm in his reply that the IRL 54 million that he talked of was, in fact, interest subsidies arising from our joining the EMS?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) The 54 millions represented a loan from EIB, at a subsidized interest rate.

Mr Guerneur (RDE). — (FR) I found the Commissioner's reply highly satisfactory, especially where he said that the ERDF can intervene to reimburse expenditure by States on railway capital development. I should like to put the following question to the Commission in this connection: the European Court of Justice has given judgment against France for having granted subsidies to support a reduction in freight charges on the railway network serving Brittany. I therefore wish to ask the Commission this: are the Commission and the Community prepared to enter into direct agreements with the regions, with their new decentralized powers, under which they would meet a proportion of capital expenditure aimed at reducing the cost of providing freight services instead of artificially supporting cuts in freight charges by means of annual subsidies? This question is of particular interest because it sets aside intervention by States and opens up the prospect of the ERDF working direct with the regions.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) I regret, I cannot give a precise answer to this question. What I want to say is that the Regulation does not permit arrangements and direct agreements with particular regions. Our dialogue with the regions about

Varfis

understanding their problems and preparing and submitting plans is very active, and we are promoting it, but it is essential for the aid to be approved by the Member State in which the aided regions are situated.

President. — Question No 7, by Mr Andrews (H-550/84):

Subject: Convention for the protection of individuals with regard to automatic processing of personal data

In 1981 the Commission recommended those Member States of the Community which have not already signed the Council of Europe Convention for the protection of individuals with regard to automatic processing of personal data to sign the Convention during the course of 1981 and to ratify it before the end of 1982.

Is the Commission satisfied with progress to date in this area and if not does it now intend to propose that the Council adopt an instrument on data protection on the basis of the EEC Treaty as indicated in its Recommendation of 29 July 1981?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — The Convention was open for signature on 10 June 1981, and the Commission's recommendation of 19 July 1981 asked that Member States should sign the Convention before the end of 1981 and ratify it before the end of 1982. So far France, Belgium, Germany, Greece, Denmark, Luxembourg, Italy and the United Kingdom have signed the Convention. Article 4 of the Convention requires domestic legislation before the Convention can be ratified. France has already ratified, and Germany, Denmark, Luxembourg, Italy and the United Kingdom are expected to be able to ratify soon. The Commission takes the view that the course adopted has enabled more rapid progress to be made than if we had proceeded by way of Community legislation. Not only would it have been necessary to reconcile differences between Member States but the pace of technological development is such that a directive might well have been out of date before it had been adopted. There are two countries, therefore, which have not signed — Ireland and The Netherlands.

Mr Andrews (RDE). — Perhaps the Commissioner could use his influence to get his old friends in Ireland to ratify the Convention!

Does the Commission accept the right of another Member State to issue a machine-readable European passport in 1987, which is the reason given for that country's delay in issuing EEC passports? Can the Commission state to what extent an individual issued with such a passport has any right of access to the information contained therein, and how can his or her

rights be protected in the face of such technical developments in data processing?

Mr Sutherland. — First of all, let me say that whilst it may not appear so at first sight, the results of the recommendation are not too bad. Only one Member State, as I have said, has ratified but four are preparing to do so.

I cannot address myself directly to the problem concerning passports which has been adverted to by Mr Andrews. All that I can say is that, in the area of data protection, the Community believes that the correct approach to take is to proceed by way of communication with individual Member States to try and bring about a situation where a general consensus and existing legislation within the Member States allow for reasonable protection of data which is provided.

With regard to the specific issue relating to passports, that is something which I will have to inquire into and come back to the honourable Member on specifically at a later time.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 8 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 9, by Mr Guermeur (H-620/84):

Subject: European petrochemical industry

Is the Commission aware that the Community's petrochemical industry is increasingly unable to defend itself against competition from countries in the Middle East, which have lower production costs, and does it not consider it necessary to negotiate a ceiling on imports into the Community of petrochemical products from Saudi Arabia?

Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission is fully aware of the problems entailed over imports of petrochemical products from the Gulf. Up to now these imports were not a significant proportion of the Community's total import volume. Our information also confirmed that the Gulf states' prices for exports to the Community were in general fair market prices and thus a reflection of the efforts by exporters and politicians in the Gulf states to develop a regular trade and good trading links with the Community. Problems may arise if in the foreseeable future sizeable additional capacity of the kind currently being created in this area is devoted to production.

The European Council of the Chemical Industry Federation (CEFIC) recently outlined to the Commission in a position paper the following consensus of its members on this potential problem.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Narjes

Firstly, CEFIC is aware that in future sizeable quantities of petrochemicals will probably make inroads into the markets of the western industrialized countries. The industry is not, however, calling for protectionist measures in Europe.

Secondly, CEFIC does not expect the Commission to solve the problems arising for the Community industry as a result of imports from the Middle East. The industry will take measures of its own to cope with the expected volume of imports. These will include continual restructuring measures.

This statement indicates a doubtless justified self-confidence on the part of the European petrochemical industry and rather gives the lie to the fears expressed by the questioner in his question. The European petrochemical industry does indeed still enjoy a number of considerable competitive advantages which offset the lower raw materials prices of the Gulf states. The position expressed by the industry cannot, however, take away economic responsibility, and particularly responsibility for ensuring supplies from the Commission. In particular it must not lull us into forgetting that a war has been going on in the Gulf region for several years now which may also affect the Community's supplies. The Commission is thus observing attentively the Community market for petrochemical products and the structural adjustments going on in the industry. Should it discover instances of unfair competition on the part of exporters or importers from the Community or third countries, the Commission would take action as its powers allow.

These matters are also the subject of discussions between the EC Commission and the Gulf states — discussions which are not yet completed at present.

Mr Guerneur (RDE). — (*FR*) I am very grateful to the Commissioner for the detail and sincerity of his reply. He could not have made it plainer that the Commission is concerned and that the various States are pretending not to be.

What your answer means in practice, Mr Commissioner, is that each State intends to retain control of its own petrochemical industry and above all not to allow the Commission the remotest opportunity to intervene in the interests of harmonization. It is this that worries me, and, although you have all but answered already, I would put this question to you, Mr Commissioner: in view of the increasingly clear threat from very large petrochemical installations, with capacity to export ethylene and polyethylene, do you not consider, for all the confidence that the Member States are showing according to your reply, that the time has now come for the Commission to show very clearly and unequivocally that it is determined not to leave the Community market defenceless at a time when unemployment is already too high and capital investment in the very large installations which are now being built is becoming increasingly difficult.

Mr Narjes. — (*DE*) I have alluded to the question of ensuring supplies and to the risks which may occur if we are too dependent on the Middle East. We are monitoring this question very closely. Regarding the question of whether the Community should subscribe to a preventive protectionist policy, I would point out that on the contrary the Community seeks, via the system of generalized tariff preferences and other political measures to provide the Third World producers with increasing but ordered access to the Community markets, and that the products under discussion here are related to those on the so-called sensitive list which gives us plenty of opportunities to avoid the effects you are afraid of.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — I would like to thank the Commission for its answer on this particular occasion, because I am sure that the question which Mr Guerneur has asked reflects an individual view of an individual country and is totally out of line with the official European view of CEFIC and the position papers on the subject.

Surely the European petrochemical industry has indicated and declared its readiness to absorb its fair share of Gulf produced petrochemicals, which in any case only represent 3 to 4% of the world's supply, provided that these products are not dumped in individual markets. Surely the European petrochemical industry has never asked for ceilings or quotas on such exports to the EEC. We are totally satisfied with the GSP system whereby normal duties are applied once the GSP duty-free element has been fulfilled. Therefore, the position with the Saudi Arabian imports is the same as with the US, but surely the Saudi Arabian petrochemical industry SABIC has totally misconstrued the position of the European petrochemical industry and I would be grateful if the Commission will please use its powers to see to it that what is required by that industry is normal and fair trade. We would like them further to monitor these things to see that it is normal and fair trade.

Mr Narjes. — (*DE*) Indeed the discussions currently under way are also aimed at making clear to the Middle Eastern producers that we want fair trade. We make no secret of it, however — and the honourable Member's question offers me an opportunity to say this — that we should be very glad if the terms of access for petrochemical products from the Middle East were not poorer on the Japanese and US markets than they are on the European market.

President. — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 10 and 11 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 12 by Mrs Ewing (H-643/84):

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

President

Subject: Spanish fisheries

Will the Commission comment on recent developments on Spanish Accession negotiations *vis-à-vis* fisheries?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Some considerable time has, of course, elapsed since the question was tabled. In the meantime, the results of the negotiations between the Community and Spain have been announced, and we are now in the process of adding the details to what was a general agreement.

Since that time the Commission has given the appropriate parliamentary committee detailed information on the contents of the agreement reached with the Spanish Government, and I do not therefore think, Mr President, that there is any need for me to discuss the agreement at length. What we tried to ensure during these extremely laborious and delicate negotiations was, on the one hand, that the existing interests of the ten Member States were protected and, on the other, that acceptable conditions were created for the integration of Spain into the Community, in the fisheries as well as other sectors. I think I can say that after long and wearisome negotiations it proved possible to reconcile these two aspects in a way that was acceptable to the Council of Ministers and to the acceding country. I would point out in this connection, Mr President, that the Commission naturally did a great deal of spadework for these negotiations, but that the negotiations as such were conducted by the Council, not by the Commission.

This is not to say, of course, that all the problems have been solved. There are matters that have to be settled in greater detail. The result of the negotiations must also be set out in treaty form. The work on this is now well under way. There is no reason to doubt, Mr President, that practical, and legal, results will be achieved by the date set and that, where fisheries are concerned, the work the Community has to do will not delay accession. I am not, of course, talking about parliamentary ratification in the Member States.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — I thank the Commissioner for his answer. My question was indeed tabled some time ago, but I can still put a perfectly relevant supplementary on the question of recent developments.

I would ask the Commissioner if he is aware of recent arrests for illegal fishing of Spanish vessels in the waters off Scotland, Ireland and France in the last two weeks, and the apprehension this has caused among the fleets of these countries, and indeed all the EEC fleets, about the disrespect for the law and its sanctions shown by the Spanish fishermen. Will the Commission tell us, therefore, on this question, which is after all an ongoing question, whether it will agree to consider an integrated European task force to enforce

the fishing regulations, which I believe in France has been called 'a blue helmet for a blue sea'? If he will not go along with that idea, will he tell us how many extra inspectors the Commission is going to appoint to control these fairly unruly fishermen and what the optimum staffing of an inspectorate would be? The Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food believes it to be 40.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) As a Member of the last Commission, I had some experience of inspections in the area of competition. I must say to the honourable Member that effective policing is far more difficult in the fisheries sector. I will add straight away that this certainly does not apply only to countries that have just joined the Community. It appears to be a peculiarity of fishing that breaking the rules is seen as quite a challenge. Perhaps this has something to do with the open sea and the fact that fishermen work in wide open spaces and have so much freedom.

Having said this, I would add that at present we carry out two forms of fisheries inspection. We already have our hands full with inspections for the Community of the Ten, and I can assure you that their fishermen are not all lawabiding citizens either.

The second point is that it will indeed be necessary to carry out effective controls to ensure that the arrangements agreed with the Spanish after lengthy negotiations are respected. At the moment I cannot say precisely what this will mean in terms of manpower and equipment, but what I will say to Parliament is that the Commission will not hesitate, once it has drawn up its list, to ask Parliament in its budgetary proposals to make it possible for these fishing regulations to be effectively enforced. The Commission hopes, of course, that Parliament will be willing to provide the resources required.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — (NL) The Commission may say that the negotiations as such were conducted by the Council, but it bears responsibility for the implementation of the fisheries policy. In view of the competition between Spain and the Netherlands in scad fishing in particular, a quota arrangement will be needed sooner or later. Is the Commission already working on this? Has it any ideas on this subject, or is it letting things take their own course under the transitional arrangement for the time being?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) The Commission is not in the habit of letting things take their own course, as you undoubtedly know. I should like to make that quite clear to the honourable Member once again.

The fact of the matter is that we had to negotiate long — too long, I think — and laboriously before practical results were achieved. I would ask Parliament to appreciate that it is an enormous task to set out in

Andriessen

legal texts, in treaty form, in a few months what years of negotiations have produced and then to prepare translations in all the Community languages which correspond exactly and can be submitted to the Member States for ratification. This being the case, I am bound at the moment to concentrate on the overriding objective of ensuring that the texts on both agriculture and fisheries are completed in time for them to be signed by all concerned in June. We shall use all the resources at our disposal for this purpose. Once this is done, I promise Parliament that I shall devote the same energy to the drafting of the implementing regulations for this policy with a view to avoiding disputes between present and future Member States. This will apply to all species of fish and thus to scad.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — I appreciate the Commissioner's difficulties regarding this very difficult and complex question. Nevertheless, Spanish boats are continuing to fish illegally, particularly in Irish waters where, as Mrs Ewing has rightly said, a number of boats were arrested last week — one of them for the fourth time! Many of these illegal fishing vessels were in the south and the south-west of Ireland, but now they are in the north and the north-west of Ireland and off Scotland! Surely, therefore, even before enlargement, the Commissioner must accept that additional protection measures are required. Would the Commission consider a request from Ireland for additional protection vessels, planes and helicopters? It is evident to us, as I said, that even before enlargement the whole system is breaking down because the onus for protection and surveillance rests with the Member States. I have got to say, as a Member from Ireland, that Ireland does not have the resources at its disposal — notwithstanding the assistance from the EEC in recent years — to police the area around it. Therefore, as of now — before enlargement — chaos is emerging. I shudder to think what it will be like after the next 18 months.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) I know that illegal acts are being committed although I was not aware that, as the honourable Member has said, one ship or rather its crew had been arrested four times.

The question whether the Commission is able to provide the assistance requested at this stage will require further thought. The resources available to us are limited. The willingness to provide resources is in inverse proportion to the demands made on the Commission when it comes to inspections. I must make that absolutely clear, and it is not therefore easy to give a correct answer to the honourable Member's question. Let me say that I am prepared within the limits to which I am subject to do what I can to ensure optimal inspections. I cannot say more than that simply because the resources available to me in the Commission's fisheries department are absolutely inadequate for all the checks that ought to be made in an enlarged

Community. I do my best, but not even the Commission can do the impossible.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — (FR) I think that we can pay tribute to the tenacity and courage displayed by Mr Commissioner Andriessen in dealing with this whole issue. It is therefore not about the substance of the agreement concluded that I wish to question him. That agreement is what it is. It could have been worse. That is now my considered opinion. Like the earlier speakers, I wish to ask the Commissioner about the future, not the past.

An agreement is well and good, but an agreement which is not adhered to is disastrous, and in order to ensure that it is complied with it is necessary to have resources, to have political will and to have a budget.

As you have just said, Mr Commissioner, the budget is insufficient. I therefore have three questions to ask you. First, is the Commission in a position to earmark funds in the budget for 1986 which will be sufficient for the purpose of pursuing a fisheries policy in the Community? Secondly, on the subject of resources, is the Commission prepared, since it has the power of proposal to the Council, to undertake, not to continue with the arrangements under which each country is responsible for policing its own waters, but — and I hope that I have your full attention, Mr Commissioner — to replace the existing system with a system of integrated Community surveillance to enforce the rules on fishing, in other words a fleet placed directly under the responsibility of the Commission and funded by contributions from the Member States? Thirdly, is the Commission prepared to demonstrate its political will by applying sanctions, since such political will is clearly lacking at present in most of the Member States?

(Applause from the benches of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance)

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) Three questions. Firstly, is the Commission willing and able to put forward proposals for the machinery needed to carry out proper inspections? I am willing and able to do that. But if I do, I would remind Parliament that the budgetary authority, or one part of it, has developed a formidable capacity for deleting resources proposed for this area. But the Commission is willing to adopt this course because it is convinced that an effective fisheries policy cannot be pursued unless effective and appropriate means of control are available. I have already said that the open sea clearly encourages an interpretation of legislation that differs from what is usual on dry land.

Secondly, is the Commission willing to set up a Community control apparatus with its own fleet? It is extremely difficult at the moment for the Community

Andriessen

to introduce effective inspections in another sector. We have discussed inspections for the fruit and vegetable sector on several occasions in this Parliament, and the Commission has submitted proposals for effective control in this sector. These proposals have met with considerable resistance from a number of delegations in the Council of Ministers. I am quite sure we shall encounter the same difficulties in the Member States when it comes to introducing Community inspections in the fisheries sector. The problem is not, then, confined to fisheries but is of a far more general nature: are we prepared in 1985 to allow supranational inspections *tout court et sans conditions* to enforce supranational regulations? That is the crux of the matter. It concerns fisheries and it concerns other sectors of Community policy. Unfortunately, I believe it will be extremely difficult. But I promise Parliament that the Commission will continue to insist — whether the Community's or the Member States' resources are used — that checks in the fisheries and other sectors be made as objectively as possible on the basis of Community legislation. I will add straight away — thinking of a very recent practical case, now that we are discussing 1985/86 farm prices — that it will be far from easy to introduce a system of genuinely Community inspections. We have a system of this kind to ensure fair competition, but the opposition where other sectors are concerned is very strong.

My answer is thus affirmative with qualifications.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Would the Commissioner accept that he has wholehearted support from all parties for anything he does to have more effective policing of this matter, but would he also agree that it will be easier to deal with the problem of illegal fishing once Spain is a member of the Community than when she is outside it. Would he also accept that it is time that people diverted their attention from small issues and looked at the very strong benefits coming to the Community both politically and economically from Spanish accession next January?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) In the past I have always tried to limit my answer to the question asked. For this reason I should not like — and I am sure you agree with me on this point — to discuss the broader aspects of the enlargement of the Community in the context of this question.

It is worth considering — and I think we should be grateful to the honourable Member for making this point — whether it will not be easier to solve this problem after Spain's accession to the Community than before and also whether the situation might not have been even easier if certain Member States had not been so obstinate and tenacious in their opposition to the incorporation of Spanish fisheries in the Community's fisheries.

Mr Falconer (S). — Like Mrs Ewing I am a wee bit concerned that it should be after the event rather than before it. Therefore, I would give you the opportunity, Commissioner, to advise us if during the negotiations with the Spanish Government you have arranged for compensatory funds to be made available for those who have suffered as a result of the present-day Spanish piracy and could you advise this Chamber of the machinery for making such claims — and one hopes the Commission has done this already during the negotiations — which should of course include a form of reimbursement from the Spanish Government when those claims are met by the Commission?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) If I understand the honourable Member's question correctly, he is asking whether it is possible to obtain some kind of compensation from the Spanish Government for any infringements of the protocol or of the agreement that has been reached. This point — if that is what the question is about — was not discussed during the negotiations, just as we do not discuss and have not discussed this subject when we find other Member States breaking the rules, where the possibility of obtaining compensation similarly does not exist.

What I find slightly disappointing about this discussion is that it is confined to infringements possibly committed by an applicant Member State. I can assure you that its fishermen are not the only ones to have been guilty of such infringements. I can give any number of examples of infringements of the present regulations by fishermen from almost all the Community countries that have fishing fleets. That is the fact of the matter, in the recent past at least. It can, of course, be said that some go further than others, but I am not in a position today to make comparisons.

I would ask you to appreciate that, as I have already said, fishermen are apparently a group of people who find it difficult to obey rules that restrict their activities. Why do we restrict these fishermen? We do so in the final analysis because it is in their own interests. The object is to protect fish stocks so that fish can be caught not only today but tomorrow too.

I am convinced, firstly, that after accession it will be possible — provided, of course, that we are given the necessary resources — to introduce a system that prevents infringements by one Member State from clearly exceeding infringements by other Member States and, secondly, that we will have instruments not for requesting compensation but for taking the legal action needed to prevent infringements.

That is all I can say about this matter for the moment. I am quite prepared, either in this Assembly or in the committee responsible for fisheries, once the initial work of drawing up the treaty provisions has been done, to consider the most effective way of introducing controls which are not aimed at a new Member

Andriessen

State but are designed to maintain the fisheries policy as such for the Community.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — The Commissioner here today is under an impossible bombardment of questions. One other thing I would like to draw attention to is that fines, even heavy repeated fines, on the same boat and the same skipper, do not seem to be a sufficient deterrent. Has the Commission considered measures that would enable the Member States carrying out surveillance to confiscate a very expensive boat for repeated infringements, and to take away the licence of a certain skipper who has been apprehended five times, and indeed a further time a few weeks later in another country's territorial waters? Is that a possibility, because some measure of this sort will have to be taken if we are to have law and order and preserve sufficient fish stocks to meet the requirements of the fishermen generally.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) I am not absolutely sure whether we would not need additional legal instruments for so serious a sanction as the confiscation of boats. I should imagine so, but I am not a lawyer. I must look into this, and I am prepared to do so and to give an answer later. I think we would need an additional legal basis for such action.

The honourable Member's second question concerned the withdrawal of licences, and that seems rather easier to me, but whether it would be effective I do not know, because illegal catches mean no licence. I do not therefore know whether the absence of a licence in itself would prevent such abuses, unless it would stop a skipper setting sail in the first place. If that was so, I think it would be worth considering the withdrawal of licences as a possible sanction. But I repeat, any such sanction would apply not only to this one acceding country but throughout the Community.

Mr Møller (ED). — (DA) Mr President, is the Commissioner aware that we are dealing here with an old profession which has existed and operated in absolute freedom throughout history and which now, quite suddenly over a period of a few years, finds itself having to be policed by a Commission which that profession has not recognized as an authority in its own country? I should like to ask the Commissioner if he does not feel uncomfortable in the role of a policeman *vis-à-vis* law-abiding people who have always set great store by observing the law but now suddenly find themselves turned into criminals, because they cannot change their understanding of the conditions of freedom which obtained in their profession when they originally embarked upon it. We are talking about human feelings, and I should like to think that the Commissioner also appreciates this human feeling in the exercise of his profession as a Commissioner.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) In what is beginning to develop into a debate I have said several times that the open sea clearly has the effect of making restrictions less acceptable. From that you can take it that we appreciate the situation that fishermen face. We have had a fisheries policy for several years. We must get used to it. That is another reason why the Commission, having noted that infringements occur to a greater or lesser degree in almost all the Member States, has so far pursued a cautious policy towards legal action in this area. This shows that we try to adopt what you have called a human approach to the problem. I have just one word to add to this. Humanity also implies that one man does not gain an advantage at the expense of others by breaking the rules we have made together. That is humanity among competitors, and the Commission is there to ensure that this humanity is upheld. I believe I have shown this afternoon that I want to take a balanced and human view of both aspects, of those who break the rules and those likely to suffer as a result.

President. — Question No 13, by Mr Pitt (H-644/84):

Subject: Flag of convenience shipping

Would the Commission give details of the economic effects of supporting flag of convenience shipping, in terms of the contributions to the balance of payments of Member States, to shipbuilding and associated industries, and employment in shipping, shipbuilding and associated industries?

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — The economic effects of the use of open registries by Community ship-owners are complex and often negative in terms of the viability of European shipping. Regrettably, EEC beneficial ownership of ships flying a flag of convenience represents as high a proportion as 22.7% of the total flag of convenience fleet.

It is however true that in terms of employment the ships registered under the Liberian flag, which represent about two-thirds of the total open registry tonnage employed in 1980, which is the last date for which figures are available, employed some 7 000 officers and some 13 000 ratings from EEC countries.

In terms of shipbuilding, we understand that at present orders from open registry owners to Community yards consist of 4 container ships, a coal carrier and a passenger ship. This is not large but the same is unfortunately true of orders from other flags.

I regret that it is impossible to quantify the Community balance of payments effects of open registry tonnage. This will depend more on where and how the ships are operated rather than where they are registered.

Apart from these points I would like to emphasize that

Clinton Davis

much has to be done at the international level to improve both the safety record of some open registry flags and the conditions of employment that are offered on them. The Unctad Conference on conditions of registration, which will be resuming its work soon, will, I hope, be able to contribute to these ends.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

Mr Pitt (S). — I thank the Commissioner for that answer and note that he gave a figure of some 20 000 EEC nationals employed by the Liberian flags of convenience ships. Does he have a parallel figure for non-EEC nationals employed on those same vessels?

Secondly, can the Commissioner please tell me where in the common market the principal beneficiaries of flags of convenience shipping are located? Would he, in spite of the economic difficulties, make a judgment on the balance of the benefit between, on the one hand, the owners of open registry ships and, on the other hand, the social cost to the nation States in terms of loss of jobs and lost revenue in the form of taxation?

Mr Clinton Davis. — I am afraid I cannot answer the first question put by the honourable Member without notice.

As for the question of the beneficial ownership of open registry ships, I can give the honourable gentleman these figures: 14% German, 9% UK, 4% Italian, 3% Dutch, 3% Danish, 2% French and 65% Greek.

On the last question that he poses, I think really it begs the whole question as to the viability of the future of a merchant fleet within the Community. It is my own personal belief that a continued and expanding reliance upon flags of convenience shipping can be inimical to the continued viability of the merchant fleet within Europe. I believe that it does represent as great a challenge as unfair competition in other respects. On the other hand, I must balance that view by saying that some open registry shipping has adopted higher standards, in relation to increased demands for those higher standards, over the course of the last few years. In that respect I refer to Liberia in particular.

However, that does not gainsay the fact that the concept of open registry, the philosophy underlying it, is in fact a permissive relationship to international obligations and an attack on trade unionism in seafaring, which I believe is unacceptable.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — Could I ask the Commissioner if he has read the report of the very full hearing just prior to direct elections under the chairmanship of Lord Bruce of Donington which went into all aspects of flags of convenience shipping, and if not, will he do so forthwith? Would he not agree that, despite what he said about the improvement in the Liberian situation, whereas previously flags of convenience were seven times as dangerous as any other ships plying the ocean, now they are five times as dangerous in terms of accidents? Could we look to the cost to the balance of payments when there are these really serious disasters, bearing in mind that at all times we are threatened with them?

Mr Clinton Davis. — I have not read Lord Bruce of Donington's report. He is an old friend of mine and in view of the honourable lady's question I have no doubt that either he or she will send it to me.

I am aware of the consequences of flag of convenience shipping and I think that my answer has been very explicit in that regard. The fact that there has been some reduction in accidents as far as Liberia is concerned, does not excuse, in my view, or condone, the whole philosophy of flag of convenience shipping. But it is a fact of life; so, however is pneumonia and we do not actually encourage pneumonia.

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

Mr Wijzenbeek (L). — (NL) Mr President, I refer to Rule 44 and Annex II of our Rules of Procedure. Does the President not think it is time — and this is a reference to someone who has spoken at length during Question Time about the qualities of fishermen instead of asking a question — that steps were taken to ensure that Rule 44 and Annex II of the Rules of Procedure were respected. In other words, questions from Members and answers by the Commission should be brief. As things now stand, Mr President, the number of questions we have in reserve will last us until December, which means the first new question will not be taken until 1986. Mr President, that cannot be the purpose of Question Time.

President. — I would point out to Mr Wijzenbeek that the conduct of Question Time is an issue which is constantly being discussed in the Bureau and in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and petitions. I would add that when I spoke, before taking the Chair, this was during Mr Nord's presidency, and if I gave any grounds for reproach with my statement I take it that the honourable Member will agree that it was for Mr Nord to put me right and not the honourable Member.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

7. Budget 1975 (continuation)

President. — The next item on the agenda is the continuation of the debate on the Fich report (Doc. A 2-30/85).

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Mr President, we have had an extraordinary debate this morning, and we have now come on to the time when we are going to decide very soon on Mr Fich's report itself. Not a word has actually been said about the report, not to mention the amendments to that report. If I may refer to it for one moment, I wonder to myself how many honourable Members have actually read the report of Mr Fich as opposed to listening to the very excellent speeches that he has made over the period of time when he has been the Committee and Budgets rapporteur on the 1985 budget.

I am hopeful that we shall see an end to the constant repetition of arguments concerning the British repayment. It has been going on almost as long as this directly-elected Parliament has been in being, since 1979. Certainly Mr Fich and myself are heartily sick of it and we hope we can see the end of it.

Of course, Mr President, we want the UK to be in the situation of fairness. We want to see that the amount of receipts through the Social Fund and the Regional Fund make it quite unnecessary in the years to come to have special measures for the United Kingdom and indeed, for that matter, for the Federal Republic of Germany. But the situation as it is at the moment is that this is not so, and to my astonishment — and I am sorry to see the Council is absent — the Council is being very restrictive in allowing new policies to come in which could correct this imbalance. It is something that I deeply regret, because the only way we are really going to escape from the problem that we have, and all the quite frankly fruitless debate as to whether the UK rebate should be on the expenditure side or whether, as per Fontainebleau it should be on the revenue side, is by increasing the money available in other programmes than the CAP. Like my honourable friend, Mr Curry, I was equally despondent at leaving Mr Andriessen talking about the meetings of the Agricultural Ministers which he had been present at, and that there might be some compromise on his original proposals for the agricultural prices for 1985/86. I sincerely hope that both he and his colleagues will have the courage to stand by their convictions and will not allow any weakening of their position. That was the feeling that I did not quite receive when he was talking this morning.

But moving from that for one brief moment, the last point I would like to make, Mr President, concerns the amounts of stocks of food aid that we have. Quite rightly, priority is being given to food aid for developing countries and yet we are valuing — and I have said

this before to the Commissioner for budgets — our food in stock at a high level and even raising that level when in point of fact the value ought to be lowered because the value of those products — both of milk products and of cereals — decreases while they are in stock. It would be a great advantage if we could write down the value of stock held in surplus and I am sure it could.

Mr President, I hope that our amendments to the Fich report will receive favourable consideration not only by the rapporteur but by the House.

Mr Langes (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, we have since this morning been holding a discussion, a very serious discussion, but one which, if I may say this to my colleagues, seems to have given some of them, especially my specialist colleagues, the impression that we are once more holding a full budget debate. We have rather lost sight of the fact that Parliament this year is in rather an unusual situation having thrown out the budget last December.

We of the Parliament can certainly claim with some pride to have got the Council to accept essential points of our criticism and make a proposal which is on many counts conciliatory towards Parliament. We have also, and this we must stress, got the governments to agree on supplementary financing to the tune of 2 000 million ECU. This means — and I must remind my colleagues of this — that this extraordinary situation in which we find ourselves also requires extraordinarily great efforts of us during the first and second readings. We cannot act as if we were able now to resume full discussions with the Council.

There is just one point which I consider to be vital and which has not yet been hammered out. This is the question of the refund for the United Kingdom. The UK refund, if I may put it this way, is like a millstone around our necks. What is the position? On the one hand Parliament has always acknowledged that a special measure for the UK is necessary until such time as we have a new financial regulation. We have described this new financial regulation in a variety of motions. But unfortunately the Council has done virtually nothing in this respect. The latest Luxembourg meeting was not a success either as regards own resources, not least because the Council — psychologically very ineptly, I would say — did not understand at all what Parliament was after.

The question therefore is, we must conclude from the consequence this Parliament has always applied, in view of the decision to give the UK its refund reached at Fontainebleau, i.e. by the heads of government of the ten Member States, that Parliament must now make vigorous efforts to take this sum out of income and transfer it to expenditure. This would be the consequence of our entire political action. I can understand any colleague who has supported that, and I

Langes

should also like to say to my British friends that this is a very important question which is important for them also, for it cannot be in their interest if the Community in future comprises citizens of two categories, viz. the nine or ten countries which pay the full rate of VAT and the British, who pay the full rate less a bit. This would mean we had second-class citizens here. This cannot please any of us.

I thus ask the Council, is it willing and able — not least because of the accession of Portugal which, under this old financial regulation is actually a member, which will have to pay more because it is supposedly rich, although everyone knows it is not rich and cannot be a net contributor in the Community — is the Council willing, in a reasonable consultation meeting with Parliament between the first and second readings, to make clear that it is also aware of this problem and that our British friends are aware of it too, so that the foundations for a new financial regulation can be laid at the latest at the Milan summit? For this is the key. We want a reasonable solution, I can assure the Council, because we are faced with an unusual situation, and for this reason we are prepared to cooperate with the Council this year. It is a one-off occurrence, however, which we cannot guarantee for 1986 and 1987.

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Mr President, when I asked to address the House again, it was not to engage in a debate with Members who will not have an opportunity to replay, it was simply to correct one or two misunderstandings and to answer a few questions which have been asked along the way.

To start with, I should like to say to Mr Christopher- sen that I find it somewhat unreasonable for him, on the one hand, to say that we are wrong to use an additional 232 million ECU in own resources — although it is the Commission's own estimate that these 232 million ECU exist — and, on the other hand, to criticize us for earmarking too little for food aid. He cannot criticize us for spending both too much and too little. I agree that the appropriations for food aid are inadequate but, by earmarking the 232 million ECU, we used the maximum of resources which were available.

With regard to the deficit for 1984, Mr Christopher- sen put a rhetorical question: is it at all realistic to expect an intergovernmental agreement? Mr Christo- phersen, I cannot answer that, but whatever happens the Council will pay the 417 million ECU sooner or later; if the Council does not pay it in 1985, it will do so in 1986. The Council will pay the 417 million ECU sooner or later; there is no-one else to pay it.

In answer to Mrs Scrivener, who spoke about the repayment to Great Britain, I should like to point out that what the Council of Ministers and the Commission have set out in the budget proposal for this correction mechanism on the revenue side does not in

reality correspond to present legislation in the Com- munity; there is no legal basis for it. The present sys- tem of uniform VAT rates — and that is what Parlia- ment wants — does correspond with present legisla- tion and I think we agree, Mrs Scrivener, for it cannot be seen in any other way. What we have decided is that all Member States should pay the same in VAT, and of course things should not be done outside the budget. The whole question must be settled within the budget proper. I just wanted to be sure that there were no misunderstandings on this point.

To Mr Hutton, who is unfortunately not present, I would say that he is making a wrong comparison. He says that the Regional Fund has been reduced from about 8% to about 5%. But you cannot draw that comparison, because in fact it has increased in numeri- cal terms. However, because other things — namely agriculture — have increased more, it may look in a comparison as though the Regional Fund has con- tracted. But in numerical terms it has grown, thanks in particular to pressure from Parliament, and I think Mr Hutton should take note of that.

Finally, Mr President, I would say to Mr Bonde, who had some personal remarks to make to me and who unfortunately is not present, that we are in a very grey area where the revenue side of the budget is con- cerned, since the Treaties do not make any stipulation with regard to it. There is no provision in the Treaties for the Council or Parliament to intervene on the revenue side, but the Council has now begun to do so, and quite simply Parliament feels it can do the same. At no time have I ever wanted a new Treaty of Rome — on the contrary. Throughout my speech I empha- sized the need to adhere to the Treaty of Rome, because that is in fact what should regulate our pro- gress. And finally, when Mr Bonde says that the appropriations we are earmarking for food aid will lead to absolutely nothing, I would answer that, if we do not vote for these appropriations, we can be certain that no food aid will be forthcoming.

Mr Cot (S), chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Mr President, as this debate draws to its conclu- sion, I should just like to add a few words on the problem which all of us — you Mr Commissioner and your colleagues, Mr President-in-Office of the Coun- cil and honourable Members — have recognized as being of essential importance, the problem of the Bri- tish contribution.

This morning one honourable Member spoke of Ban- quo's ghost. We would certainly like this particular ghost to be laid once and for all, so that our debates would no longer be constantly poisoned by this prob- lem. And I am very sympathetic to the arguments which our British colleagues have advanced, both in committee and in plenary, on the need to clear up this issue so that it no longer poisons our debates each time that the budget comes round.

Cot

It is therefore my wish that we shall be able to reach a reasonable solution.

As this debate draws to its end, then, I propose to try to identify the points of agreement and those on which we are still unable to see eye to eye.

First, the proposal made by the Commission and adopted by the Council, on revenues. This amounts to a proposal to give official sanction to a scale for VAT contributions, with effect from the budget for 1985, even though the basic text on own resources has not yet been adopted. I should like to make our position on this absolutely clear to the Council and the Commission. You really cannot expect us to anticipate a solution with which we are not even in agreement. What I mean by this is that, for the time being, we are clearly in an illegal situation as long as the text on own resources has not been adopted, and there is every possibility that Parliament will not approve this text since, as we said during the course of budgetary conciliation, it is contrary to Parliament's philosophy. Nor can you expect us to vote to condone an illegal situation when the basic text is still lacking.

On this point, therefore, I wish to make it clear that this is probably how we shall vote on Thursday, since I believe that we must refuse to accede to an illegality which is contrary to our philosophy. If the Council subsequently adopts a text on own resources, a new situation will have been created and Parliament will then have been put in the position of having a legally valid proposition to debate. But for the time being and as matters stand at present, let us not read more than that into the decision that we are going to take. The proposal which has been put to us is manifestly irregular as long as there is no proper basis for it. I am quite convinced that you cannot expect us to take an illegal step in order to assist the attainment of a political aim with which we are not in agreement.

On the expenditure side — and here I speak as chairman of the Committee on Budgets — I really did have the impression during our discussions that an aspiration, a consensus was emerging in favour of concrete developments along the lines foreshadowed at Fontainebleau. We are politicians, we are realists. We are well aware of the difficulties, we are well aware of the problems that ratification will pose, which we do not underestimate, and we have no desire to complicate matters. But what we want — and Parliament, which will not change its position, is determined to see the imbalance rectified by adjustments on the expenditure side, having been delighted at the declaration made at Fontainebleau that this was the method to be adopted — what we are now asking is to be told how and when this is going to be done. I think there could be a large majority in favour of making this demand. I heard Mr Langes asking: how do we go about it, what do we say? I think that we should be able to find a wording for this question. Our rapporteur has proposed one wording, Mrs Barbarella another. Others may yet be

found between now and Thursday, but, to my mind, the main thing is for us to ask the Council — and do not expect any less than this from us, Mr President-in-Office — how and when it will be setting about the problem. Short of an answer, we shall be unable to accept that Fontainebleau is to be interpreted as follows: thank goodness we've seen the back of that problem, let's hear no more of it! We've made a few concessions on expenditure, by means of which we've secured a scale for revenues from VAT. That is something that we will not accept, nor, I believe, can the Commission accept it, in so far as it is custodian of the Treaties, since it would undermine the very principle of own resources and mark a return to national contributions, which we cannot accept.

That is how I see this essential issue at this stage. It was for your guidance, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Commissioner, Ladies and Gentlemen, that I was anxious to give this further information as the debate draws to its conclusion.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I shall try to be as brief as possible, but the important statements that have been made about various aspects of the present agricultural policy make it necessary for me to reply to some of the remarks that have been made.

Firstly, Mr Woltjer more or less said this morning that I was to blame for the Council's failure to take a decision on farm prices because the Commission had not submitted a proposal at the weekend. I utterly reject this accusation. The Commission has put forward a proposal. What was lacking was the political will, the political conditions in the Council at the weekend for a final decision to be taken on the basis of any proposal. There is no point — I say this quite openly in this Parliament — in the Commission putting forward a compromise proposal if the Council is not prepared to take a final decision on it at one meeting. I hardly need explain here what happens to a compromise proposal that has been on the table for ten or fifteen days without political decisions being taken on it. That is why the Commission did not submit a proposal. For the same reason the Commission undertook to submit a proposal for the Council's next meeting on Monday once it became clear that there was sufficient political will to push on to the end, possibly with a vote. We must lay the blame where it should be laid. It is not the Commission that is at fault. It is the Council that has failed to take decisions on the basis of practical proposals.

Secondly, Mr President, I should like to turn to the budget. I talked this morning about the need to avoid adverse effects on the budget, and I said that, if the price decisions resulted in additional expenditure, there would have to be compensation elsewhere. This in no way conflicts with the general statement on a possible second supplementary budget made by my

Andriessen

colleague the Commissioner responsible for the budget. If and to the extent that — as I said in the Council — agricultural expenditure is increased, there must either be compensation — which is what I would prefer — or a commitment to additional financing. Otherwise I believe we shall endanger the agricultural policy in the longer term.

It has been asked whether this will not make agriculture the closing item of the budget. At a time when agricultural expenditure accounts for 70% of the budget, it cannot but be assessed in the context of the budget. No further explanation is needed. Whether there will be enough money will depend, of course, on the decision taken on prices and also on what compensatory action may be necessary. The Commission has in all conscience sacrificed an amount intended for agriculture, and we hope it will be enough. I admit there are difficulties about action to reduce our stocks. That is a point the Commission will have to consider further. Clearly, these problems cannot be discussed in greater detail until actual decisions have been taken.

Fourthly, farm prices. I said this morning that the proposals from the Presidency largely correspond to the Commission's proposals. I would point out that this chiefly concerned farm prices. The text submitted by the Presidency contains a number of additions and improvements to existing arrangements, relating, for example, to the milk and other sectors, which also take account of suggestions made during the debate on farm prices in this Parliament.

The answer to Mr Tolman's question whether a reduction in the milk quota by one million tonnes would also lead to a reduction in the co-responsibility levy is 'yes'.

My fifth comment concerns the external aspects of the policy. We had a long discussion on this during the debate on the Pranchère report, but in view of what was said this morning, I should like to emphasize once again that, with the policy we are pursuing, it is not only a question of what incomes we can provide for farmers this year or next year but also whether or not we intend to go on exporting certain products. And if the answer to this question is 'yes' — and how could it be otherwise, Mr President, given the current level of production in the Community — we shall have realized that there is an external barrier when we talk about prices and the application of our market organizations. I want to make it quite clear that we do not allow our policy to be dictated by anyone else in the world, not by third countries, not even the United States, but we must remember that, as one of the world's largest exporters of agricultural products, we must leave room for others in the world market and for world market considerations in our own agricultural policy.

Finally, reference has been made to the report the Commission is drawing up on future prospects. I said I

was prepared to have this study consider any suggestions that might be made. Some Members have said that prospects are not enough: there must be real change. Others have said that adjustment is an excellent idea, but the common agricultural policy must not be dismantled in any way. I should like to make my position on this very clear. We are outlining prospects, we are looking for new openings, we are seeking out the weaknesses of the policy, we are not excluding the possibility — quite the contrary — of the analysis leading to the adjustment of the policy. Yes to change if it is justified and necessary. No to dismantling. The common agricultural policy is and should remain one of the cornerstones of the Community, and while this Commission and this Commissioner are responsible for the common agricultural policy, it will not be dismantled of that I can assure you.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I was a little troubled at times during today's debate to note that there was so little disagreement between the Commission and Parliament, but I was encouraged when I heard Mr Fich's last intervention, for I can see that there are some things after all on which we are still not entirely agreed. This means of course that we have not wasted our time by meeting together like this.

I shall not repeat what I said this morning; I shall just make two observations to Mr Fich. Then I shall turn to some more positive considerations.

What the Commission criticizes both the Council and Parliament for is in fact that it is impossible to reconcile, on the one hand, the requirements of sound administration and proper budgeting with, on the other hand, the proportions taken on by political ambitions. The Commission criticizes the Council because it has plenty of wishes of a political nature but, in the final analysis, it is apparently not prepared to provide the means in full to meet the expenditure they will involve.

What I have said about Mr Fich's report amounts to the same thing. Parliament has a number of wishes for additional expenditure, but in the end Parliament also cannot find the means to meet the expenditure in full, with the result that both the Council and Parliament leave it to the Commission to find out how a shortfall of 400 million ECU is to be made good, while at the same time cutting the appropriations for food aid.

These are things which I find regrettable and which the Commission really does not consider justifiable. But, if the Council and Parliament cannot do things differently, the Commission must take on the task of solving the problems created by others. That is why I said today that we must impose tight control in our administration and look at the problem when we frame our budget for 1986. I say this now, because I do not want to be criticized at a later stage by the

Christophersen

Council or Parliament for excessive stringency in administration. I say it now to make plain the reasons for such conduct.

Mr Fich says that the Council will pay the 417 million ECU sooner or later. I do not know whether it is the Council which has to pay it — I think that is oversimplifying the matter. The reality is that, if we cannot make good the 417 million ECU now, we shall have to do so at some future date by cutting out other claims on our resources.

But in other respects I think it has been a debate characterized by realism, a sense of responsibility and a will to assist in the rapid production of a budget for 1985. Here I agree entirely with Mr Langes. This realism and sense of responsibility also emerged clearly from the large number of contributions on the provisional solution to the British imbalance problem, in particular from what Mr Cot had to say on the matter — albeit somewhat, perhaps not aggressively, but forcefully — and from what Mrs Barbarella said. I have already referred to this question, and there is no disagreement between Parliament and the Commission over the fact that imbalance problems should in principle be solved via the expenditure side of the budget. That is what we should be working to achieve, and that is in fact what is stipulated in the Fontainebleau solution.

The question is how we can as quickly as possible reach a more permanent solution and one which is more satisfactory to us all. In this connection I should like to inform your, now that the debate is drawing to a close, that I have just learned that the Council this afternoon finally adopted the proposal on new own resources. This was made possible by one Member of the Council withdrawing a previous reservation. The proposal is therefore adopted. It should also be stressed that the Council has acceded to the strong wish expressed by Parliament in the course of consultations that the means should be made available for expenditure on research and development to be allocated outside the 1.4% framework, if agreement is reached, through the application of special distribution keys. A procedure which up to now only covered Euratom, or was intended to cover Euratom, is now to be extended to research in general.

Finally realism and a sense of responsibility also emerged from a contribution on the need for multiannual budgeting — that was Mr Dankert's view — and from what Mr Pfennig said on the need for more resources to be made available to the Community in the somewhat longer term. Mr Pfennig is of course right in thinking that the present Community budget is not of such a size that it can have any decisive influence on the macroeconomic factors affecting the Community. This is a shortcoming of the Community's budgetary policy.

A number of contributions have also been made on specialized matters, but I shall not go into them. My

colleague, Mr Andriessen, has dealt with the views on agricultural policy matters, but a number of things have been said about social policy, regional policy and cultural policy arrangements. All I will say about these various contributions is that they clearly reflect the need in the Community for a more factual debate on the priorities to be allocated to our wishes in the coming years. The debate here as a whole shows that there is not room for all of them; there is not room for all the wishes expressed in the institutions. We must therefore devote more attention to deciding what priorities we are to allocate to the various wishes.

With these few remarks, Mr President, I should like to express my gratitude especially to the Committee on Budgets for its very valuable contribution to ensuring that we can now move on rapidly to finalizing the budget for 1985.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — A point of clarification, Mr President. The Commissioner did say that in the agreement reached this afternoon the Ministers had agreed that research should extend over a wider field than Euratom but it should be outside, go beyond, the 1.4% VAT. Was that what I understood him to say?

I may be wrong but that is what I thought he said. Outside or above the 1.4%.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, it should be understood to mean within the budget but outside own resources.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday at 10 a.m.

8. Budgetary policy 1986

President. — The next item on the agenda is the report by Mr Christodoulou, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the guidelines of the budgetary policy for 1986.

Mr Christodoulou (PPE), rapporteur. — (GR) Mr President, I am very pleased to set the ball rolling on analysing the guidelines for the 1986 budget, after the optimistic message that Mr Christophersen gave us, namely that the matter of own resources has finally settled into the right groove and that the appropriations for technology, which Parliament has fought for so persistently, are beginning to develop in the correct way.

Our optimism for the future, restrained though it must be following past experience, makes it appropriate to

Christodoulou

ask to what extent it may be necessary to review our aims, and hence the general orientations of the budget, and if so, then in which direction?

It is commonly accepted that solutions to our immediate problems, such as the unacceptably high unemployment rate which now stands at 11%, on the one hand, and for long-term problems, such as convergence of the Community's economies on the other hand, will require economic recovery and the development of steady economic growth.

The recent analytic statistics in the economic forecasts published by the Commission justify a degree of optimism, since they indicate that Europe is in a phase of recovery. Based on those statistics, the gross national product is increasing by 2.4% on average, and inflationary pressures are being reduced from the 10% typical of the period 1977-1983, to 5% in 1985.

Thus the prime target of the Common budget for 1986 should be to maintain this recovery, and so far as possible to convert it into secure and steady growth.

Yet how is recovery to be maintained? On this point we must agree with President Delors, who correctly suggests that for this aim to be achieved, the Community's resources should be directed towards expenditure that will improve the competitiveness of the respective markets, while at the same time contributing to their expansion.

It is appropriate to stress the following: Firstly, if the financial policy of the Communities aims to improve the competitiveness of our economy, it will have to turn towards new directions which, for a start, strengthen research and technology, especially in original technological applications, such as in biotechnology, telecommunications, data processing and new sources of energy. In parallel, our competitiveness will increase if the budgetary expenditure in 1986 is used for as great as possible a coverage of social programmes, such as support for cooperation between Member States, both in the joint production of new products and in improving the infrastructure of interstate transport.

Secondly, a prerequisite for improved competitiveness is necessarily an enlarged market. There can be no really large internal Common market so long as the economies within the Community diverge instead of converging. We therefore think that convergence of the economies in the enlarged Europe can be accelerated via the budget, especially if substantial regional development programmes such as the IMP's are promoted.

Thirdly, a general review of the CAP may perhaps be the start of a new orientation, now so very necessary, towards the correct development of the Community's economies and the safeguarding of small producers' incomes.

Only in this way can there be a long-term and definitive solution to the problem of unemployment. It is a fact, at any rate, that unemployment is perhaps the Community's most important current problem, and it is also a challenge. The limits of the national budgets, with the large deficits they already show — less 5% as the proportion making up the Community's gross national product — render them quite incapable of bearing the entire burden of eliminating unemployment. And besides, in their attempt to deal with the problem they are forced to postpone all the other measures that contribute to the promotion of recovery.

For this reason, until recently, before the alternative solution of economic recovery became apparent, the Common budget went a long way towards replacing the national budgets. At this point it is appropriate to state clearly the view that so far as the Social Fund's expenditure is concerned, the 1986 budget must not conflict with obligations already undertaken, even though a permanent solution to the employment problem can only stem from a recovery of the economies of Member States.

In parallel, we recognise that during periods of economic recovery and increasing competitiveness, productive investment has a direct effect on the labour market. Thus, to prevent the Common budget from turning into an instrument for exacerbating social differences, its orientation will have to provide for policies that will mitigate the negative consequences of increased competitiveness.

What policies are those, however? First of all, the working man is quite rightly unwilling to accept as his private burden the cost entailed by economic recovery, especially when this is connected with a rapid devaluation of his special skills or with the necessity for him to move from his place of work. The cost is a public one, and to facilitate recovery the Common budget will have to contribute substantially to national programmes that will also have to earmark resources for the preparation and implementation of programmes that will protect women, young people, and the handicapped against the increased weight of competition. From all this it emerges that the basic orientation of the 1986 budget must be to promote recovery, to vitalise competitiveness by mechanism that improve, develop and enlarge the markets, and to fight unemployment. However, the orientation of a Common budget cannot ignore two important activities that have always represented basic aims of the Community. Parliament's own guidelines have been quite consistent about this. Thus one category of activities comprises all programmes supported by the budget and aiming to protect non-renewable natural resources such as the sea, forests, the wealth of the land, but also to protect the Community's citizens against the increased dangers that economic competition creates for the environment.

The other category of activities of our financial policy comprises the provisioning and developmental aid to

Christodoulou

countries with which common programmes are in progress or under consideration. As we all know, it was never the aim of European Union to create a closed society. The Community has proved that the promotion and development of its internal dynamic factors is not a private benefit in which only its own citizens may share. It is a public benefit for the international community, and especially for disadvantaged regions. It is therefore essential for the potentials afforded by the budget to be correctly planned and brought to fruition. However, a budget does not just mean expenditure, but also revenue. Financial management during the years 1984 and 1985 was characterised by evident instability. It commenced on the basis of restricted own resources, it compromised with the very rapid increase in CAP expenditure, and it ended by substantially reducing Parliament's flexibility in developing new policies. The result of all these things coming together was that the budget for 1985 was rejected, own resources were increased, and despite all this, it is likely that the financial deficits of 1985 will be carried over to 1986. We think that Parliament's tolerance for the exogenous definition of most of the budget's expenditures is at an end, especially if we reject the solutions we already know. For these reasons the increase in own resources, together with the Community's enlargement and the recovery of Europe's economy, may contribute to a more long-term concept of financial management, and to the relocation of the CAP within a framework of reasonable financial discipline determined in common by the two arms of the authority responsible for the budget, so as to maximize the results of using the resources and so that through its budget for 1986, the Community may devote more resources to the promotion of new policies and social priorities.

I now turn to the presentation of the report we are to debate. Since the budget is one of the principal means of implementing the Community's policies, it inevitably attempts to cover a very broad spectrum of needs. However, it is also true that the Common budget is too small to satisfy all the perfectly legitimate and worthy views expressed by the political Groups and the Parliamentary Committees, especially when we bear in mind that the lion's share goes to cover the CAP. Thus, I believe that the budget will above all have to indicate in some way the path that the Community should follow, making a start by financing the Community's most important initiatives and activities.

With that in mind, I shall recapitulate the basic ingredients of the report, largely with the help of a list prepared by my colleagues in the European Democratic Group during our discussions in the Budget Committee. According to this, the Community's financial policy for 1986 ought to be characterised by the following basic priorities: § Firstly, the fight against unemployment by measures which will promote and consolidate economic recovery. In other words, unimpeded development of the internal market. The promotion of programmes and the development of

technology on a Common basis. The promotion of Common investment programmes in transport and communications. Substantial measures to achieve convergence of the Community's economies, with emphasis on regional programmes such as the IMP's.

Secondly, until such time as the recovery begins to show results, we must lay special emphasis on measures of direct effectiveness to fight unemployment with particular reference to young people.

Thirdly, steady development and continual qualitative and quantitative improvement of the Community's aid to developing countries, both in the provisioning sector and in infrastructural programmes.

Finally, from a procedural point of view, long-term planning, especially in relation to own resources, must be a prime objective in any formulation of the Community's budget.

(Applause)

Mr Papoutsis (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen Colleagues, today's debate on the Community's financial policy for 1986 is taking place in a political climate characterised by three important developments within the Community's territories.

First of all, the solution at a political level of the critical matters outstanding in connection with enlargement, a fact that has opened the way for Spain and Portugal's accession from 1st January 1986.

Secondly, the increase in the Community's own resources to the level of 1.4% of VAT.

Thirdly, a start has been made in preparing a general framework for long-term development in the financial sector.

It is thus apparent that for the first time, the political, institutional and pragmatic prerequisites for the promotion and safeguarding of our political priorities actually coexist. At the same time, the prerequisites exist for the budget to become a substantial instrument of Community development, and not just a means for dealing with national and Community impasses. In this period of economic crisis that the European Community is passing through, the success of financial policy will not lie in managing the crisis that ultimately reproduces it. On the contrary, success can only be ensured by the formulation and financing of policies that achieve a compromise between two sets of priorities that conflict in principle. Priorities that preserve the status quo, and those aimed at building the future. This means that in dealing with the worsening social and economic consequences of the crisis, we must apply policies with a built-in potential for development. The transfer of resources in the fight against unemployment, in putting right the abnormalities of

Papoutsis

income and production in agriculture, in enabling the survival of declining branches of industry, in eliminating structural inequalities between the economies, and in dealing with the problem of famine in the world, should not take place only on the basis of criteria pertaining to aid and grants.

The transfer of resources must form part of a developmental strategy in which the specific segments of policy exert leverage towards a new Europe. A Europe of its peoples, without structural inequalities between the economies of the Member States, and with powerful competitive potential in the face of the technological and economic development of Japan and the United States of America.

On this basis we agree that the fundamental political priorities which the 1986 budget must secure, are growth, and the convergence of the economies of the Community's Member States. These two priorities are interrelated. Growth will secure the possibility of a steady and substantial transfer of resources to peripheral regions of the Community, while convergence of the economies will create conditions leading to uniform and self-nourishing economic development. However, we disagree substantially with what Mr Christodoulou said about the desirability of economic growth. The beneficial consequences of opening up the internal market are not self-evident, and certainly not sufficient in themselves to guarantee growth. Growth implies steady and self-nourishing economic development on the one hand, and on the other hand a fair distribution of its own results, both in social terms and geographically.

The uncontrolled and unplanned circulation of productive factors within the Community, and its subsidy via the budget, may well bring just the opposite results. In other words, it may add to our problems instead of solving them. Complete liberation of the labour markets would intensify the pressures of unemployment upon the manpower in today's less well developed regions, and upon the conditions of professional training and adaptation to the new structure of the labour markets. We should not aim to lead the workers to jobs, but to bring jobs to the workers by means of investment and development programmes. In any case, what makes us so sure that just by developing our internal market we will achieve long-term benefit for the Community? For example, it would be wrong to regard the economic dynamism of the United States as exclusively the result of its strong domestic market, forgetting the intense interventionism of the Government, whose scale and consequences we all recognise. For us, the internal market is not an end in itself. The conversion of recovery into growth implies specific developmental policies oriented in two more general directions: firstly planning, and secondly, industrial policy.

Development should not be pursued for its own sake. It should rest on the needs of the moment, on the

demands of the future, and on the cultural and democratic traditions of the European peoples. More specifically, we propose the following criteria of developmental policy, which could serve as criteria for finance and aid via the Common budget:

First, the utilization of new technologies.

Second, regional consequences. The implementation of integrated programmes in the Community's peripheral regions should follow from a recognition of the differences in the economic structures of those countries.

Third, the creation of new jobs. The basic criterion of long-term policy must be to combine the creation of new jobs with the competitiveness of the investment. The criterion of short-term policy should relate to the aim of a balanced geographical distribution of jobs.

Fourth, protection of the environment and utilization of new forms of energy.

Fifth, participation of the workers. The reinforcement of new types of economic organization, especially economic units developed on the basic principle of democratic and economic worker participation.

Sixth, aid for special social categories within the Community. Aid must be provided for national programmes particularly aimed at employment for women, young people and the physically handicapped.

However, in addition to taking note of the above criteria for our developmental policy, we must view 1986 as a critical year for two very important autonomous policies of the Community: our regional policy, and our relations with the Third World.

Mr President, it is evident that on the basis outlined above there are serious ideological and political differences between our views and the financial guidelines proposed by the rapporteur. The Socialist Group has summarized its minimum demands in amendments, whose approval will determine our attitude when we come to vote on the final text.

Mrs Giannakou-Koutiskou (PPE), *presenting an opinion on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.* — (GR) Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, and as the special rapporteur for that part of the 1986 budget which concerns the Social Fund, I will refer almost epigrammatically to the philosophy that prevails among our Committee in connection with the matter in hand.

The members of our Committee base their views of the problem on three factors.

Firstly, the Community's present economic condition, and the impending increase in own resources.

Giannakou-Koutiskou

Secondly, the performance up to now of the programmes financed from the Social Fund.

Thirdly, the emergent recovery of Europe's economy, and hence the concentration of the Social Fund's aims not just on retrospective remedial intervention, but on the attempt to create jobs within the scope laid open by new technology, and the placement of already trained unemployed people in them.

Today, we are examining the general orientations of the budget for 1986, among which the development of the Social Fund holds pride of place. The philosophy developed by the rapporteur is positive in a general way, as indeed are the rapporteur's references, not only to maintaining the recovery, but to converting it into steadily promoted growth. Parliament's resolution does not of course refer extensively enough to the Social Fund. However, in his speech today the rapporteur included a special analysis of unemployment, and this satisfied us, particularly in regard to the point which defines the principle of priority finance for programmes of job creation for young employed people, and the point referring to increasing the professional qualifications of the unemployed.

Colleagues, the problem of unemployment is perhaps the Community's most important problem today, mainly from two points of view. First, from the standpoint of the inability of unemployed people and their close families to survive under socially equal conditions, and secondly, from the standpoint of the social problems arising from the creation of a disadvantaged group, trapped at the margins of the potential that characterizes a society. Such problems certainly cannot be solved by perpetual grants of unemployment subsidies, which in the long term convert unemployment into a profession and thrust the individual even further aside. Besides, the fact of unemployment among the young and among women undermines both the future of our society and the democratic principle of equal treatment for both sexes. Productive investment to create jobs is therefore essential. That is an aim which both demands immediate priority, and possesses long-term relevance.

Consequently, until such time as the aim in question is achieved, the Social Fund has a duty to do what it can to minimize the impact of the Community's 11% unemployment rate. This will take place by the procedures voted for by our Parliament during the March part-session, when we debated guidelines for the management of the Social Fund.

Colleagues, the Committee on Social Affairs has discussed the matter in detail, and has charged me, apart from presenting this report, with the responsibility of tabling an amendment to the resolution that follows Mr Christodoulou's report. The amendment does not substantially modify the text, but points out the problems and at the same time defines a 'target quota' for 1986, amounting to 7.5% of the Common budget.

The purpose of this is to meet the 'target number' defined by Parliament in its resolutions of 20 June 1983 and 19 December 1983.

The amendment tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs — which is admittedly rather lengthy — was not accepted by the Committee on Budgets. I would like to believe that this was because nowhere in the report is there any reference to quotas covering the various sectors, and not of course because the Committee on Budgets is opposed to the substance of the amendment.

In conclusion, I would like to say again that it would be fine if the Community did not have an employment problem, and consequently had no need for a Social Fund. However, since the problem exists, and indeed in a particularly acute form, let us face it without small-mindedness and in a decisive way. Let us expand our powers via the budget at this time, especially since it is the budget that is our Parliament's prime responsibility.

(Applause)

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, our group strongly supports the Christodoulou report. We believe that it is an excellent reflection of what the Community needs, especially in the first year of enlargement. It spells out what the Community needs if we are to get our economies going again and to find jobs for our young unemployed. I do commend to the Socialist Group the principle of trying to get an economy going again in order to find jobs — there really is no alternative to it! The report recognizes that whatever lead and leverage can be given by our tiny Community budget towards economic recovery should be given. It reminds us that those funds are minuscule and will not be enlarged unless there is some limit to the present pattern of farm spending. The non-compulsory section of the budget (the non-farm sector) — the only part where we have any leverage — is only a quarter of one per cent of the total national product of the Community. If we could increase our section of the budget by 10%, that would represent only a quarter per thousand, or 0.025% of our national incomes.

That brings us to the agricultural proposals where the rapporteur wants to change our present reliance on crude price levels pitched at a level which keeps the small farmer in business and which are, therefore, higher than are needed to keep the factory farmer in business. This means that a greater proportion of the budget is wasted on those factory farmers, landlords and financiers who do not need these price levels. So we support the view that new measures should be: 'directed towards sustaining the incomes of small farmers and the economic life of the disadvantaged regions by means other than dependence on the price mechanism.' That is possible! In Cambridgeshire,

Fred Catherwood

where 6% of the population is in agriculture, there has been an increase over 5 years of 14% in the number of non-agricultural jobs, mainly in the new, small, high-technology industries.

We know that these changes are especially urgent because of the accession of Spain and Portugal. A wasteful method of maintaining people on the land might be tolerable in a Community of six, arguable in a Community of ten, but with an addition next year of a third to the farm population, adding a heavy bias towards Mediterranean products, we cannot leave the expenditure bias of the CAP as it stands. We certainly cannot level it up with similar price regimes for Mediterranean products — the national parliaments would not vote the money. So we have to move away from the crude price mechanisms and deal, as the rapporteur suggests, with the needs of the small farmer directly. So long as there is a price mechanism biased towards the northern farmer, there will not be a worthwhile Integrated Mediterranean Programme. One can, therefore, see why the rapporteur is edging it that way, and he is absolutely right in doing so.

Finally, I would like to contrast the constructive priorities of the Christodoulou report with the destructive insistence of the Fich report on reopening the old wounds of the British rebate. One looks forward constructively, the other looks, I think, too much backwards. Mr Langes, we too are looking to the Milan Summit. We need agreement there not only on the Commission's programme for economic recovery — on which, I think, our recovery from unemployment depends — but on the decision-making process outlined in the Dooge report, without which Mr Delors and Lord Cockfield are agreed it cannot be implemented! They cannot do it unless the decision-making is changed. If we re-open the wounds of the British rebate at this point, we make it harder to persuade the whole Council to make the decisions needed to launch our recovery.

We are trying to encourage the British Government to go in the right direction, and we voted for the report of the Committee on Institutional Affairs. We want to persuade them to go that way, but that is entirely dependent on their bringing the British public with them and persuading it that the Community can be trusted to respect British interests. So a totally irrelevant decision to block an agreed British rebate for the fifth time would destroy that trust. It is irrelevant because we cannot spend 500 million in the second half of the year.

I very much hope, therefore, with Mr Cot, that we can find a solution which preserves Parliament's long-term position, does not wreck the decision needed for recovery at Milan and gives Mr Christodoulou's proposals a real chance of success.

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, there are two things in Mr Christodoulou's report that

we should like to emphasize. From his report it must be very clear that, in the guidelines for the Community's budgetary policy for 1986, job-creating productive investments must be given absolute priority in the Community.

In effect we want 1986 — which is the year when the new rate of VAT should in the normal way become effective — to be also the year when, at Community level, new productive investments are made with the aim of creating jobs for the unemployed and, in particular, progressively absorbing youth unemployment, at least in part.

We therefore want all the financial instruments that are available today, as well as those that will be introduced in the future, to be used for this purpose, giving priority to the most urgent sectors.

In saying this we are not questioning the other objective named in Mr Christodoulou's report — the need to remove the obstacles to the unimpeded operation of the internal market. We believe, however, that the wording of paragraph 6 of his report is not quite right: the aim is right, but all of the financial instruments of the Community should not be used solely to this end.

As far as we are concerned — I say again, by way of conclusion — priority in the use of all the financial instruments should be given for the purpose that I have already emphasized — that is to say, productive investment and active new Community policies. This is a point of prime importance to us, and on this point we shall determine our position when the final vote is taken on the Christodoulou Report.

Mr Van der Waal (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, the most important, the most serious social problem in Europe is unemployment. Any measure designed to promote Europe's economic recovery should therefore have top priority. Although the national governments are primarily responsible for combating unemployment and have the best means of doing so, programmes implemented at European level will have a major supplementary and supportive influence on the action they take.

We therefore fully endorse the main points made in the Christodoulou report, which calls, among other things, for the strengthening of the competitiveness of the European economy and an active contribution to the economic convergence of the Member States, proposals which follow on from the Commission's programme. We also approve the proposals made in the report for direct Community action with own resources to combat unemployment, through an increase in the money allocated to the social funds and the ERDF, for example. As a significant proportion of these funds is already being spent in the Mediterranean countries, these additional resources will be needed more than ever after the accession of Spain and Portugal.

Van der Waal

We also call for an improvement in the instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness of the aid provided, especially as the Newman report reveals that ERDF money has so far done little to reduce unemployment in the regions concerned.

Finally, a very important point: food aid and aid to the infrastructure of developing countries. We believe there should be no let-up in this aid. The Community clearly has a duty to encourage and coordinate activities in this sphere, as the Christodoulou report says. We cannot therefore afford any reduction at all here, especially if the Community's policy results in an increase in Europe's food surpluses.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, I will confine myself to making a few general remarks, as my colleague Mr Bardong will be discussing various matters in greater depth.

The Christodoulou report marks the beginning of the procedure that will lead to the budget for 1986. This will be an important budget for three reasons:

1. On 1 January 1986 the Community's revenues will be substantially increased.
2. On 1 January 1986 Spain and Portugal will join the Community.
3. The 1986 budget is the new Commission's first budget.

When this new Commission took office, it announced an ambitious programme. Practical measures now have to be taken to implement this programme, and they must be reflected in the budget for 1986 and the years that follow. The EPP Group therefore regards this budget as the baptism of the new Commission, which must now see to it that the hopes aroused when it took office come true. It will not be an easy task, and it will not be completed in one year. My group therefore believes a multiannual financial estimate should be submitted with the budget for 1986. As the Commission remains in office for four years, I would prefer, Mr President — if the Commissioner is listening — I would prefer a financial estimate that covers four years. It should become the rule that the new Commission submits a multiannual financial plan with its first budget. This prompts me to make a few comments and put a few questions to the Commission.

How does the Commission see its programme being implemented with the limit set at 1.4%? When will this 1.4% ceiling have to be exceeded? It is obvious, Mr President, that in the long run a budget of 35 000 m ECU will not be enough for a European policy for 320 m people. I would also point out that the governments of almost all the Member States face the difficult task of reducing public spending. The national governments and parliaments will therefore be reluctant to increase the Community's resources. There is a

greater need than ever for a European approach, a European policy, to enable us to spend the tax-payer's money more effectively. A Community policy that replaces national policies will reduce expenditure at national level.

The Commission and Parliament must, of course, set priorities. The EPP Group sees the first priority as being Europe's economic recovery so that unemployment, the greatest scourge of our times, can be brought under control. I would also refer in this context to the guidelines set out in the Christodoulou report.

I will conclude, Mr President, by appealing to the Members of this House to be more modest in the demands they voice.

I am convinced, Mr President, that the influence wielded by this Parliament will grow if we too cut our coat according to our cloth.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

President. — At this point we shall adjourn the debate, which will resume on Thursday, after the vote on the budget.¹

9. *Votes*

Report (Doc. 2-4/85) by Mr Marinaro, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-6/85 — COM (85) 48 final) and on the draft Council resolution on the guidelines for a Community policy on migration.

President. — I would inform Members of the Assembly that on this report the Group of the European Right has requested that all the votes be taken by roll-call.

Draft Council Resolution

After the vote on Amendment No 85

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Madam President, admittedly I am no expert on the Rules of Procedure, but I

¹ *Topical and urgent debate (announcement):* see Minutes.

Gautier

gather from my Group's voting list that we are required to deal with 200 'small' amendments! Did we not somehow amend the Rules of Procedure to the effect that last time such questions would be dealt with in committee? Am I right in thinking that we have to vote this evening by roll call on more than 200 amendments?

President. — Mr Gautier, the present vote is likely to go on for quite some time; I would therefore ask you to save us losing further time.

After the adoption of the Commission proposal

Mr Welsh (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — Madam President, I think Mr Gautier deserves a slightly fuller answer to the question he asked because it is rather an important matter. The fact is that the committee did examine these 150 amendments. Of those amendments, over 70 were rejected by the committee because they achieved three votes or less. I regret to tell you that one group has decided to resubmit all its amendments, in spite of the fact that they achieved less than three votes in the committee, and that particular group has now asked for a roll-call vote on every single amendment. Of course they have the right to do that, but I think colleagues should be aware of exactly what is being attempted and that is to block the business of Parliament and prevent it from doing its job.

I hope we will implement the Rules in the way intended and that we will make sure that this particular tactic does not succeed.

(Applause)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, the Chair has sought to mediate here, but the Group of the European Right maintains its point of view. Consequently we must go on voting.

Mr Patterson (ED). — May, I remind you, Madam President, that you have it in your power to solve this problem by tabling the original text first. The Rules allow you to do that, to take the original text instead of the amendments. That would save us a great deal of time.

President. — Mr Patterson, I entirely agree with you. Rule 74(3) provides that:

Exceptionally, the President may put the original text to the vote first . . .

I therefore put to the vote the proposal to put the original text to the vote.

(Parliament adopted the proposal)

I put to the vote the original text.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, Mr Patterson thought that we could vote on the individual points but not on the amendment as a whole. There is clearly a misunderstanding here, and I would thus ask you to treat this procedure accordingly and repeat the vote. Acceptance of the full text of the Marinaro report was certainly not the intention of the overwhelming majority who have just voted yes.

President. — Mr Brok, the vote has already taken place and the Assembly was able to state its position.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, I have only asked to speak because we are talking about a precedent. If in future we . . .

(Mixed reactions)

. . . base ourselves on this interpretation there will be a great discrepancy in this House. The passages from the Rules of Procedure quoted by the President are quite correct, but they refer to the individual paragraph numbers. If we have six or seven amendments to a specific number . . .

(Mixed reactions)

. . . the honourable Member shouting there at the back should realize that it will always be so in future — not just today. I therefore ask everyone to think about it.

What my honourable friend Mr Brok means is this: if we vote on a number for which there are ten or twenty amendments, the President can of course decide. He will start by putting the original text to the vote, or the amendment which has the best chance of being accepted. In my view it is not, however, intended that we should vote on the whole motion for a resolution in one fell swoop, without considering the amendments.

(Applause)

If we introduce that, it will always be asked for again in future.

President. — Mr Klepsch, before putting the motion for a resolution to the vote, I asked the Assembly if it agreed. The Assembly said it did. Consequently, I put to the vote the original text of the motion for a resolution, that tabled by the committee.

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — (FR) Madam President, it is quite obvious that the manner in which the House has voted on a difficult and important matter is not satisfactory to the House.

I do not say that you are in breach of the Rules of Procedure, but I do say that you have applied them in a way which the House has not understood.

(Applause from the right)

In the circumstances, Madam President, we must go back. It is inadmissible for a vote taken in this manner, on an issue over which the House is, I know, deeply divided, to override the clearly and democratically expressed will of the majority of this House.

In my opinion, Madam President, you should suspend the sitting and call an immediate meeting of the Bureau to seek advice on what procedure should now be adopted.

(Applause from the right)

President. — Mr de la Malène, I take up your proposal and shall suspend the sitting for a few minutes to allow the Bureau to examine the procedural problems which have arisen during the course of this vote.

(The sitting was suspended at 6.20 p.m. and resumed at 6.45 p.m.)

President. — I would inform the Assembly that five political groups have requested, under Rule 81(4) that the previous vote be cross-checked. Parliament must therefore decide whether the provisions of Rule 74(3) are applicable to the whole of the original text of the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament decided that Rule 74(3) was not so applicable)

We shall therefore resume the vote on the Marinaro report.

I would ask Mr Le Pen if he maintains his request for a roll-call vote on all the votes.

Mr Le Pen (DR). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the group of which I am chairman considers that the debate on the Marinaro motion for a resolution is a debate of fundamental importance in that it has a bearing on the vital interests and the future of Europe.

We therefore consider that, on each of the points raised, the House must discharge its responsibility before public opinion by voting in a manner which leaves no room for doubt. The only way that we can

eliminate all possibility of doubt is to take a roll-call vote, and this is essential in my view.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Madam President, I tried to speak before the vote was taken, because Rule 74(3) which you quoted really requires you to ascertain beforehand whether the procedure is not opposed by at least 21 Members of the House. A secret ballot was thus not necessary. It was enough to ask who was opposed to this procedure, and as there were more than 125 Members against, this ballot was not necessary. I regret that things have happened in this way, for there is no doubt that one Group is misusing the Rules of Procedure in order effectively to obstruct the work of the House.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Arndt, the vote has taken place. More than 150 Members have voted, and therefore we shall continue the vote.

Motion for a resolution

After the vote on the first five indents of the preamble

Mr Bombard (S). — (FR) With your leave, Madam President, I should like to say before the vote that we do not have time to vote, for technical reasons. The lights have to stay on for long enough for us to vote.

President. — Right, thank you.

After the adoption of Amendment No 153

Mr Muntingh (S). — (NL) Madam President, you have just quoted from the Rules of Procedure, and I understood from this that you perhaps wanted to go further and take the original text. I would be grateful if you could put the original text from the eighth to the seventeenth indent to the vote first.

President. — Mr Muntingh, we cannot start all over again.

After the adoption of the eighth indent of the preamble

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Madam President, I notice that Amendments Nos 9 to 17 all seek to delete citations in the report. Would it not speed things up if we simply took one vote as every single one of these amendments is to delete?

(Applause)

President. — Mr Cassidy, as you know, a request has been made for a roll-call on each amendment. I have

President

tried, for the nth time, to save us from having to go through this procedure. But if someone has decided to go against this, it is not possible to stop him.

I ask you to just go on without losing any more time.

After the adoption of the ninth indent of the preamble

Mr Sakellariou (S). — (DE) Madam President, I have the impression that we were not at all clear what we were voting on in the last vote. Would you tell us please: are we voting on the amendments, or are we voting on the individual points of the report?

President. — Mr Sakellariou, we are voting on the amendments. At the end we shall vote on the text as a whole.

Mr Ryan (PPE). — Madam President, I just want to draw attention to the fact that my machine is now not operating. I think it is overheated from the speed of the vote! But I cannot now operate the machine!

President. — Mr Ryan, we are checking the electronic system. I would point out that there is a lapse of ten seconds between each vote.

Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC). — (DE) Madam President, would you please be kind enough, before each vote, to make clear which amendment we are voting on, because otherwise we shall get confused.

My second request is this: could someone please operate the machine sensibly so that it is switched off when we have finished voting or you have concluded the vote, and goes on again when you again declare the voting open. I have the impression that the error lies not in the light itself but in the overall mode of operation.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — Madam President, it must be obvious to the House and to Mr Le Pen and his group that he has no chance whatsoever of winning any votes. We have now had sufficient votes to prove this point.

May I ask you to appeal to the House and to Mr Le Pen that he removes his group's total number of amendments and we get on with the vote?

President. — Mr Beazley, I have already tried to do what you ask of me. Mr Le Pen can withdraw his request whenever he wishes.

After the adoption of the third indent of the preamble

Mr Balfe (S). — Madam President, may I draw your attention to Rule 79(2). Since the European Right are obviously indulging themselves in a game which is largely designed to get their names on a roll-call, could I suggest — and the machine does provide for it — that we should proceed by secret ballot by machine, which takes precedence under Rule 79(3) over a roll-call.

So they may have their fun but they will not have their lists. May I formally ask you to put that to the House?

(Applause)

President. — Mr Balfe, you well know that we have proceeded to the vote. Let us not lose any more time. I hope that in due course Mr Le Pen will be prepared to withdraw his request for a roll-call vote.

Mr Provan (ED). — Madam President, perhaps you would like to ask Mr Le Pen that question again, because I saw him applauding Mr Balfe!

President. — Mr Le Pen, I ask you on behalf of the whole Assembly . . .

(Sharp protests from various benches)

Mr Le Pen, I ask you in the name of the Chair to withdraw your request for a roll-call vote. Retain it on essential points, but do allow business to proceed smoothly.

Mr Le Pen (DR). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as I said earlier, each honourable Member must be personally responsible for his vote on the various parts of this report. This is why I consider — and the voting results bear this out, since they are different each time — that each honourable Member must be accountable to his constituents and to European public opinion. This is why you will, I hope, understand that our group cannot change its position. I would add that it is ridiculous to ask the Group of the European Right to observe a rule of courtesy when we are not afforded the benefit of the most elementary rules of justice.

(Applause from the right)

After the adoption of the fourteenth indent of the preamble

Mr Ferruccio Pisani (PPE). — (IT) Madam President, when the amendment is suppressive in character, I think that two votes are not necessary — only one, in order to approve the new text.

President. — Mr Pisoni, if we have put a text to the vote, it is because the Rules so require.

After the adoption of the fifteenth indent of the preamble

Mr Dankert (S). — (FR) Madam President, I would ask you to apply Rule 74(3) to the 16th indent and each subsequent indent and paragraph.

President. — Mr Dankert proposes that we apply Rule 74(3) and take a roll-call vote on the original text, paragraph by paragraph, and thus that of the Social Affairs Committee.

Before applying this procedure I have to make sure that at least 21 Members have no objections.

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — (FR) Madam President, I should like to know whether the vote for which you are calling is on the 16th indent only or a more general vote. That is the important point. If it is to be a vote paragraph by paragraph, that means — and we are prepared to accept this — that votes in favour are taken first instead of votes against. But it must be made clear what the procedure is.

Mr Dankert (S). — (FR) I proposed that Rule 74(3) be applied to each indent and each paragraph, and this will be the procedure for the remainder of the text, but one by one.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, just for clarification — I agree with the proposal. This means of course that where we have a motion we must first reject the original text. We shall then vote point by point.

President. — It is clear that we have to reject the original text and then vote on the amendment.

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — (FR) I request that, if the procedure proposed by Mr Dankert is accepted by 21 members, a roll-call be taken of those 21 members also.

President. — Mr Dankert proposes that we apply Rule 74(3) of the Rules. Since we do not have objections from 21 Members, we shall therefore apply the provisions of that Rule as from now.

Paragraph 2 — After the rejection of Amendment No 129/rev.

Mr Galland (L). — (FR) Madam President, forgive me, but I have voted against an amendment. It now

appears that it has been revised and that the revision is not incorporated into the French text. I find this a serious matter, Madam President, because where Amendment No 129 tabled by Mr Tuckman and Mr Cassidy, which I have to hand, reads '... practical response to migrant workers' aspirations to participate more fully in the civic and political life of the country' it appears that the words 'and political' and 'of the country' have been deleted. If that is so, Madam President, I would ask that this amendment be put to the vote again, since we may wish to vote differently.

President. — Mr Galland, we are generally putting to the vote the revised amendments and therefore we have just voted on the revised amendment.

As you know, you may withdraw the amendment at the appropriate time.

I would point out to the Assembly that, with the agreement of the staff, we can continue voting up to 8.30 p.m. Beyond that we cannot go. In any case we shall not be able to complete the voting. So we shall vote until that time and then adjourn.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Madam President, I would suggest that we now suspend the voting punctually and give the group spokesmen a chance to provide us by tomorrow with a compromise amendment which will cover all the rest of the text and which can then be dealt with in a single vote.

(Parliament adopted the proposal by Mr von der Vring)

*
* *

Report by Mr Schmid (Doc. 2-1777/84), drawn up on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, for a directive on restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (second PCB(PCT directive) (Doc. 2-803/84 — COM(84) 513 final):

adopted¹

*
* *

(The sitting closed at 8 p.m.)²

¹ See Debates of 15 March 1985.

² *Agenda of next sitting*: see Minutes.

ANNEX

Commission Action on European Parliament opinions on Commission proposals delivered at the March and April 1985 part-sessions

This is an account, as arranged with the Bureau of Parliament, of the action taken by the Commission in respect of amendments proposed at the March and April 1985 part-sessions in the framework of parliamentary consultation, and of disaster aid granted.

Reports adopted by Parliament in March which were included in the April 'Commission Action' document do not appear here unless there have been developments since then.

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

- A. In connection with the following report the Commission has adopted an amended version of its original proposal which incorporates the proposed amendments it accepted at the plenary sitting:

2nd report by Mr Beumer, adopted on 19 April (EP 2-15/85), on the proposal from the Commission of the EC to the Council for a 20th directive on the harmonization of the laws of the Member States relating to turnover taxes — common system of value added tax: derogations in connection with the special aids granted to certain farmers to compensate for the dismantlement of monetary compensatory amounts applying to certain agricultural products (COM(84) 391 final)

The amendments involve:

- (a) bringing forward the expiry date for the period in respect of which the special 3% aid may be granted to 31. 12. 91;
- (b) assessing the measures taken for the implementation of the directive by means of an annual report covering in particular the manner in which the objectives have been kept to, the absence (or otherwise) of tax repercussions and the effect of the measures on the Community's own resources.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 18 April 1985, pp 285-287

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 19 April 1985, pp II, 15-22

- B. In connection with the following reports the Commission is preparing amended versions of its original proposals in which account will be taken of the proposed amendments it accepted at the debates:

1. Report by Mr Van Der Lek, adopted on 15 March (EP 2-1778/84), on the proposal from the Commission of the EC to the Council for a directive amending Directive 78/1015/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on the permissible sound level and exhaust system of motorcycles (COM(84) 438 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14 March 1984, pp 242-243

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 15 March 1985, pp II, 16-19

2. Report by Mr Rogalla, adopted on 18 April (EP 2-18/85), on the proposal from the Commission of the EC to the Council for a directive on the easing of controls and formalities applicable to nationals of Member States when crossing intra-Community borders (COM(84) 749 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 18 April 1985, pp 254-256

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 18 April 1985, pp II, 5-14

3. Report by Mr Nordmann, adopted on 19 April (EP 2-6/85), on the proposals from the Commission of the EC to the Council for:

- (i) a directive on consumer protection in respect of the indication of prices for non-food products (COM(83) 754 final)
- (ii) a directive amending Directive 79/581/EEC on consumer protection in the indication of the prices of foodstuffs (COM(84) 23 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 18 April 1985, pp 280-281

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 19 April 1985, pp II, 6-14

4. Report by Mr Marshall, adopted on 19 April (EP 2-9/85), on the Commission proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 543/69 on the harmonization of certain social legislation relating to road transport and Regulation (EEC) No 1463/70 on the introduction of recording equipment in road transport (COM(84) 147 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 18 April 1985, pp 309-311

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 19 May 1985, pp 29-42

5. Report by Mrs Banotti, adopted on 17 April (EP 2-2/85), on the proposal from the Commission of the EC to the Council for a draft recommendation on social security for volunteer development workers (COM(84) 710 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 17 April 1985, p 128

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 17 April 1985, pp II, 1-8

II. *Commission proposals in respect of which Parliament did not request formal amendment*

Report by Mr Wolff on the proposal from the Commission of the EC to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 682/81 adjusting the Community loan mechanism designed to support the balance of payments of Member States (COM(84) 309 final)

This proposal, in respect of which no amendments were proposed by Parliament, was adopted by the Council at its 29 /30 April session.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings 14 March 1985, pp 238-239

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 15 March 1985, pp II, 11-12

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

Report by Dame Shelagh Roberts, adopted on 19 April (EP 2-1590/84), on the Commission proposal for a regulation concerning customs debts (COM(84) 395 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 18 April 1985, pp 296-297

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 19 April 1985, pp II, 27-31

IV. *Emergency aid granted in April*

Emergency aid within the Community

Nil

*Emergency aid for third countries**Financial aid*

<i>Country</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Reason</i>	<i>Distributed by</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
Ethiopia	12 m ECU	drought (Dublin plan)	Lutheran World Federation EEC delegation	23. 4. 85
Sudan	35 m	drought (Dublin plan)	EEC delegation Commission charitable organizations	26. 4. 85
Vanautu	200 000	cyclone	EEC delegation	12. 4. 85

*Food aid**Direct aid*

<i>Country</i>	<i>Quantity/Product</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
Sudan	8 000 t cereals	18. 4. 85

Indirect aid

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Quantity/Product</i>	<i>For</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
ICRC	300 t butteroil	Ethiopia	18. 4. 85
NGO	300 t sugar	Sudan (Ethiopian refugees)	18. 4. 85
Caritas (D)	250 t cereals	Chile	11. 4. 85
Diakonisches Werk (D)	4 110 t cereals	Sudan	18. 4. 85
ICRC	4 000 t cereals	Sudan	18. 4. 85

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 8 MAY 1985

Contents

FORMAL SITTING — Fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War: Address by Mr P. Pflimlin, President of the European Parliament	
1. <i>Agenda:</i>	
<i>Lord Douro; Mr Prag</i>	97
2. <i>Enlargement — Report (Doc. A 2-20/85) by Mr Hänsch:</i>	
<i>Mr Hänsch; Lady Elles; Mr Wettig; Mr Croux; Lord Douro; Mr De Pasquale; Mr De Gucht; Mr Musso; Mrs Piermont; Mr Romualdi; Mr Van der Waal; Mr Tzounis; Mr Toksvig; Mrs De March; Mr Toussaint; Mr Lalor; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Stirbois; Mr Blumenfeld; Mrs Thome-Patenôtre; Mr Habsburg; Mr Guerneur; Mr Andreotti (Council); Mr Natali (Commission); Mr Hänsch; Mr Balfe; Mr Provan</i>	97
3. <i>Bonn Summit (Statement by the Commission):</i>	
<i>Mr Delors (Commission); Mr Juppé; Mr Segre; Mr Franz; Mr Bonde; Mr Seeler; Mr von Bismarck; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Ippolito; Mr Galland; Mr Elliott; Mr Mallet; Mr d'Ormesson; Miss Brookes; Mrs Ewing; Lady Elles; Mrs Hoff; Mr von Wogau; Mrs Charzat; Mr Delors</i>	114
4. <i>Question Time (Doc. B 2-267/85) (contd):</i>	
Questions to the Council:	
• <i>Question No 71, by Mrs Banotti: British Prevention of Terrorism Act:</i> <i>Mr Forte (Council); Mrs Banotti; Mr Forte; Mr Marshall; Mr Forte; Mr MacSharry; Lady Elles; Mr Forte</i>	121
• <i>Question No 72, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre: Validity of the European passport:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mrs Thome-Patenôtre; Mr Forte</i>	122
• <i>Question No 75, by Mr Papoutsis: USA protectionism in the steel industry:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Papoutsis; Mr Forte</i>	123
• <i>Question No 76, by Mr Christodoulou:</i>	
<i>Greek Government Development Programme:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Christodoulou; Mr Forte</i>	123
• <i>Question No 77, by Mr Elliott: Aid and trade provisions of the Lomé Convention:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Elliott; Mr Forte</i>	123
• <i>Question No 78, by Mr Toksvig: European aerospace policy:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Toksvig; Mr Forte</i>	124
• <i>Question No 82, by Mr Evrigenis: Distribution of food aid in African countries:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Evrigenis; Mr Forte; Mrs Ewing; Mr Forte; Mr Galland; Mr Forte; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Forte; Mr Seligman; Mr Forte</i>	125
• <i>Question No 83, by Mr Lalor: Reclassification of disadvantaged areas:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Lalor; Mr Forte; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Forte</i>	126
• <i>Question No 84, by Mr Barrett: Quick-frozen food products:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Barrett; Mr Forte</i>	127
• <i>Question No 91, by Mr Adam: Energy imports:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Adam; Mr Forte; Mr Seligman; Mr Forte; Mrs Ewing; Mr Forte; Mr Galland; Mr Forte</i>	127
• <i>Question No 93, by Mr Chanterie: Proposal for a Council resolution on a second programme of action of the European Communities on safety and health at work (submitted to the Council by the Commission on 4 November 1982):</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Chanterie; Mr Forte</i>	128
• <i>Question No 94, by Mr Lomas: Aid to Turkey:</i> <i>Mr Forte; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Forte; Mrs J. Hoffmann; Mr Forte; Mr Alavanos; Mr Forte; Mr Wedekind; Mr Forte; Mr Prag; Mr Forte; Mr Pearce; Mr Fitzgerald</i>	129

- Questions to the Foreign Ministers:
- Question No 107, by Mr Christodoulou:
Human rights in Albania:
Mr Forte (Foreign Ministers); Mr Christodoulou; Mr Forte 130
 - Question No 109, by Mr Habsburg:
Situation in the Baltic States:
Mr Forte; Mr Wedekind; Mr Forte; Mr Seeler; Mr Forte; Mr Seligman; Mr Forte 131
 - Question No 110, by Mr Flanagan:
Pressure on the Nicaraguan Government:
Mr Forte; Mr Flanagan; Mr Forte; Mr Newens; Mr Forte; Mrs Dury; Mr Forte; Mr Schinzel; Mr Forte; Mr Alavanos; Mr Forte; Mr Wurtz; Mr Forte; Mr Galland; Mr Forte; Mr MacSharry; Mr Forte; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Forte; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Forte; Mr Prag; Mr Newens; Mr Elliott 132
5. *Mediterranean countries — Interim report*
- (Doc. A 2-24/85) by Mr Galluzzi and report (Doc. A 2-27/85) by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti:
Mr Galluzzi; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Forte (Council); Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mr Seeler; Mr Costanzo; Mr Seligman; Mr Rossetti; Mr Romeo; Mr Musso; Mr Ulburghs; Mrs Pery 134
6. *Votes:*
Lord Bethell; Mr Ephremidis; Mr P. Beazley; Mrs Charzat; Mr Christensen; Mr Christiansen; Mr Pranchère; Mr Le Chevallier; Mr Welsh; Mr de la Malène; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Luster; Mr Le Chevallier; Mr Coste-Floret; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Guerneur; Mr Welsh; Mr Ducarme; Mr Welsh; Mrs Rabbethge 145
- Annex (Formal sitting on the occasion of the visit to the European Parliament of Mr Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America):
Mr Pflimlin, President of the European Parliament, Mr Reagan, President of the United States of America, Mr Pflimlin 149

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

(The formal sitting was opened at 9.30 a.m.)

Fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here today to commemorate an event that took place exactly forty years ago, on 8 May 1945. That event marked the end of the most terrible tragedy experienced by Europe in its long history; it was swept by a wave of suffering and millions died. Our thoughts must turn first to those who — died members of the armed forces and of the resistance and the civilian victims — and, with particular poignancy, to the martyrs of genocide, whose memory must remain etched in our minds so that the excesses of ideology that led to those heinous crimes never occur again.

May I invite you to honour the memory of all those who died by standing and observing a minute's silence.

(Parliament stood and observed a minute's silence)

8 May 1945 was an end, but today we see it above all as a beginning: the beginning of an era of peace marked by the reconciliation of former enemies and the first steps towards European unification.

Forty years of peace! Seldom has Europe lived in peace for so long. Only twenty years elapsed between the end of the first world war and the beginning of the second. What was then termed peace was in fact hardly more than an uneasy truce between two conflicts. The treaties signed at the end of the first world war scarcely deserve to be called peace treaties. They set the formal seal on a balance of power that the vanquished were forced to accept while harbouring hopes of revenge.

The peace we now enjoy in western Europe is quite different. No peace treaty in the traditional sense was signed, and it is better so. Much more has been done to cement our peace. We have established institutions in which former enemies have come together to work for a common cause.

First, the European Organization for Economic Cooperation (EOEC) was founded to bring about the material reconstruction of Europe with the help of the Marshall Plan. Without that help it would not have been possible to restore our economic strength and raise the standard of living of our people in such a relatively short time. I can confirm this from my own

President

experience, having been a member of my country's government just after the end of the war.

But there had to be reconstruction of another even more important kind: moral and spiritual reconstruction. On 5 May 1949 the governments of ten countries signed in London the Treaty establishing the Council of Europe. They were joined in 1950 by the Federal Republic of Germany.

The purpose of this organization as laid down in its statute is to protect and promote the ideals and principles that are the common heritage of the founding countries, in particular by safeguarding and extending human rights and fundamental freedoms. In the midst of the ruins of Europe the main purpose of the founding fathers was not material but ethical and spiritual. Their intention was to unite the people of Europe in the service of the principles whose negation had opened the doors to the abyss. The Convention on Human Rights remains the Council of Europe's supreme achievement. This Convention does not confine itself to proclaiming human rights, but has set up a court, the Court of Human Rights here in Strasbourg, whose task is to ensure that these rights are observed. Let us pay tribute to the States which have set a historical precedent by allowing individual appeals to the Court, thereby facing the risk of being found guilty by the Court and required to provide redress if the Court rules, in response to an action by one of their citizens, that they have failed to respect the rights enshrined in the Convention.

It was realized very quickly that inter-governmental cooperation in the Council of Europe was not enough. On 9 May 1950 Robert Schuman unveiled his plan for the first community, the Coal and Steel Community. Tomorrow is the 35th anniversary of this event. The staff of our Secretariat, to whose devotion I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute, have not forgotten this, and for them 9 May is a holiday — 'Saint Schuman's Day'.

For a man of my generation, who has childhood memories of the first world war, who lived through the inter-war years, pervaded by resentment, distrust and fear, and who took part in the second world war, the rise of the European ideal so soon after the curtain had been rung down on a tragedy of such magnitude is nothing short of miraculous.

I must admit that in 1945 I was pessimistic. I thought that it would take several generations before there was reconciliation and genuine peace, a peace of the heart and of the mind.

How much greater then is my admiration for the men whom we call the founding fathers of Europe, who had the courage to take the first step by bringing into being the first six-country Community, the Coal and Steel Community. Yes, it took courage to bring those six countries together as equals and to forge com-

pletely new bonds between them. They did so by creating tangible links in an area that was then one of the keys to economic and also military strength, and at the same time they had a much more far-reaching vision. When we re-read that historic declaration by Robert Schuman, a man whom I was proud to call a friend, we realize that he saw his action as the first step towards a 'European Federation'.

Five years after the end of the war the memories were still agonizingly fresh and the wounds unhealed. Those who were the first to embark upon this completely new road were spared neither insults nor calumny. In a sense one can understand the reactions of those who were opposed to a step that was alien to all historical tradition and wholly without precedent. It was the first time that this kind of Community had ever been mooted. Its salient feature is a radical change in the nature of the relations between the peoples that belong to it. It is founded not merely on peaceful co-existence or even cooperation, but on a deep-seated and active mutual commitment, on a pooling of resources to achieve common goals by working through joint institutions.

Since then the European Community has progressed. In 1957 the Treaties of Rome established two new communities and now we, the Members of the second directly elected European Parliament, are the trustees of this heritage.

The most precious treasure in that heritage is of course peace, a peace built on a determination to bring our peoples together in the community of a shared future. War between the countries of Europe, the threat of which hung for so long over their people, has become unthinkable.

Nevertheless, we are not entirely secure against fresh outbreaks of national egotism fuelled by the long recession we are experiencing. National egotism is a perversion of true patriotism. We come from ten different nations — and there are soon to be twelve — but each of us remains committed to his own country and to its traditions and cultural heritage; we feel that by helping to build a united Europe our nations, far from submerging their own identities, can develop to the full by following a historical calling that is in keeping with the needs of our age.

The situation here in the European Parliament is the most stimulating and enlightening of all the changing scenes I have witnessed in my long life. It enables us to get to know each other in all our national and even regional individuality. Our discoveries are sometimes surprising and sometimes even disconcerting, but they bring home to us just how rich Europe is in its diversity. Its unity will not be uniformity but a coalescence of creatively interacting national components, as the history of European civilization down the ages has shown.

President

There is diversity too in our opinions. We have different political allegiances and in many areas our views do not coincide. We all remain faithful to our political convictions. But if our views do clash, sometimes vigorously, it is only fair to say that mutual respect is the hallmark of most of our debates. We acknowledge a right that is a guarantee of freedom: the right to be different. We are thus a living example of that pluralism which lies at the heart of western democracy.

Let us not indulge in self-satisfaction. We must recognize our limitations. We represent only one part of Europe. There are peoples every bit as European as our own that are unable to take their place in our Community. Dresden and Warsaw, Prague and Budapest are cities as European as our own ten capitals . . .

(Loud applause)

It might now seem a vain hope to dream of bringing together all the peoples of Europe, but no-one can stop us dreaming of a complete Europe united in peace. After all, mankind's greatest steps forward have often only been dreams come true. The sole weapons available to idealists are the weapons of the mind. May our actions make our societies, despite their imperfections, paragons of the ideals of freedom and justice to which we subscribe.

One thing is certain: our responsibilities do not stop at our borders. Our people are aware of this. News of natural disasters and of famine in Africa moves them to spontaneous gestures of pity and generosity. They it is who have encouraged our Community to come to the aid of the victims of famine and to devote resources — as yet on an insufficient scale but more than has come from some other quarters — to the fight against world hunger.

Our fellow-citizens, especially young people, would not allow the building of Europe to consist of the replacement of national egotism by European egotism. On the balance-sheet of European Community achievements, which do not always live up to their expectations or indeed to our own ambitions, our policy towards the Third World counts beyond any doubt on the assets side. The Third Lomé Convention, which was signed last December, is an unparalleled example of cooperation with 66 countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific.

But the world does not only expect us to provide material help to the most deprived. We are the heirs of a civilization of which humanism, be it derived from Christianity or from rationalism, is a vital component; it is our duty to stand up and be counted whenever human rights are threatened, whatever the political views of the government responsible may be. We are criticized in some quarters for interfering in the internal affairs of others. Some claim that our protests achieve nothing. Nevertheless, as a result of pressure from the public opinion which we represent, lives have

been saved and prisoners released. Come what may we must not stand by in silence. Europe would be a traitor to its own ideals if it did not fight to defend human rights.

(Loud applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, we are, I think, quite justified in commemorating the 40th anniversary of what happened on 8 May 1985 as the beginning of a period of peace unparalleled in the history of Europe. I am not ashamed to say that I am one of those who are still nostalgic for the heady days of the 1950s that set our peoples on the road to unity. As long ago as 1946, in the speech he made in Zurich, Winston Churchill, using the term coined in 1850 by the poet Victor Hugo, whose centenary we are celebrating this year, advocated the foundation of a United States of Europe. For a brief moment there were grounds for believing that this goal lay within our reach. No longer is this the case. But on no account must we fall prey to pessimism or resignation. We have already achieved much and there is a greater need than ever for us to continue our efforts: Europe is faced with new challenges and only a united Europe can play on the world stage its rightful role in safeguarding peace and working for a more equitable world order.

Many of us place great hopes in the summit that is to deliver an opinion next month on our draft Treaty for European Union and will perhaps launch new policies, particularly in the area of research. The choice to be made in Milan will be between a new beginning and stagnation that can only be the prelude to decline.

If the Heads of State and Government decide to convene a conference to map out the path for institutional progress advocated by the Dooge committee, we must be prepared to ensure that the voice of our peoples, who aspire towards greater and more vigorous European unity, is heard in that forum.

Ladies and gentlemen, whatever may happen in the next few weeks, I hope that by reflecting here today on our past and by acquiring a fuller awareness of our responsibilities in the present we shall find the courage to pursue unrelentingly our efforts in the most noble of causes: the construction of a united Europe that holds proudly above a world wracked by violence and fanaticism the torch of freedom and human brotherhood.

(Loud applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, would you please stand to listen to the European Anthem, a song of joy and hope.

(Parliament stood to listen to the European Anthem — The formal sitting was closed at 9.50 a.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)¹

1. *Agenda*

President. — By letter of 3 May 1985, the Council forwarded to Parliament a decision authorizing additional provisional twelfths for 1985 under Chapter 92 'Food aid' and requested that this decision be considered under urgent procedure.

The Committee on Budgets, which was informed of this request, gave its approval in principle at its meeting on 25 April 1985. So that these appropriations can be made available as soon as possible, I propose that this question be placed on the agenda of Friday, 10 May 1985.

(Parliament agreed to the proposal)

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, today's agenda envisages that this evening at 7.30 p.m. we first continue the vote on the Marinaro report, followed by the vote on the Mühlen report, followed by the vote on any motions on which the debate has closed.

I would like to propose to you and to the House that we change that order of voting so that the Hänsch report is taken first. There are only three amendments to Hänsch. There is, I believe, a tremendous symbolic importance in taking that vote today. I do not believe that the Marinaro vote can be concluded within one hour and, therefore, I hope you and the House will agree now to declare that the voting this evening will start with the vote on the Hänsch report.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

(Parliament agreed to the request)

President. — I also propose that a statement by the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, on the Bonn Summit be placed on today's agenda at 3 p.m.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

Mr Prag (ED). — I am sorry to raise this, Mr President, but if we have a statement from the President of

the Commission at 3 p.m., does that mean that there will be a curtailment of Question Time?

President. — Mr Prag, Question Time will be half an hour late.¹

2. *Enlargement*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-20/85), drawn up by Mr Hänsch on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the enlargement of the Community to include Portugal and Spain.

Mr Hänsch (S), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. It is appropriate that this debate is taking place on a historic date. Exactly 40 years ago to the day after the murderous Fascist rule over Europe came to an end, a European Parliament is stating its position on the return of the Spanish and Portuguese peoples to Europe after freeing themselves from dictatorship. On 9 May 1950 Robert Schuman cleared the way for the European Coal and Steel Community and for reconciliation between France and Germany. Almost 35 years later to the day the European Parliament is clearing the way for the third enlargement of the European Community.

According to the basic principles established in the treaties of Rome, the European Community is open to all European States with a democratic constitution which wish to join the Community. Our vote can prove that this is still binding on us today.

For us and others it is quite natural that our Parliament should state its position on the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community. In fact this is not, unfortunately, a matter of course. It is one of the few instances of progress which the European Parliament has achieved recently in its fight for increased powers.

In their solemn declaration in Stuttgart in 1983 the Heads of State or Government of the Community undertook to consult the European Parliament before the accession of new States. The Heads of State or Government have finally — albeit hesitantly — respected that undertaking. The Council forwarded a memorandum on the results of the negotiations to us so that the Parliament could give its vote before the treaties were signed. It was no easy matter to get this done. As rapporteur I would like to thank the Italian President expressly for the effort, care and understanding which made consultation both possible and timely.

We shall, of course, as called for in previous resolutions, hold a formal ratification debate in due course

¹ *Approval of minutes — Decision on urgency: see Minutes.*

¹ *Documents received: see Minutes.*

Hänsch

when the texts of the treaties are made known. Our discussion and resolutions today will not anticipate this debate. We have two main points to consider today: firstly, the formal request addressed to the governments of the Member States of the Community to sign the treaties with Spain and Portugal and to initiate the national ratification procedures, and secondly, an opinion on the institutional adjustments within the Community and this Parliament occasioned by the accession of new members.

At this point we would like to put on record our agreement with the outcome of the negotiations, in particular in respect of the number of Spanish and Portuguese members of Parliament, the number of members of the Commission, the number of judges at the European Court of Justice and the members of the European Court of Auditors and the weighting of votes and majority arrangements in the Council.

Our Portuguese and Spanish colleagues who will take their places in this Parliament after 1 January 1986, will initially be delegated from their national parliaments. We think it extremely important that this should only be the case for a short transitional period. We want our colleagues to be elected directly, within a year after accession if possible, but at the latest when the first national election takes place in their country. I am glad to be able to state with certainty that both countries have now indicated that they will respect our wishes.

Today we want to clear the way for the accession treaties to be signed. We are not only concerned with the results of the negotiations in detail but also with the historical and political background against which they are to be seen.

Spain and Portugal expressed their desire to become members of the European Community in March and June 1977 respectively. They have not faltered over seven years despite what, at times, were extremely difficult conditions which, due to the community's shilly-shallying, occasionally bordered on the politically unacceptable.

The Community could thus only reject Spain and Portugal if their accession severely damaged the interests of one Member State or the Community as a whole: even though some details of the negotiations are still open, it is quite clear to us that this is patently not the case.

The accession does not damage the interests of the Community; on the contrary, it will serve its interests. Parliament can thus recommend that the Council and the Heads of Government sign the accession treaties as soon as possible. The ratification procedure can thus be initiated so that the third enlargement of the Community can be accomplished on 1 January 1986.

Only few of us would be so naive as to think that a larger Community would necessarily be a stronger

Community. Scarcely anybody will expect all the problems and conflicts to be resolved by and during the negotiation process. Some of these will only be seen in their true dimensions after accession and some will only become apparent later. Things will not be easy, either for the new Member States or for the Community. The accession is a challenge for both sides. However it can give new impetus to the task of unifying Europe. If we are not careful though, it can also spell the end of the Community.

We must tackle this challenge in concert. In the first place, enlargement of the internal European market from a population of 272 million to one of 320 million can act as an economic and technological stimulus for the acceding countries and the Community. It can offer the European Community new ways of solving social and economic problems, in particular in fighting unemployment. However, at the same time the enlarged Community must use these opportunities to reduce the widening social and economic disparities in a selective and orderly manner. In future the Community will have to shoulder more responsibility for the world economy than hitherto. It will have to resist growing tendencies towards self-sufficiency and protectionism. It is high time our political responsibility and our political potential matched our future economic influence.

Some people also fear that the enlargement from ten to twelve Member States will reduce the Community's decision-making capacity. In this respect things could not get worse, even with twelve members!

This would mean that we are underestimating the willingness of Spain and Portugal to compromise and their desire to help unify Europe before they have had a chance to demonstrate them. Whether we have ten or twelve members, a reform of the decision-making structures and the division of powers between the Community's institutions is an absolute necessity and we expect Spain and Portugal to take part in the corresponding governmental conference after the Milan Summit.

Thirdly, with the accession of Spain and Portugal the focal point of the Community will shift towards the south, not necessarily in economic terms but mostly certainly in political and psychological terms. This is not necessarily a disadvantage, either for the Community or for the Member States, as it could sharpen the Community's awareness of developments in other parts of the world, in Latin America, in the Mediterranean etc., areas which are critical for Europe's future.

Fourthly, with the accession of Spain and Portugal all the European members of the western alliance, with the exception of Norway, belong to the European Community. This results in both an opportunity and an obligation to give Europe's voice in the alliance more clarity and weight than was previously the case,

Hänsch

which is only possible if European political cooperation increases in extent and in depth.

Fifthly, there is another reason for this increase in European political cooperation. The new members will bring us traditionally very close ties with certain regions of the world in which Europe has long been expected to play a special part. This is true of some Arab states and also of Latin America. The Iberian peninsula could prove a particularly stable bridge to these regions and we could exploit these ties all the better if Spain also adopted all the links which the European Community has with other states — i.e. Israel.

Sixthly, we need our own Community policy in Latin America and the near East. Almost the entire northern coast of the Mediterranean will be in the enlarged Community and this will cause economic problems for a number of other Mediterranean countries. The European Community must not sacrifice the historic economic links to other Mediterranean states, in particular to North Africa but also to Israel, on the altar of its own protectionist considerations.

Seventhly, the acceding countries have high expectations of their membership in the Community. If these expectations are disappointed these peoples' rejection of Europe will be all the more violent and the Community will soon be paralysed. These expectations can, however, also be used to inject new spirit and new resolve into the task of unifying Europe. The new Member States want to contribute to this process.

Spain and Portugal have left their marks in the development of art and religion, science and philosophy in Europe. It was from these countries that Europe's eyes and influence were directed towards other parts of the world. The course of history separated Spain and Portugal from the economic and political development of Europe for a time. With their accession, two European peoples have been reunited politically with the Europe they have always been a part of culturally. These countries will reinforce the Community's European identity which would not be complete without the contributions of the Iberian peoples. Let us do what we can on the 8th of May 1985 to make the Community more European on the 1st January 1986.

Lady Elles (ED), *Chairman of the Working Group on the Application of the Treaties and on Inter-institutional Relations*. — Mr President, I must make it clear that I am speaking as chairman of the working group dealing with the implementation of the treaties as a working group of the Political Affairs Committee, and not on behalf of my political group, whose spokesman on this matter will be Lord Douro.

I wish to join with Mr Hänsch in welcoming the accession of Spain and Portugal to this Community

and the future arrival of Members from Spain and Portugal elected in free democracy to this Parliament.

I would particularly like to express my thanks to Mr Hänsch for having produced his report so quickly and so speedily and also to the services who enabled us to have this debate as early as today. In particular, I thank the President-in-Office of the Council not only for passing the memorandum so quickly on to us and enabling us to have this report and debate before the signing of the accession treaty, but also for honouring us with his presence this morning at this debate. We are especially conscious of the effort he has made to be with us here this morning.

I would also like to say that this debate is the result of the call made in the Blumenfeld report and embodied in the Stuttgart Declaration that this House should be consulted before the signing of an accession treaty and the ratification of such a treaty. That this resolution of Mr Blumenfeld should now be implemented not only creates a precedent in the history of this Parliament. It creates a precedent for the many countries which we hope will eventually join this Community of ours.

I only have one comment to make with regard to the actions of the Council. We regretted that we were not consulted beforehand on the constitution of the Parliament itself regarding the election of representatives from Spain and Portugal. I know that the Council has taken this on board. I know that it was in the memorandum that these countries should have free choice, but I have understood also from the Council and from Mr Hänsch's speech that the Spanish and Portuguese governments have themselves agreed to have elections either within the year after accession or at their first national elections. This we welcome as a recognition of democracy in our Community: for us it is a symbol that their entry will strengthen our democracy in Western Europe, and this can only be welcomed fully and whole heartedly.

Mr Wettig (S), *Chairman of the Delegation to the European Parliament/Portuguese Parliament Joint Committee*. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. In his introductory remarks the rapporteur has already stressed the historical significance of the accession of Spain and Portugal for the development of the European Community. I would merely like to emphasize once more the historical significance which the accession has for Spain and Portugal themselves. Anyone who knows these two countries will realize what this means to them after spending decades on a solitary journey away from democratic Europe. Democratic trends in Spain and Portugal will also be greatly consolidated by their joining the European Community.

We ourselves link the accession of Spain and Portugal and the decision to finalize the accession negotiations with the hope that the stagnation so marked in the European Community in recent years will now come

Wettig

to an end. We hope that through Spain and Portugal the European Community will gain fresh impetus and are sure that the dynamic effect of the two new entries will sweep the European Community forward from 1 January 1986 onwards.

For anybody following the negotiations over the last seven years it was worrying to see them on the point of breakdown due to economic nit-picking. Sometimes it seemed as if five thousand tonnes of tomato puree or five thousand tonnes of hake were more important than the historical significance of this enlargement. Sometimes it seemed as if the petty interests of current Member States was blinding them to the significance of the accession of Spain and Portugal for the European Community. Many observers of the negotiations must have been given the impression that the European Community was just a club for the rich industrial nations in Europe all too prone to neglect solidarity with poorer countries.

That the negotiations were completed has been a triumph for solidarity. When the agreements are appraised — which we shall do at a later stage in the ratification debate — it will be apparent that Portugal in particular has been treated very fairly by the European Community. This country, which in the last ten years has had great economic problems due not to a democracy but to the fifty-year dictatorship in Portugal, will receive substantial aid to enable it to catch up with the other Community states.

A comparison of the agreements with Spain reveals that this country has unfortunately not been treated so fairly. The agreements are marked by the fear of Spanish agricultural and industrial potential. Let us hope that during the ten-year transitional phase a process of change will ensue, proving as beneficial to Spain as the agreements were for Portugal right from the start.

Mr Hänsch has pointed out the significance of the southwards enlargement of the Community. This is particularly apparent in the weighting of votes, which will affect the Community's decisions in the future not only in Parliament but in particular in the Council of Ministers. To use a traditional concept one could say that the European Community is becoming a Mediterranean power as a result of the enlargement. In economic and political terms Mediterranean policy within the European Community will become increasingly important and this will chiefly involve the European Community bearing responsibility for the political and economic development of this crisis-hit area. This means of course — and we will have an opportunity to discuss this this morning — that, over the next few years, it will have to sort out its relationships in an equitable way with countries with which it has traditionally had links in this area.

As Co-President of the meetings in Portugal I would like to say a word about the elections: I think there has been lively discussion on this point. We can thus be

sure that both Spain and Portugal will elect their Members of Parliament relatively quickly and that we will soon be able to welcome the directly elected Members of Parliament after a short transitional period.

Today's debate takes Parliament into the final round of the discussions on the enlargement. The European Parliament has on many occasions given public support to the negotiations on the accession of Spain and Portugal. It has done a great deal to ensure that public opinion was on the side of those who resolutely called for the accession of these countries to the European Community. Parliament has always supported the accession with an overwhelming majority and my group has always been part of this majority. We thus support the Hänsch report in its entirety.

Mr Croux (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of our Group I should like to express my support for the Hänsch report and my appreciation for our colleague's presentation of it. We shall be giving this resolution our wholehearted support in the spirit which you described.

I also support what Lady Elles said when she reminded us that this historic debate is to a large extent based on the report presented to the House in 1982 by our colleague Mr Blumenfeld. We are also very happy to see Mr Andreotti here with us. We know the important part he played in the elaboration of the accession agreements and, as we said earlier, we are counting on him to bring the whole operation to a successful conclusion in the months to come.

The problem of the accession of Spain and Portugal must be seen against the background of the Community's problems as a whole. As has been said again today: how can the Community operate with Twelve when it is already in such difficulties with Ten? Some people say that all we need to do is to use the new accession to promote new developments and make progress, in quantitative terms at least. My Group does not agree with this. We believe that this is the start of a qualitative process which makes finding a solution to the Community's institutional problems even more urgent than before. Anyone who thinks that the great internal market will come automatically, including Spain and Portugal, and that we can develop a technological community without reviewing the Community's organizational methods and decision-making processes, to mention only two topics, is mistaken. We only need to remember what happened last week in Bonn. Our disillusionment with the differences in the Community which emerged at the Bonn economic summit has again made us very cautious and rather uneasy about what will happen in the coming weeks and months.

The accession of Spain and Portugal is a major event in qualitative, structural and institutional terms. We

Croux

must not go to these two countries and tell them what we expect them to do. We must first start by improving our organization and sharpening up our political will. The Milan summit under the Italian Presidency on 28 and 29 June this year is of course very important in this connection. President-in-Office of the Council, we have already had one opportunity last month of expressing not only our great concern but also our great expectations in this respect. And yet, a Council has seldom been better prepared than the forthcoming one in Milan. There is the report by the Dooge Committee, there are the efforts of the European Parliament itself, in particular the draft treaty on European Union, and there is Parliament's declaration of 17 April this year which stated once again, with the backing of a large majority, that we must make qualitative institutional progress by holding an intergovernmental conference to negotiate a new treaty on European Union in which Spain and Portugal must also participate. This is what a great many people would like to see.

What concerns us now is who will plead for Europe and European Union in Milan. Will the Heads of State or Government who attend the summit really bear in mind what we, speaking through the President, Mr Pflimlin, reminded them of a few minutes ago? Will the Heads of State or Government in Milan think back to what Schuman said on 9 May 1950? Or is it true, as some people claim, that after the first generation of the 'fathers of Europe', the present generation of Heads of State or Government who now hold responsibility has lost the political ability to develop the Community any further? This is what we often hear. We now hope that the accession of Spain and Portugal, the financial difficulties, the budget problems, the new hopes for a great internal market in the Community, technological developments and peace and security matters will all mean that the time is right, and that Milan will show that there are still Heads of State in Europe who defend the interests not only of their own countries but also of the Community. This is what we hope to see. I will say again that we expect a lot of the Italian Presidency in this respect. The members of the European Parliament will be doing everything they can to increase our contacts with national parliaments in order to discuss matters with our own national governments, but the long-term future of the Community is to be decided in the course of the next few weeks. We fervently hope and pray that those who attend the summit will remember what was begun in 1950 and will pave the way for further European Union.

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, I would like to begin, on behalf of my group, by congratulating those people who have been particularly involved in bringing these negotiations to a successful conclusion. I think first of all of the President of the Council, Mr Andreotti, whom I am very pleased to see here today. I know everyone realizes what an important part he

played in concluding the negotiations at the end of March. I would also like to thank and congratulate Mr Natali, who has toiled with this problem longer than any of us who have been involved. From the beginning to the end, he has had to carry on his shoulders the very difficult job of reconciling a tremendous number of interests. He has, of course, been criticized at times by Parliament, but we should now congratulate him on all the work he has done. I would like to congratulate the negotiators for Spain and Portugal, Mr Fernando Moran and Mr Ernani Lopes, who, I am sure, will deserve the everlasting credit in their own countries for having brought their two countries into the Community.

We strongly welcome the accession of Spain and Portugal, and we welcome the report by Mr Hänsch. The European Parliament has always supported the applications of Spain and Portugal. We have exerted continuous pressure on the Council and the Commission, and I hope that we can claim to have had some influence on the final outcome.

It is, of course, an important historic and symbolic day for us here in the European Community. How appropriate that our first item of business should be the formal approval by the European Parliament of the Council's intention to sign the Treaties of Accession next month!

We very much hope that the accession of the two Iberian countries will strengthen democracy in both countries and bring prosperity to their peoples. But we must warn them not to expect too much. Those of us who have been members of the Community for 12 years or longer will find that the Community is not a panacea to our economic problems. It has great advantages, but we should warn Spaniards and Portuguese not to expect too much.

Mr President, it is now essential that the parliaments of the Member States should ratify these Accession Treaties so that there should be no further delay. Both Spain and Portugal have been very patient and have waited too long already. We must not countenance any further delay, and the ratification must be completed by the end of the year.

I very much welcome the decision of the Spanish Government to hold European elections next year. I hope the Portuguese Government will do the same, taking account of the strongly-felt views in this Parliament.

I very much look forward to 1 January next. The Bureau of this Parliament took certain decisions yesterday to welcome Spanish and Portuguese Members into our work over the next few months.

Next 1 January will, for many of us, mark one of the most important acts of the European Community in the last 10 years. I believe that history will show that

Douro

the cementing of Spain and Portugal to our alliance and our Community in Western Europe will be a considerable factor in preserving peace and stability in Europe for at least another 40 years.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr De Pasquale (COM). — *(I)* Mr President, on behalf of the Italian Communists I should like to express my full support for the Hänsch resolution.

The Italian Communist Party has always considered the accession of Spain and Portugal to the EEC as an historically essential step in European integration and in the consolidation of democracy on our continent.

Armed with this conviction we have endeavoured to promote inside and outside our country, within the context of the European left, the extent of the consensus in favour of enlargement, something which could by no means be taken for granted at the outset and which even now comes up against substantial resistance.

We are therefore gratified that, albeit with some delay, the finishing straight has been reached.

We have never underestimated the problems — still unsolved — arising from accession, but we have always set our sights beyond these at a superior interest, i.e. the union in democracy of all the European peoples.

Admittedly, if the Community were to stay as it is at present — by that I mean devoid of the institutional, political and economic prerequisites for finding appropriate solutions to Europe's problems — then the consequences would be serious for all concerned. It is nevertheless from this contrast between what the Community is today and what it will be tomorrow in the context of enlargement that greater opportunities for endeavour and success arise for us, the democratic and progressist forces of Europe.

Ladies and Gentlemen, our fight is a fight for reform staged within the Community and therefore incompatible with any spirit of abandonment, climbing down or climbing back into our national shells.

This is an arduous and difficult battle. The accession of Spain and Portugal makes it more acute and calls for more commitment, in that it poses in objective terms the need for deep-rooted changes in the policies of the Community institutions, in terms of both internal and external relations.

These changes will not come about of their own accord: an endeavour has to be made. But in the final analysis, they will be seen to have been necessary. Examples are Mediterranean cooperation, structural policies, social policies, the development of weak-mar-

ket areas or, more generally speaking, the north-south relationship.

These will be the problems to be faced in the immediate future. In the months ahead, this parliament will have to take a stand on the ratification of the treaties. Our view is that the approval we are about to give today on this anniversary of the victory of European civilization over Nazism and Fascism assumes special political significance with regard to future developments.

Mr De Gucht (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, the Liberal and Democratic Group of the European Parliament fully supports the Hänsch resolution and thanks our colleague Mr Hänsch for the excellent work which he has done in such a short time on this report. As my speaking time is very restricted I shall say no more by way of congratulations, but they are no less sincere for that.

Mr President, one of the traditional criticisms of this enlargement is that it is a political act, a political project, the economic implications of which have not been adequately thought out. We could spend hours discussing this and we might wonder who ultimately examined the economic aspects of the enlargement most closely: Spain and Portugal or the European Community itself. I think it is right that the political nature of this act should be particularly important. It is high time that the Community stopped thinking in purely economic terms and talking nothing but economics, and actually started to take political action. Spain and Portugal, the two countries which are to join us shortly, have come through a particularly difficult period in the past few years to arrive at a democratic system.

The Treaties of Rome specifically provide for what I would describe as the right of democratic states to join the European Communities. When I say that the Treaties provide for a right, I mean that, fundamentally, all the European Community can discuss are the *details* of accession and it is regrettable that these discussions of the details have eventually taken more than seven years. But I believe that we must not underestimate the political nature of this question.

Nor can we, Mr President, ignore the economic aspect. On the contrary. Both Spain and Portugal on the one hand and the European Community on the other are going to have to give this aspect full consideration. Enlargement presents both partners with particular challenges in that respect, including in the social field. Spain and Portugal will have to consider how to adapt to modern industry, while the Community is going to face particularly bad problems with the common agricultural policy, which has itself not been a great success in recent years.

De Gucht

The Community will also face a particular challenge as far as its institutions are concerned, and Mr Croux went into this point in detail. Qualitative progress is indeed required. We are very rapidly approaching the critical point — if indeed we have not already passed it — where we are going to have to do something about the institutions of the European Community if any decisions are ever to be reached again. It is impossible to overstress the particular attention Mr Croux gave in his speech to the Milan summit and the crucial and historic decision to be taken on whether the institutions are actually going to move forward or just mark time.

Mr President, a second point that I would like to touch on is the place given to the European Parliament in these arrangements, which has positive aspects such as giving us the possibility of holding this debate today even before the Treaty is signed, but also very negative aspects, particularly as regards the election of Spanish and Portuguese members to the European Parliament. What I find particularly disturbing is that the future Member States of Spain and Portugal — as we in the delegation to Spain and Portugal noticed — have a greater appreciation of the need for their Members to be directly elected to the European Parliament than have either the Council or the Commission. A very sad fact to have to admit, Mr President. I find it unacceptable that the Commission in the first instance neglected to devote adequate attention to the democratic right to direct elections which Parliament won for itself, and that it continued to neglect this point throughout the negotiations. I hope that Spain and Portugal will have the goodwill to put this right.

Mr Musso (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what are we being asked here today? We are being asked whether we approve of the principle of enlargement. We have already given an answer. We have always said that we were for this principle and that we are ready and willing to welcome our immediate neighbours, who are as European as we are. But, unlike some of our colleagues, we forthrightly condemn the way in which this enlargement is going to take place, both for what it means to us — the Mediterranean areas of the Community — and on behalf of the two new arrivals, who have been lulled into a false sense of security. Indeed, the way in which the negotiations have been conducted, with those responsible saying that we will work out the problems later because we cannot bear to look at them beforehand, is — I believe — a bad approach and there is no call for paying homage to the Council nor to the European Council for the ways in which they have conducted themselves.

As regards the principle, I shall be voting for Mr Hänsch's report. I will be even more willing to approve it if the three amendments that have been tabled — the first by Mr Romeo, the second by Mr Nord and the third by Mr Prag and allies — are

adopted. But, once again, for our own sake, and for the new Europeans about to join us — our Spanish and Portuguese friends, whom we will never be able to hold responsible for these bad negotiations because we courted them ourselves — I believe that we in this House are going to regret the way we have gone about things.

Anyway, you need look no further than at the avalanche of motions for a resolution concerning Article 47 which are heaped up in our files to see the concern that has already been expressed about the Mediterranean areas, our associates in the Mediterranean Basin and the consequences of this enlargement.

I should like to conclude by reminding you of something that Mr Delors said in this House, not so long ago, when answering one of our colleagues, and I quote: 'Oh, if only the Community had had its eyes open when it initiated these negotiations! My impression, rather, is that for four or five years we kept our eyes closed while we were courting these countries and that only now have we opened them — and it is too late. The political commitment has been given and I cannot give you a precise figure on the consequences of enlargement'.

That is my conclusion. No further comment is needed, I feel.

Mrs Piermont (ARC). — *(DE)* We have to make a decision here on a resolution in which, on close examination, it is more a question of how the European Parliament can use the accession of Spain and Portugal to increase its own influence rather than under what conditions and with what consequences these countries can join the EEC.

The avowed or unavowed desire of an individual member of parliament to increase his own influence and power as a person by strengthening the parliamentary institution can be explained in terms of psychology and has surely had a massive impact on the development of national parliaments in the past. However, we should not get things mixed up. The main thing is whether, under the conditions negotiated, the effects of membership for Spain and Portugal will be beneficial or harmful. We think they will be extremely harmful. On Sunday several thousand Spaniards demonstrated against Reagan's visit to Spain and called for Spain to pull out of NATO and drop the political commitments involved, and for all American military bases to be removed. And what does the EEC do? For years its representatives, in particular Chancellor Kohl during his visit to Spain in May 1984, have been practising political blackmail: anyone who wants to be a member of the EEC must also be a member of NATO. Item d of this report harps on the same tediously familiar theme. It is becoming clear that one of the most important aims of this enlargement was to bring all the European NATO states together in the

Piermont

EEC and so increase its power in the confrontation between the Eastern and Western blocs.

We reject out of hand these blackmailing methods, which President Gonzalez is now using on his own people too, and call upon him to allow the Spanish, the majority of whom are known not to wish to belong to NATO, to decide this issue in a referendum, and not to try and trick them by asking them to decide on the nature of Spain's membership.

However it is not only the NATO issue that we are criticising. The EEC's rationalization and concentration targets in agriculture are going to put thousands of farmers with small and medium-sized holdings out of work. This will be accompanied by the same problems in respect of soil, water and foodstuffs which chemical rationalization has brought. The much vaunted internal market of 320 million people will mainly ensure fat profits for the exporting multinationals in the Ten, particularly the Federal Republic of Germany and its chemical industry. The Spanish employees on the other hand will have to wait seven years for freedom of movement in the EEC of the Ten, and as much as ten years for Luxembourg.

And the Spanish regions? They had hoped for greater independence in respect of the EEC regional funds, and were under the illusion that the regional fund would mean that financial support in future was no longer dependent on political good conduct towards the central government in Madrid. President Gonzalez soon put paid to these pipe dreams. He made it abundantly clear that all roads to Brussels pass via Madrid.

Wherever we look, be it fisheries or shipbuilding, the trend is clear: existing problems will be aggravated. Instead of using the accession as a pretext for contemplating its own navel and wasting time and effort in trying to get more for itself, the European Parliament should concentrate on an entirely different aim: namely that the Spanish and Portuguese be allowed to decide by a referendum whether, in view of all these problems, they really want to join the EEC.

Mr Romualdi (DR). — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as in the Political Affairs Committee, I shall be voting in favour of Mr Hänsch's report on the conclusion of the negotiations with Spain and Portugal in the context of the enlargement of the Community. No one who is familiar with the institutional, administrative and bureaucratic workings of the Community can turn a blind eye to the problems facing the Community of the Twelve, soon to replace that of the Ten, as regards its smooth running. Whence the urgent need to achieve as quickly as possible European Union or at least a fundamental review of the Treaties and, until such time as this comes about, at least a change in the current voting procedure whereby the oft-impossible unanimity sought ends up by blocking the decision-making of that supreme body, the Coun-

cil, which, rather than serving as a Community institution, thus becomes a downright hindrance to the attainment and safeguarding of common economic and political interests. The same is true as regards the political and structural physiognomy of the Commission which the accession of the new Member States makes even more top-heavy than it already is, which means, incapable of taking the rapid decisions normally incumbent upon an executive body.

Notwithstanding these drawbacks of enlargement and which must obviously be added to the far more important ones concerning economy, agriculture, industry, trade, fishing, brought out very clearly by the Galluzzi report we shall shortly be debating, and which are as yet by no means defined, it would be politically short-sighted not to acknowledge the extraordinary importance of the return of Spain and Portugal into the political and economic life of Europe of which they are historically and culturally a fundamental part. Furthermore, these are two countries which for centuries have been open to the life of the peoples of Mediterranean and Atlantic Africa, as the chequered pattern of their history shows, and to nations of the entire central and southern American continent with which they have in common a language, a religion, traditions and customs which constitute bonds which are indestructible and politically and economically decisive for a more direct dialogue and relationship with the whole of the European continent and with the Community in particular.

On top of all this comes the problem of security of the Community — obviously not an issue which Mrs Piermont has at heart — in which the Iberian peninsula is an irreplaceable bastion, a problem which the Community in its commitment to peace, simply must tackle with a solemn sense of responsibility and resoluteness, but without isolated fits of pride and conceit from those who would believe and have others believe that Europe has won the struggle, and indeed won it alone, and can alone guarantee its own independence, its own freedom and its own peace. After noting the conclusions of the negotiations, albeit at a stage that is not yet final, we await the signature of the agreements so that this Parliament can assess them in good time and urge all our governments and national parliaments to ratify them promptly. Otherwise, Mr President, the official date of entry scheduled for 1 January 1986 could turn into a mirage and, like all mirages, fade away.

Mr Van der Waal (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, although we are in favour of the accession of Spain and Portugal, we should like to make the following comments. The first concerns the effect of the Spanish/Portuguese entry on the Mediterranean countries with which we have treaties of association for the import of fruit and vegetables. We are concerned about how the Community hopes to fulfil its obligations to handle the imports of these products particularly when Spain and Portugal become fully integrated

Van der Waal

at the end of the transitional period. In all probability the Mediterranean countries will not be able to avoid the need to adapt their economies. Is the Community prepared to give these countries financial aid for this?

Next, the role of the European Parliament in the accession. The Hänsch report argues in favour of adapting the EEC treaty to give the European Parliament the right to participate in the second phase of the conclusion of the accession procedures. According to Mr Hänsch the European Parliament has been given a mandate to do this by the sovereign power of the Member States, in other words by the people of Europe. We were rather astonished to read this. This would mean that, simply by relying on a mandate obtained from the direct elections, Parliament could increase its powers to an unlimited degree. Next, we object to the view that the sovereign power of a Member State lies with its people. Is it not the national governments controlled by the national parliaments which, as sovereign authorities, advised by the Commission and in consultation with the European Parliament, must always have the power of decision?

Finally, the significance of enlargement for the Community's external political relations. The relations which the Iberian Peninsula has long had with Latin America may act as a bridge after enlargement to enable Europe to play a greater political role in that part of the world. Unfortunately this is not the case with the Middle East. Unlike Portugal and the other Member States Spain is alone in having no official diplomatic relations with Israel. This is a very unsatisfactory situation. The Community has in the past regularly concentrated on the Middle East in the context of European political cooperation and has made statements on the subject in the Venice declaration and on other occasions.

On the other hand the Middle East countries also recognize the positive significance of having political relations with Europe. We must, in our opinion, continue to maintain these relations.

They are of vital importance for promoting a peaceful solution to the existing problems in that area and for counteracting the increasing influence of the Soviet Union. What we want to know is: how does the Community intend to continue this important political tradition when a major country which is a new Member State does not maintain diplomatic relations with the democratic state of Israel, thereby casting doubt on its right to exist?

Mr Tsounis (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, I too should like to congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Hänsch, on his valuable report and to support its main conclusions, which in my view are the two set out below.

Firstly, that as soon as the agreements on the accession of Spain and Portugal have been signed there will have

to be a major debate in this House on the substance of these agreements. The debate would amount to a ratification of the agreements by the European Parliament, and it would have to be preceded by ratification of the agreements by the individual Member States of the Community.

Secondly, that an effort will have to be made to reduce to a minimum the length of the transitional mandate of the Members of the Spanish and Portuguese national parliaments who are appointed as Members of the European Parliament, so that the anomaly of the different popular mandate of part of this House will come to an end as soon as possible. Because, ladies and gentlemen, one of the main features of this Parliament is precisely that it is the only example of a multinational assembly elected by direct universal suffrage, i.e. with a European and not a national mandate.

There is a second reason why I should like, if I may, to express my deep satisfaction at the successful conclusion of the arduous negotiations, which dragged on unnecessarily for seven whole years and sorely tried the abilities, imagination and perseverance of the negotiators. On this point, I think that special praise is due to the Italian Presidency, which gave a decisive boost to the negotiations and succeeded in bringing them to a successful conclusion. With the completion of its third enlargement, the Community has, I feel, clearly expressed its firm resolve to move along the path of European integration, a path which will have to remain open in the future also. However, the satisfaction which I am sure we all feel at the moment should not lead us into dangerous overoptimism, which is usually what happens when only the positive aspects of successful negotiations are emphasized. Because, although it is true that the third enlargement in the last 15 years increases the prestige and weight of the Community as regards international trade and politics, it is equally true that enlargement is not devoid of problems of which we ought to be fully aware. Since the later accession of the new Member States will give rise to the problem, on the one hand, of intra-Community competition between the Mediterranean countries, which produce similar agricultural products, and, on the other hand, of Community relations with the non-member Mediterranean countries, for which access to the Community market will probably be more difficult. It is obvious that the Community will need to have new negotiations with these countries and to find solutions which, while safeguarding the interests of the Mediterranean Member States, will not be likely to cause fundamental changes in the conditions of trade enjoyed by the non-member Mediterranean countries and to have undesirable and destabilizing repercussions on the Mediterranean region. Furthermore, the later accession will also give rise to the problem of the further widening of the gap in economic development between the Community partners. This gap already exists and is unfortunately getting wider rather than narrower. The accession of

Tsounis

Spain and Portugal will further aggravate this problem, and I would say that it is high time for the Community to take serious account of its own appeals for the need to bring together the economies of its Member States. I say economies, ladies and gentlemen, and not only economic policies, since what we are striving for is to reduce the economic divergences between the partners, and of course we are not bound to achieve our objective — and perhaps it is not even possible — by common and converging economic policies. What is probably required is the opposite, since the various economic shortcomings all need to be tackled in different ways if our economies are to become as strong as we wish them to be.

Lastly, a point which is perhaps more important than all the rest, the problem of the smooth functioning of the Community institutions, will be even more acute, since even now, with its ten members, the Community is losing steam and is already in danger of grinding to a halt. This problem will have to be tackled with courage and determination, not with half-measures.

We shall have to come up with suitable institutional forms and machinery which will enable us to overcome the obstacles which still stand in our way, and in this report I hope that the Milan Summit will prove to be decisive.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Toksvig (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, it requires incredible application to reduce seven years of negotiations and the results of them to a report amounting to only 15 pages. The Hänsch Report is therefore, in my view, a valuable document for which the rapporteur is to be congratulated. He has used the time devoted to the accession of Spain and Portugal to look at the political, social and economic spectrum as a whole. The conclusions he draws are worth remembering — not just because it is the 8th of May, the fortieth anniversary, but also because they give us some idea of the direction in which the Community should go. He makes a lot of important points both in the motion for a resolution and in the explanatory statement. I am especially interested in a number of questions of particular relevance to the future; the weighting of votes in the Council is a good compromise and should help the decision-making process.

I could not agree more that direct elections in Spain and Portugal must come as soon as possible. We could very easily find ourselves in the situation where, having converted this chamber in July and August, we are just getting to know the new colleagues we are to welcome on 1 January when the elections are held and we are faced with a whole lot of new Members. This cannot be a sensible way of working, and I would ask the Council to press for direct elections as soon as possible.

The report suggests that the national parliaments should aim to have the new Treaty documents ratified as soon as possible. This is something else that this Parliament should stress — there is no longer any time to be lost. We have found a compromise and now we must show that we intend to see the procedure through.

There are a number of points at the end of the report on the challenge before us. There are seven points and I would recommend anyone who has not read them to do so, because they are extremely important. According to the report, enlargement may provide an economic and technological stimulus. This is absolutely true. The Common Market will suddenly consist of 320 million people and action will clearly have to be taken — not least to deal with unemployment. Unless we get down to business we shall never solve the unemployment problem.

The report says that the decision-making processes are too slow and should be reformed, as should the distribution of responsibility — and this is precisely the view expressed in the Committee on Institutional Affairs. I am still not absolutely convinced that it is the right way, but I am sure that government conference envisaged in the Dooge Report and indirectly supported here is crucial and that Spain and Portugal should automatically be invited to take part.

One point made is that the psychological hub of the Community will be shifted southwards. I should like to say on behalf of the majority of Danish Members that we also want to maintain our contacts with the Nordic peoples with whom we have very close relations. We can therefore perhaps in this way maintain a balance in the Community of the future.

Mrs De March (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee extends motions for resolutions already adopted by the majority of this House on enlargement.

Mr Hänsch has asked for the green light to be given to signing the accession treaty. He has expressed satisfaction at the conclusion of negotiations and has stated that accession would be beneficial, both to the Community and to the applicant countries. But at the same time, he has spoken about a challenge that could sign the Community's death warrant. This catalogue of good intentions and pious hopes is derisive in the light of the Bonn summit conclusions, which have been glossed over this morning but which throw a true light on what is at stake when enlargement occurs.

To those who are trying to believe or make others believe that the main aim of enlargement is to consolidate democracy in the applicant countries and to strengthen the political cohesiveness of an independent Europe, the message of the Bonn summit is loud and

De March

clear: Europe can only exist as an appendage of the United States, under its political, economic and military control.

The enlargement of the Community is all part of this basic approach and cannot be separated from strategic questions linked with NATO. The report by Mr Hänsch even admits this: if the Spanish application had been rejected, it would probably have heralded the withdrawal of Spain from NATO. The Americans themselves are well aware of this, since the American Secretary of State, Mr George Schultz, congratulated the negotiators by calling the agreements between Spain and Portugal major political successes. Say no more!

When it came to the bottom line of the negotiations, the political will to hasten the relaunching of European integration and to set up a military Europe, in conjunction with Reagan's 'Star Wars' project, was more important than all the other economic and social considerations. In my opinion, getting set for the arms race and nuclear winter is a very strange way of celebrating the victory over Nazism of 8 May 1945. At the same time, the enlargement to Twelve is to serve as a springboard for changes in the Community's decision-making procedures, with the abandonment of an institution about which we — the French Communists and Allies — are extremely concerned: I am talking about the right to veto, that is to say a Member State's right to independence and sovereignty. Naturally, we are against this.

The risks of enlargement are also economic. As in 1972, when the United Kingdom joined, the United States is making capital out of enlargement to renegotiate the GATT agreements. The purpose is to pursue the transformation of the Community into a vast free trade area by opening up new territories in which capitalist firms can manoeuvre. They will be able to enlarge their markets and swap their industrial products for agricultural products, all to their own advantage.

Competition between the various regions of the Mediterranean is going to be exacerbated. Spain and Portugal will serve as European bridgeheads for American and Japanese firms which are currently stepping up their investments. But no mention is made of this. After having neglected them for such a long time, the negotiators have at last acknowledged the dramatic consequences of enlargement on agriculture, fishing, industry and hence on jobs. If some light on this has been shed and some true facts have emerged, I believe that we have had something to do with it.

Today, however, they are trying to make us believe that we can skirt around the dangers with a few extra-funds and with a few alterations to existing regulations. But what is the truth? The fact is that false guarantees and meagre compensatory appropriations will

not be able to prevent the dismantling of protectionist measures which enlargement will entail.

It is the belief of the French Communists and Allies that it is possible to avoid the wounds which Mr Andriessen spoke about and which would go against the interest of our peoples, not just the French, but also the Spanish and Portuguese. What is more, if we had any sense and were logical about this we would also take note of what is happening in Greece. Yes, we could avoid these wounds. We could also avoid — as my friend Emmanuel Maffre-Baugé said — waging a war against the poor of southern Europe.

Those were a number of points which had to be stressed. The negotiations are still not completed. Above all, it remains to ratify the accession by a treaty and through the national parliaments. This is a significant stage in the process which will give us an opportunity to enlighten our populations about what is really at stake. In our country, workers in towns and in the countryside, the trade unions and professional organizations will all have something to say and an important role to play when they confront each Member of the national parliament with his responsibilities for the present and the future.

For our part, we will do all we can to institute a wide democratic debate and to retain our national and regional identities. Men and women must be prepared to take a stand. That is precisely what the wine-growers in my area — Provence-Côte-d'Azur — are saying. We must defend, simultaneously, the interests of our farmers, the interests of the Community's populations and their economies, and see to it that our countries do not get crushed in the cogs of a supranational wheel of a Europe which, instead of expressing an unanimous European opinion, might well be waving an American flag. That is why we are against enlargement and its doom-laden logic.

Rather than submitting to the damaging process of enlargement, we would prefer to set up a new policy of cooperation with Spain and Portugal, in a spirit of mutual respect for our various advantages, which safeguards national independence. Rather than confining this cooperation to the Community framework, we would prefer to integrate it into a new Mediterranean policy which would make it possible to promote development in the countries concerned and to escape from domination by multinational firms.

Mr Toussaint (L). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is obvious that the European Communities could not but decide to allow the accession of Spain and Portugal, precisely because the Treaty of Rome clearly states that any democratic State can become a member.

The real problem, then, is not that of the decision, but of the unequivocal attitude which the Member States

Toussaint

must now adopt now that enlargement has been agreed on.

In this respect, it appears that there are two major obligations: increasing the EEC's financial resources and implementing institutional reform as a matter of urgency.

The accession of two new Members whose economic development is not so advanced as the Community average will inevitably lead to an increase in the EEC's financial requirements and we cannot help but acknowledge in all honesty that an increase of the VAT ceiling from 1 to 1.4% is not sufficient to cover this. Integration will of course be progressive, but a radical reform of the CAP must be carried out during and before the end of this transitory period. In the industrial sector, customs duties must be aligned with the Common Customs Tariff in seven years and it is well understood that both Spain and Portugal have accepted the principle of the adoption of *acquis communautaire*. But also — and above all — a Community of twelve increases the need, and confirms the urgency of reforming the institutions, because, if we retain the rule of unanimous voting with twelve of us, blockages will result.

Let us insist on the fact that it is not possible to hold up this institutional reform for long, now that enlargement has been decided upon. The EEC runs the risk of being unable to withstand such an enlargement if it does not reform itself.

To quote a pessimistic theory — to which we must not subscribe — if we are not consistent with our own decisions and do not take the courageous decisions regarding finance and institutional reform which our own logic commands us to do, enlargement will weaken rather than strengthen Europe.

Mr Lalor (RDE). — Mr President, the solidarity among Europe's democratic peoples must be promoted. No nation belonging to our common Western civilization should be excluded from the European Union which we have set ourselves as the final goal of our endeavours. The countries of southern Europe have a right, as do those of the north — one of which I represent — to cooperation in the interests of their people's social progress. The accession to our Community of Spain and Portugal is no longer a subject for discussion; it is a *fait accompli*. I hasten to add that I welcome their accession.

This having been said, it is not right for the Community to run the risk of ruin by unwisely taking on new problems, especially at a time when it is finding it difficult to resolve the difficulties it already has. There are very many problems that still exist which will have serious repercussions, not only for existing Member States — and not least for my own country, Ireland — but also for the two new applicant Member States

themselves if these problems are not resolved before accession becomes effective. It is therefore necessary that serious negotiations should continue in the Community on an ongoing basis to deal with these problems and difficulties.

One subject of particular concern to me is that of fisheries. As long as no formal assurance has been given or received that fish-stocks will not be subjected to additional depletion incompatible with natural replacement of the species, there must be cause for concern. The accession of Spain and Portugal will result in a substantial increase in the number of fishing-vessels, in fishing capacity, in fish extraction for human consumption, and in greatly increased pressure on existing fish-stocks. The survival of coastal occupations in Europe will depend on the Community's firmness against unreasonable exploitation of our natural reserves. I ask that the Community take every step to ensure the necessary rigorous controls and surveillance in our fishing waters in the interests of all parties.

Another subject of concern is the availability of a sufficiency of resources to meet the even greater demands that will be made on both the Social and the Regional Fund after enlargement. So far available funds have been totally inadequate to meet the requirements of the existing Community, with particular reference to the needs of peripheries like Ireland, Scotland and Greece. This basically means that unless the Council shows the political will to increase the Community's own resources substantially there can be no doubt that the sprinkling-can effect which will result will be unacceptable not only for the Europe of today but also for the enlarged Europe of tomorrow with its increased peripheral needy areas.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, any democratic country in Europe which applies to join the Community has to be allowed to do so. At least this is what it says in the Treaties. Of all democratic civil rights the right to vote is the first.

The nations of which Spain is made up already possessed these civil rights long before Spain existed as a country.

That is why we might justifiably expect that the representatives of the Iberian Peninsula who come to take up their seats here will be elected on the basis of electoral arrangements which suit the communities concerned. The sovereignty of the people takes precedence over coincidental national sovereignty, and I hope that the Commission will negotiate with Spain and Portugal on this basis.

Mr Stirbois (DR). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we must remind those who would still doubt Europe's future of the heroic sacrifices which, through 25 centuries of struggle, have created Europe,

Stirbois

beginning in 480 BC at Salamis, when the Greeks of Themistocles triumphed over the Asian invaders.

For 25 centuries, we have undergone our trials: the Asiatics were imprudent enough to challenge Athens; the Carthaginians ravaged the countryside of Italy; the Huns laid waste to within 150 kilometres of Paris; we were attacked by Muslims in Bordeaux and by Turks threatening Vienna.

Several nations have taken turns as the leaders of Europe. Spain in the late Middle Ages, which contained and then pushed back the Moors; the Slavs, who repelled the onslaught of the Tartars; the Habsburgs, who held the Ottomans at bay for three centuries and who thus to some extent helped to safeguard Europe. Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands, England, France and Italy were subsequently to make Europe's presence felt in the world.

Spain and Portugal have therefore both played an important role in the past. Both these nations are part of the European Community, their entry to the EEC is logical and beneficial because it will offer Western Europe the opportunity to strengthen its links with Africa, which is a natural extension of these countries and modern Africa cannot survive without Europe. The economies of our two continents are complementary. Whatever happens, Europe cannot tolerate a foreign power getting a foothold in Africa and threatening Europe from its southern flank. Did not Zinoviev say 'We will encircle Europe via Africa'?

The enlargement of the Community is going to make it possible to establish special links with the countries of Latin America.

Certain problems will nevertheless have to be solved, in particular the future financing of the EEC. An enlarged Europe will not have a future without increasing its own resources. Raising the VAT ceiling to 1.4% on 1 January 1986 already does not seem to be enough. We must release other resources, based for instance on indicators of living, agricultural and industrial wealth.

Enlargement also implies respect for the *acquis communautaire*, which itself calls for improvements in the way the common agricultural policy functions.

I cannot conclude this topic, ladies and gentlemen, without making it quite clear that Europe extends from Brest to Bucharest. One day our enlarged Community should include the East Germans, the Poles, the Czechs, the Albanians, the Hungarians, the Bulgarians, the Rumanians and the Yugoslavs, all of whom were saved from Nazi totalitarianism only to find themselves crushed and subjugated by the Communist dictatorship of the Soviet Union.

The United States of America saved Western Europe from such a disaster 40 years ago. Those who appear

to have forgotten this today and who are protesting against the visit of a president of this great democratic country are behaving disgracefully. Their favourite slogan is indeed 'Better red than dead'. We, on the other hand, say 'Better European and alive'. Let us remember who our friends are.

(Applause from the right)

IN THE CHAIR : MR DIDÒ

Vice-President

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, the rapporteur, Mr Hänsch, and Lady Elles were good enough to refer to my report, which was approved by Parliament on 18 February 1982. At that time I attempted to identify the institutional significance of Parliament and this is what I wish to talk about now.

The European Parliament must, as a European institution, take part in the decisions on enlargement. Originally, we could not get this legal position accepted, but the Stuttgart Summit gave the Parliament the right to give an opinion on the enlargement.

As soon as the accession treaties are signed they must be ratified by the European Parliament on equal terms with the national parliaments.

Secondly, direct elections for the European Parliament must be held in the acceding countries as quickly as possible, as it would be intolerable if we had a Parliament consisting of members with varying legitimacy and the people of Spain and Portugal did not have the same voting rights as the people of the Community of Ten.

The Hänsch report deals with the problems of Mediterranean policy which will arise in conjunction with the enlargement. I would like to comment that the enlargement of the European Community — if it is to be an integral part of a new overall Mediterranean policy — merits particular attention. To be frank, my imagination and my faith in Europe is inspired less by government statements or political slogans than the governments' actions.

Mr Galluzzi's interim report on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations calls the attention of the Council of Ministers and the Commission in Brussels to a number of basic problems. These require political decisions this year. Mr Galluzzi thus points out that we are extremely concerned at the constant deterioration in trade and conditions of payment of the Mediterranean countries and their balance of trade with the European Community, and calls on the Twelve Member States of the enlarged European

Blumenfeld

Community to undertake to guarantee these countries better access to our markets for their products.

The report by the Committee on External Economic Relations is only an interim report and cannot be anything more. The Committee did not have any opportunity to conduct in-depth talks. Many of Mr Galluzzi's statements must therefore still be revised, substantiated and completed and others, I believe, will have to be changed. My Group will therefore propose that Parliament agrees to the report in principle and, in accordance with Article 85 Paragraph 1, refers it back to the Committee on legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights with a request to submit the final report as soon as possible.

On behalf of our Group Mrs Boot and I have submitted a detailed question to the Council, the text of which speaks for itself. We call attention to the great concern in economic and consumer circles in the Community that in three to four years imports to the European Community from Mediterranean countries could be paralysed by Community association and other treaties.

One figure is sufficient to illustrate the problems after enlargement. In 1983 the European Community imported approximately 1.2 million tonnes of fruit and vegetables from Egypt, Israel, Tunisia, Morocco, Cyprus and Turkey and in the same period 2.9 million tonnes from Spain and the Canary Isles, i.e. far more than twice as much. We now expect the Council, and of course the Members of the Commission responsible too, to tackle this complex of acute and long-term problems and to make a decision on them.

To put it more clearly, this means that we do not wish the significance of this issue to be talked to death by bureaucrats in Brussels and the national capitals. If the responsible politicians in the European Community do not find a political solution to these long-standing problems there will be no overall Mediterranean policy worth the name.

If countries such as Morocco, Tunisia, Israel, Cyprus, etc. can no longer sell their products in the European Community, they will not find other markets without involving themselves in undesirable political obligations. The quantities currently sold by these countries must therefore be established as a minimum. European Community producers competing with the Mediterranean countries will thus have an opportunity in future to exploit their market potential in terms of quality and quantity, whilst the Mediterranean countries can use the future to specialize further.

I would like to emphasize the political significance of the entire issue and call upon the Council of Ministers to make a decision immediately.

Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (RDE). — (FR) Personally, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I was always in

favour of the entry into the Community of Spain and Portugal, from the moment that these two countries became democracies.

Indeed, however great some of the economic problems raised by the accession of these two countries, and of which I am perfectly well aware, the political aspect in my opinion is of primordial importance.

To this political reason, I would add another which is economic. In the long term, the whole Latin American market will be opened up to us, which should have positive repercussions for all the member countries of our European Community.

That is why I shall be voting for Mr Hänsch's report.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, first of all, may I say what a fortunate choice it was to appoint Mr Klaus Hänsch as rapporteur on this important topic; this is an excellent report which one can support without any misgivings whatever. For us Spain's accession has mainly been a question of a political decision rather than an economic wrangle, though the economic aspects have, of course, caused problems. In the final event it is the political decisions which bring about economic consequences.

When our delegation was in Madrid recently we were thus delighted to hear the Spanish President, Mr Gonzalez, Foreign Minister Moran, but the leader of the opposition Fraga Iribarne too, saying that they were all vehemently in favour of Spanish Members of Parliament being *elected* as soon as possible, but by the end of 1986 at the latest. This is an important point: in an elected Parliament, *nominated* members never have as much influence as they should.

In this Parliament too there are people who are wondering about Spain. Will Spain not cause us problems? Quite the contrary, I think. Anybody who has been to Madrid knows that the Spaniards — government and opposition alike — are coming into the Community absolutely determined to do all that is in their power to help the Community progress. They are critical of the way progress is now being blocked by too narrow an interpretation of the concept of unanimity and they also support structural progress. In Spain we will thus find a driving force for Europe.

Madame Thome-Patenôtre expressed concern that the regions were not happy with the accession as everything would be handled via Madrid. I can only assure you that these reservations are simply not justified. We had discussions with representatives of the two most important regions, Catalonia and the Basque country, and both fully support accession.

Finally, we should not forget something that has been brought up several times already: Spain is an European

Habsburg

country, for European culture without Spain, or indeed Portugal, would not be what it is today. We should not forget either that Spain, despite its reputation, set us the best examples for tolerance in earlier times. Peace between Christianity, Islam and Judaism was first achieved in Spain, where there was a miraculous co-existence of these religions which illustrates the exemplary truth that true faith will find a means to communicate.

Mr Guerneur (RDE). — (*FR*) I will confine my speech on the problems of the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal solely to the problem of sea fishing. I must say that these negotiations, as in other spheres, have unfortunately been very badly handled. This is not the fault of the negotiators, but that of the Member States, who decided to squeeze this negotiation process into a rigid framework and to have it concluded before 1 January 1986, which shows that you cannot negotiate properly when you have to stick to a date. Having said that, the content of the agreement on sea fishing is not as bad as we might have expected and I think that we must congratulate the Commission and in particular Mr Andriessen for the efforts that have been deployed to safeguard as much as possible the interests of Community fishermen.

So I am not going to dwell on the past or cry over any spilt milk but I am worried about the future, by which I mean the fate which will meet this agreement and, particularly, the way in which its implementation will be supervised. To make people respect an agreement, Mr President, you need a legal framework, you need resources and you need political will.

A legal framework calls for strict regulations and we know full well that such regulations have not yet been devised. In fact, where the details of the regulations and their implementation are concerned, negotiations are still going on. So I think that very careful attention must be paid to the framework given to the agreement on sea fishing.

As for the resources, these are both budgetary and material. There is no budget for sea fishing in the European Economic Community and it is therefore vital that, in the 1986 budget, funds are set aside to guarantee strict supervision. Of course new material resources must also be provided to cope with the new problem posed by the entry of Spain and Portugal.

Finally, Mr President, political will is needed to ensure that the agreement is respected, by which I mean that the rules must be adhered to and supervision and penalties strictly applied. We know full well that, for various reasons — some of them political — none of the Member States — or almost none — has the will to guarantee at the present time that agreements are respected. Well, if the States do not have it then the Community itself must be provided with the means.

And I should like to finish by saying, if you don't mind, Mr President, that I do not shirk from proposing that we should have some kind of Community supervisory body in the form of a fleet under the direct responsibility of the Commission and supplied by contributions from the various Member States. Only if these conditions are fulfilled, namely, the existence of political will, resources, a budget and regulations, will the fishing agreement which has been concluded be respected and will the interests of Community fishermen be safeguarded.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Andreotti, President-in-Office of the Council. — (*IT*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is both a duty and a pleasure to take the floor in this debate which comes in the wake of an interesting discussion a few days ago in your Political Affairs Committee to which we had submitted a summary text on the agreements between the Council and the Spanish and Portuguese governments. One point remains outstanding, but subject to this reservation we can claim to be home and dry.

I should like to thank Mr Hänsch for his report and his proposals. It is significant that the Council devoted its attention to this topic, because this gives us greater political authority as regards the signature of the agreement for enlargement in June, in good time for all twelve countries to be able to ratify the act within the schedule, which is moreover tight, inasmuch as Spain and Portugal will become full members of the European Community on 1 January 1986.

Your discussion will also be useful to the national parliaments when they tackle this issue at the time of ratification and I believe, more generally speaking, that the more pressure you bring to bear on the national parliaments and national governments, the more consistent we will be with our resolute action at the European level. The representative assemblies could otherwise be out of tune with the governing forces.

I am gratified by the frequent reference made in this assembly to general political considerations as well as to historical and civilization considerations.

This is by no means a rhetorical reference! No one here underestimates the importance of the issues at stake — agriculture and fishing, for instance, to take just two of the sectors which have been mentioned this morning — issues which are vital to our people and in respect to which we must be sure that enlargement does not lead to situations of conflict, but instead to a harmonious development of the agreements reached. It is, however, essential not to lower the tone of the debate by reducing it to purely material considerations.

I recall the humiliation of the then Prime Minister of Greece, Mr Caramanlis, when the debate was centered

Andreotti

on his country's accession to the Community. At that time, very high-sounding discussions on the meeting of Greek civilization with Latin civilization and the civilization of the North gave way to, and were sometimes submerged by, discussions on the tobacco and olive oil quotas. This was really being brought down to earth with a bang after listening to considerations which had fired our imagination and boosted our fundamental beliefs. My belief is that both aspects have to be taken into consideration and I find it significant that the vast majority of those who have spoken have given a favourable opinion. I should like to take this opportunity of thanking the assembly for its kind words to the Italian Presidency.

We took over a legacy much of which had been the work of previous presidencies. The point was to get to the finishing straight and the principle according to which momentum gathers as progress is made falls flat if it is not backed up by a solid resolve.

The Commission and particularly Vice-President Natali and Vice-President Andriessen, as well as the President Delors, are working at our side in such an endeavour, all convinced that seven years ago and today the problems were and remain the same and would still be the same in seven years time if they had not been solved. These problems, now overcome, also constitute a sign of recognition that the European Community does not only stand on its past merits but is also sure of its future. The very fact that a Community soon to be joined by another 50 million European citizens means that this Community has a future.

Lastly, taking up what Mr Blumenfeld said earlier, each of us has in his mind the text — approved in this House — of one of his previous resolutions. We must ensure that enlargement does not spark off fears and misgivings amongst the non-Community elements of the Mediterranean. The political significance of the Community is great among the ranks of associated countries and countries which, although not members of the Community, entertain relationships with it.

These worries, which the last European Council also sought to allay, have prompted both the Commission as well as ourselves to stipulate the conditions for the transitional periods. These worries are monitored closely at the political level. I myself visited Morocco recently; and yesterday the Tunisian Minister for Foreign Affairs was in Rome; on Sunday the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs was in Rome and the effects of enlargement constituted the most delicate and topical subject of these contacts. At a time when we are gratified by this strengthening of the Community and by this milestone in its progress, it would be contradictory if this were to lead to a weakening of the bonds we have with other Mediterranean countries which are particularly near to us, irrespective of their political colouring.

These are thorny problems, but ones which leave us undaunted. We did not give in when faced with the

septennial problems which blocked the conclusion of the negotiations; and we are not backing down now in the face of the current problems. We believe firmly in our Community, a Community which has a glorious past but which is destined to have an even more glorious future.

(Applause)

President. — Mr President-in-Office, I am sure all the Members will join with me in once again thanking you and complimenting you on the Italian Presidency, and in particular Mr Andreotti, as well as the Commission and Vice-President Natali, for their successful efforts in overcoming this crucial final stage so that we can now have the satisfaction of seeing Spain and Portugal actually joining the Community.

(Applause)

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it has been my dubious privilege all too often to comment in this assembly upon the delays in the accession negotiations, so I think that today I am entitled to add a few words on this subject.

First and foremost, Mr President, I should like — and not just to repay compliments — to express the appreciation of the Commission for the role carried out by the Italian Presidency which, as Mr Andreotti has already mentioned, took over the legacy of seven years of work and also for the role it played in seeking broad-based solutions in an overall vision of the issues at stake.

During the debate comments have been made on a whole host of problems. Mr Andreotti has quite rightly stated that the conclusion of the accession negotiations must also be viewed in the light of the subsequent European Council during which the Heads of State or Government undertook commitments on two specific issues: the integrated Mediterranean programmes and the Mediterranean policy on which Parliament will focus its attention immediately after this debate and on which Mr Cheysson will speak on behalf of the Commission.

However, I must add quite sincerely and frankly that we cannot simply gloss over the role of the European Parliament and its merit in the attainment of this great goal which has been and still is so vital to us all.

Today's debate is in a way the conclusive phase. It has been pointed out that there are significant coincidences as regards date: today's date and tomorrow's date. I should like to add that the main point is that this debate is taking place. Even in previous debates the Commission had expressed its appreciation and its approval for the aspects mentioned by Mr Hänsch.

Natali

Today the Commission is pleased to confirm this appreciation.

But, as I was saying, it is a debate which is taking place also thanks to the stimulation, overseeing, and boost it has received from the European Parliament throughout the negotiations. The debates during the plenary sessions, in committee and in the various joint committees are still in our minds. On this subject I should like to address a special word of thanks to the chairmen of the joint committees — Lord Douro in the case of Spain and Mr Wettig in the case of Portugal — and also pay tribute to the other chairmen — Mr Galluzzi for Spain and Ms Clwyd.

Throughout these debates Parliament has provided encouragement and support which have never flagged whatever the difficulties encountered in solving the problem. This support has been forthcoming from the vast majority.

After much endeavour, oft-dashed hopes, the Community is at last opening its doors to Spain and Portugal.

I hope — indeed I am confident — that the loose ends can be tied up over the next few days and that the schedule Mr Andreotti reminded us of can be met. I feel I must reiterate that the Commission will obviously accomplish its duty as it feels it has done all along.

The entry of Spain and Portugal, it has been already noted, is an historical fact. Admittedly the debate which has taken place here has brought out the commitments and the challenges arising from this process. Mention has been made of agriculture, fishing, economic integration and, as I said before, of the Mediterranean dimension and the needs of the Mediterranean regions of the Community of the Ten. These are relevant and important issues which have not and will not be lost sight of; however, I should like above all to stress a fact which I consider to be the most important: i.e. that enlargement entails the new political reality for the Community, one of hope and real promise which should be developed to transform the Community and give it a new lease of life.

I am firmly convinced that the choice made corresponds not only to the letter but also to the spirit of the treaties and that it is the only choice compatible with a living Community whose intrinsic nature wills it to do continually better.

I believe that today's debate is above all expression of the faith in this Community which when all's said and done — as stated today in the President's address — is the Community in which we placed all our hopes at the time of its inception.

I feel sure, Mr President, that the young democracies of the Iberian Peninsula will make a fundamental and

invaluable contribution to the further growth and development of the European Community.

(Applause)

Mr Hänsch (S), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to make up for an omission in my speech just now. I forgot to thank Mr Natali for his work in conducting the negotiations and for the outcome of the negotiations. I should also like to thank him for his constant willingness to inform Parliament and its committees as soon as possible and as thoroughly as possible of the progress of negotiations.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

Mr Balfe (S). — On a point of order Mr President. On Monday, as reported in the Minutes of Proceedings approved yesterday, the President gave me an assurance that there would be no armed personnel in this Chamber during the visit of the President of the United States. Reading the account of the visit of the President of the United States to the United Kingdom, I see that when he visited the United Kingdom in 1982, according to the record and minute provided by the Speaker of the then House of Commons, he had with him a thing called the 'Black Box', which is the machinery which is needed for the President of the United States to launch a nuclear war. I am told on authority that this piece of machinery is always kept with the President. Can I therefore ask whether the Bureau has considered whether this piece of offensive machinery will be within this Chamber, and whether the President of France has been consulted as to the fact that a foreign Head of State on his soil will be carrying the capacity to launch a nuclear war from the Chamber of this House? I would be pleased if you could give these matters your attention before 'President Hopalong' arrives this afternoon.

(Protests from the right)

President. — Mr Balfe, I do not think that was a point of order.

Mr Blumenfeld has requested that the Galluzzi report be referred back to committee. This request will be dealt with during the debate on the Galluzzi report, which will be discussed jointly with the Cassanmagnago Cerretti report after Question Time.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.10 p.m. and resumed at 3.30 p.m.)^{1,2}

¹ From 2.30 to 3.15 p.m. Parliament held a formal sitting on the occasion of the visit to the European Parliament of the President of the United States of America, Mr Ronald Reagan. The proceedings of the formal sitting are contained in an Annex to today's debates.

² *Topical and urgent debate (objections):* see Minutes.

IN THE CHAIR : MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr Provan (ED). — Madam President, would it be possible now for you to give us the result of our deliberations so that we know what urgent topics actually are on the agenda and in which order they will come? I personally have one down on human rights which I think is very important, and I would like your assurance that that is still on the agenda.

President. — Mr Provan, the list you refer to will be available in about 20 minutes.

3. *Bonn Summit (Statement by the Commission)*

President. — The next item is the statement by the President of the Commission on the Bonn Summit held on 4 and 5 May 1985.

Mr Delors, President of the Commission. — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should first of all like to thank you for amending your agenda to make time to hear the Commission's view of the results of the industrialized nations' summit in Bonn, and I regard this as further proof of the spirit of friendly cooperation between our two institutions.

(Applause)

I shall come back to this at the end of my speech.

For the sake of brevity and clarity I shall begin with the simple question: what did we expect from the summit?

First of all, a certain style. The seven countries which meet on a voluntary basis each year do not govern the world economy. They meet to get to know each other better, to exchange views on the main trends in the world economy and to give a lead to the rest of the world. Why those countries? Others could do this too . . . Because, in view of their responsibilities as rich and prosperous countries, there are times when they can give guidance to the rest of the world, and particularly at present to all those suffering from hunger and underdevelopment, or in financial difficulties because of debts, whatever the causes.

The industrialized nations' summit must therefore never replace the existing international organizations which are able to discuss world economic problems within their own field: the OECD on overall economic policy, the Interim Committee and the Development Committee on development problems and mone-

tary and financial problems, and Gatt on trade problems.

Secondly, we were expecting discussions on what I would call the short-term economy. How can we bolster the international economy when it makes sense to say, whatever problems we have to face and whatever monetary, financial or other solutions we must find, that the surest way of helping each country to resolve its difficulties is to expand the international economy?

In 1984 the volume of international trade grew by 9%. This trend will not last because it was caused by the large trade deficit and the growth rate in the United States, which stood at 9% compared with 2% the year before and 0% the year before that. So how can we support the international economy this year?

The third objective of the summit was to find out whether the various countries' views on how to improve the structures of the world economy had changed. And structures include trade, money and finance. This is what we in the Commission were expecting from the summit.

I must point out first of all that the summit discussions dealt only with economic, financial and monetary matters. Strategic and military questions were not discussed by the Heads of State or Government. What was reported in the press was probably the outcome of bilateral talks. But the summit remained on a purely economic level with one exception, which I am sure everyone will accept and understand: the political declaration published on Friday. This political declaration — and I am sure I do not need to stress this — was both welcome and extremely important, because it showed our own people and the whole world that, forty years after the end of the War, the three countries on one side during the bitter fighting and the four on the other were now united. They were united and, above all, no matter what lay in the past, they now shared the same ideals about democracy and freedom. The declaration was by no means intended as propaganda, but it would have made excellent material for civics lessons in every school in the world. For today society's collective memory soon forgets as world events progress. Who would have believed in 1950 that we would be at the stage we have reached today?

Unfortunately this political declaration has not had the impact which it should have had because, as these summits tend to be distorted, the press as usual took more interest in other matters. But I wanted, again without putting undue stress on the matter, to underline the importance of then declaration.

For the rest the seven industrialized nations also agreed to try to fight the plague which is rife among some of our young people: drugs. A working party has been set up to try to find out how we can stop this evil from spreading. The seven nations also published declarations on the environment and on space cooper-

Delors

ation. On this last point I am pleased to say that the communiqué acknowledges the important role played by the European Space Agency.

I now come to the two subjects which I mentioned earlier — how to support international economic growth and how to overcome its structural defects.

As far as the first question is concerned, I had hoped, as I said in public, that the only message we could give other countries was that each of us would do his best, with America making determined efforts to reduce its budget deficit — which is the only way to restore calm to the exchange markets, to bring the dollar down to a more acceptable and realistic rate and to reduce the interest rate — and Japan taking a full part in the world economy, which is not the case at present; the figures speak for themselves. The Community comes in for criticism, yet does 45% of its trade in industrial products with other countries, compared with 15% for the United States and 5% for Japan. Could anyone think these summits at all useful if, in five years time, Japan, with its level of prosperity, was not making a greater contribution to the development of the international economy?

We, the Community, were asked — and this was a valid question from the Americans — what can you do to help the international economy to grow? Now that you are well on the way to bringing down inflation and reducing your imbalances, can you not increase your growth rate a little? A good question.

I must say that the talks we held on these questions were extremely interesting and that every country stated in the communiqué what it was going to do, but the message was not as clear as the Commission would have wished: a clear-cut undertaking to reduce the budget deficit, targets for integrating Japan into the international economy and a statement of Europe's determination to increase growth wherever possible, thereby contributing to the development of the international economy and the fight against unemployment. I think we can say that that part of the talks was satisfactory. But the message was not very clear either for public opinion or for other countries.

Moving on to the structural aspects of the international economy, I would sum them up as follows. Real progress has been made and views are now much closer on development and finance; on monetary affairs a little progress has been made, but not enough in the Commission's view; the talks on trade were rather wide off the mark, it was a waste of an opportunity — I don't know how to put it so that it can be translated accurately into all the languages. What I mean to say is that we had the wrong talks at the wrong time.

Let me take up some points. On development and finance our American colleagues have finally modified their views after years of discussions and accept that

these areas of the international economy cannot be improved simply by the free play of the market. World investment and money flows must be distributed correctly, State aid must continue at present levels or be increased, our treatment of other countries ought to change and Africa in particular, a continent much neglected in terms of development, deserves special attention. In this connection the seven nations undertook to discuss a special programme for Africa next September at the latest.

As I said, a little progress has been made on monetary affairs. I do not want to go into this subject in great detail because I was the instigator of the revival of the Group of Ten and of the questions which were put to it. I do not want to make this a matter of pride, but as far as I am concerned the results were unsatisfactory. This explains why I expressed some reservations when we voted on this passage of the communiqué. We simply have to demonstrate the same political will to tackle our monetary chaos and trade barriers. I think that the final communiqué was more passionately concerned with trade than with monetary problems.

(Applause)

If we have a little time to go into this, I could give you more technical details to show you that this is not simply a subjective judgment on my part.

As far as trade is concerned, the Commission came to the industrialized nations' summit with a resolution from the Council of Ministers of 19 March. To sum up, the resolution simply said yes to a new commercial round, provided that it was carefully prepared, covered every aspect — services, high technology, intellectual property, agriculture and many others —, that the developing countries should be closely involved and that it should produce a new push towards liberalizing world trade, sharing the burden between all contracting parties. This was the mandate we were given.

We fought for this mandate, but at one stage — the situation has been developing particularly since my trip to the United States — I had the impression that the American administration, which has to combat strong protectionist trends in Congress, the Senate and the American economy, needed a gesture which would enable it to resist this sort of pressure. This was why I personally did not oppose fixing a date, and the Commission also put forward a balanced text taking account of both the resolution of 19 March and the concern to give a committed demonstration of our desire to forge ahead in what I regard as a fine partnership — and I shall come back to this — between the United States and Europe. As it happened not all of the delegations could approve the Commission's combined proposal, as one of them thought that discussions had already been concluded before the summit and that this was not a proper way to proceed. That was why we were not unanimous on this point and why that was practically the only thing, unfortun-

Delors

ately, which the press reported from the whole summit. But even if it was done in a hurry, it still deserved a more detailed account, as I said.

What lessons can be drawn from this? There are two which concern us, you the Parliament and we the Commission. First we must condemn the lack of concertation between the four Community Member States which attended the Bonn Summit.

(Applause)

In Bonn the Community seemed both physically and psychologically to be back in the bad old days of 1980-83, without the more cheerful and active appearance which it has had in 1984 and 1985. Fearing that this would be the case, I had suggested to the Foreign Ministers when they met 10 days ago in Luxembourg that formal consultations should be held at the invitation, as the Italian Presidency proposed, of our German colleagues who were organizing the summit. Unfortunately these formal consultations could not take place and it is not my place to apportion blame for this here. But I condemn it nevertheless.

(Applause)

Secondly — please do not regard this as polemics after all the ceremony which we witnessed — are we or are we not partners with the United States? Are we simply to play the part of obedient citizens in political matters and subcontractors in economic ones?

This is what I wondered during this summit. But just as I think that there is no point in Europe complaining or protesting to other countries, I think we must realize that nothing in life is ever handed to us on a plate, we must go out and take it.

(Applause)

We will be given nothing, and as the Community has another appointment in Milan, I hope that this European Council will enable us to make progress on three levels, because the time is now right. First, to establish an internal market which will be effective by virtue of its sheer size. Second, to make qualitative technological progress to keep up with world events, in order to remain a real voice to be heard and to prevent technology from being transferred out of Europe.

And thirdly, to strengthen our institutions to promote swifter decision-making and more coherent negotiations.

Parliament, elected by universal suffrage, will, I am sure, take heed of this message, learn from it and, as it has been doing for the last four months in harness with the Commission, ask the countries of the Community to grasp this opportunity and not to wait for history to happen any longer.

(Loud applause)

President. — I inform the House that, in accordance with Rule 40 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, Members may avail themselves of a period of 30 minutes in which to put brief and precise questions with a view to clarifying specific points in the Commission statement.

Mr Juppé (RDE). — *(FR)* Madam President, I listened attentively to Mr Delors' explanation of why the Bonn Summit could be considered a failure, a failure for Europe since, on this occasion, it made a point of demonstrating its divisions to the outside world.

I share Mr Delors' view when he says that our common purpose must be growth, but apart from reciting principles, I trust that this presupposes a number of initiatives and I should like to ask the President of the Commission to make two points quite clear.

This is my first question: what precautions does the Commission intend to take so that trade negotiations — if and when they take place — do not attack Europe's interests, as has already happened to some extent? I refer particularly to attacks on the common agricultural policy and its achievements.

I should like some additional information from Mr Delors. He did invite us to ask him about the steps he intends to take so that the necessary parallelism between monetary and trade negotiations is respected, since it is true that trade can only be stepped up if monetary conditions are to some extent stable.

Mr Segre (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, I should first of all like to thank President Delors for his excellent detailed account and put to him two questions.

Firstly, he deplored — in no uncertain terms it seemed to me — the lack of concertation between the four member States of the EEC as had initially been proposed when the Bonn Summit was being prepared.

What I would like to know is how the Commission intends to put right or make up for this lack of concertation between Member States for the purposes of other summits of the same kind, in the context of the institutional reform which will — as has already been mentioned — be on the agenda for the Milan Summit.

The second point is that a number of statements and declarations have been published on the subject of the Bonn Summit — I have read one myself — and are attributed to President Delors. I should therefore like to ask him whether the declaration according to which the Commission would at the time of the Milan Summit be in a position to submit a concrete proposal in the technological context, particularly with a view, to bringing the Eureka project wholly within the Community sphere, is the truth — in which case I should be delighted. I should like to know whether this decla-

Segre

ration was made and, in any case, which Commission agencies are involved.

Mr Franz (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, you dealt only briefly with the monetary issues. I would be interested in hearing rather more precisely where you see real progress in monetary issues at the summit and what turn events will now take.

Mr Bonde (ARC). — *(DA)* I should like to ask the President of the Commission whether the star wars and Eureka projects were discussed and whether various ways of combining the two projects were discussed. From a political point of view I would ask the President of the Commission to give us an assurance that Europe is not to participate in any military projects.

Mr Seeler (S). — *(DE)* I would also like to thank President Delors for his brief but nevertheless comprehensive report on the Bonn Summit. I have one very practical question concerning the GATT talks last year: in the press we all read that efforts had been made to find a compromise for the final communiqué acceptable to all Ten States.

Will it be possible to meet the requirements for holding the vital GATT talks in 1986?

Mr von Bismarck (PPE). — *(DE)* Mrs President, I would first like to say thank you for the opportunity of listening to and putting questions to President Delors. I think this is a good starting point and an example that should be followed.

President Delors, I would like to ask you whether you were really only at the Summit as a guest or as a representative of Europe? If the latter was the case were you able to present the economic report and the Commission's policy as European policy, and so ensure that all the countries belonging to our Community were represented at the Summit?

Mr Moorhouse (ED). — Madam President, I am grateful to Mr Delors for his explanation of his own attitude and the Commission's attitude to the next round of trade negotiations. I do not, however, altogether understand his reservations about an early date, and I would be grateful for further clarification in the light, particularly, as I read it in the Press, of the attitude of the French Government.

But my question, more specifically, concerns trade relations with Japan, on which subject I am the rapporteur for Parliament. Do I gather from what Mr Delors has said that we are in a wait-and-see period? It does seem to me from my initial researches that the Japanese market is remarkably impervious to imports

of outside products both from the United States of America and from Europe. What steps does Mr Delors have in mind to rectify this situation? Was the Summit ready to consider the possibility of further joint ventures between Japanese interests and European interests both within Europe and in Japan?

Mr Ippolito (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, as I am convinced that only a united endeavour through the EEC can, in the sector of scientific and technological research, enable Europe to take up the technological challenge thrown down by the United States and Japan, I should like to know from President Delors — and I thank him in advance — what the Commission's line of action is as regards the proposal for the Eureka project with a view to making it a European project.

If we persist in squandering European research through a thousand national channels, we will by the end of the century be no further ahead than the Third World.

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Do you not think, Madam President, that the difficulties which have emerged over the Eureka project are due to a failure to anticipate this project, making proper coordination impossible, and, more generally, given the failure of the Europeans to coordinate in Bonn, do you not fear that the Commission's influence is not powerful enough and what do you intend to do about this, in particular so that the Milan summit will be a success?

Mr Elliott (S). — Madam President, could the President of the Commission tell us what real, positive moves and agreements he feels came out of the Bonn Summit that will really help to tackle one of the most severe problems that face all the countries of the Western world, namely, that of mass unemployment, other than, of course, proposals of a monetarist nature — indeed, I might say, of a Reaganite nature — designed to depress the living standards of ordinary working people by forcing down their wage levels to an unacceptable degree and increasing poverty?

What really has happened through Bonn that will give help and encouragement to the millions of unemployed in Europe?

Mr Mallet (PPE). — *(FR)* I should not like to ask the President of the Commission an indiscreet question, although I would like to know if he thinks that there is really any point in having this type of meeting, where more fine speeches are made than positive decisions can ever be taken, and where the Community tends to fade into the background, earlier decisions being forgotten. But I will not embarrass him by asking him this question.

I would, nevertheless, like to ask him about a very basic and pressing problem, brought up by Mr Ippol-

Mallet

ito: Europe's technological development. The Commission presented an excellent document on this subject to the European Council in Fontainebleau. This document came to a very precise conclusion, namely that the quota of own resources to be devoted to research should be doubled, from 3 to 6% in 1989. What has become of this proposal? What steps does the Commission intend to take before the European Council meeting in Milan to give a new boost to European technological cooperation which, it seems to me, is an indispensable condition for putting our cooperation on the same footing as that of the United States, which is what I would like to see happen.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR) — (FR) May I ask the President of the Commission whether, when the GATT conference is opened, the Community will speak with one voice? Will it ask for a circulation tax to be created on substitute products entering the Community's internal market?

My second question concerns the possibility of debating whether responsibilities could be shared by the United States and the Community where a policy concerning developing countries is concerned.

Thirdly, I should like to know the Commission's position with regard to President Reagan and the Marxist-Leninist régime in Nicaragua, because I do not fully understand the reproaches made against President Reagan with regard to his policy on the Marxist-Leninist régime in Nicaragua.

Miss Brookes (ED). — May I ask Mr Delors how he views the progress otherwise towards a European monetary system?

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — If I am correct in detecting that the President of the Commission felt there was insufficient prior consultation of the four EEC States prior to the Summit, what does he suggest should be done in the future to coordinate better the economic policies of the Ten, now about to become Twelve?

Lady Elles (ED). — I would like to ask President Delors, in view of the need to ameliorate our trade balance with Japan, what measures the Commission are considering in dealing with export markets to Japan. Would he not also consider that when we have great opportunities such as the Tsukuba Exhibition 1985 for displaying the high technology expertise of Europe, those opportunities should be taken advantage of? Although I do not pretend to say now what I thought of the European Community pavilion at that exhibition, I am willing to tell him in private, as I believe many others who have visited that exhibition will be willing to do. Have we not missed a great opportunity while moaning and groaning the whole time about failing to get into the Japanese market?

Mrs Hoff (S). — (DE) Mrs President I would like to thank Mr Delors for his report on the Bonn Summit. Ways of supporting economic growth and eliminating structural weaknesses were discussed at the Summit. A political statement was given and drug addiction was discussed. I take it that the fight against mass unemployment was also discussed. My question is as follows: what plans are there and what practical measures are to be taken to provide work for all the millions of jobless in the European Community and in the United States?

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — (DE) Mr Delors, I have another question in connection with the debate on the reform of the international monetary system. To what extent was the further development of the European monetary system significant and in particular what position was adopted by those participants at this economic summit who were not representing Member States of the European Community, i.e. the United States and Japan?

My second question concerns the fact — in your view, regrettable — that the Member States did not adopt a common position with regard to an important issue. I would like to ask you the following questions: do these differences in opinion reflect completely divergent positions with respect to international protectionism or free world trade and do you think that these differences of opinion will be overcome in the foreseeable future, thus enabling the European Community to adopt a common position at the coming negotiations?

Mrs Charzat (S). — (FR) Do you not think, Mr President, that any failure of Eureka — the European Communities' technological breakthrough — would seriously hamper ultimately any progress towards the political union of the European Community?

Mr Delors, President of the Commission. — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I will begin by telling you what I am not going to talk to you about. First, the IDS project, because the Commission is not qualified to comment on this and, contrary to what some people have claimed, I have never made a statement on the strategic aspects of the project. Nor will I say any more about Nicaragua. The Commission is working on a process of economic cooperation with Central America in the hope of making some small contribution to restoring peace and goodwill to the area.

Mrs Hoff and Mr Elliott asked me whether our economic talks produced anything new on the fight against unemployment. Every country did, admittedly, explain what its economic policy was and the steps it was taking or intended to take to fight unemployment. But I do not think any major progress was made either in theory or in practice. Both the United States and the

Delors

Community had plenty to say on this subject, but neither was prepared to listen.

What must be understood is that the European Community, or rather the European economy, which, as I said before, does 45% of its trade in industrial products with the rest of the world and trades 25% of its national product with the rest of the world, cannot introduce a sort of growth combined with low levels of productivity to create more jobs as the United States has done. If *we* had been pursuing this policy for the last 5 years we would have been digging our own grave and made sure of our decline. We promoted productivity because we, as the most open trading group in the world, must adapt our structures to meet both our old competitors, who are still as powerful as ever, and new ones. But I myself think that the European Community, the European economies, will soon be feeling the benefit of the adjustments it has made, the regrettable consequences of which are well-known.

Mr von Bismarck, Mr Segre, Mrs Ewing and Mr von Wogau asked me how we can ensure that the four Member States attending the summit present a unified front.

I think it was an excellent real-life exercise. As you are all aware, commercial policy is the responsibility of the Commission. So ideally only the representatives of the Commission should have spoken when the question was raised at the summit.

(Applause)

But this was not the case. We must ask ourselves what additional institutional steps should be taken so that we can follow the rules in everyday life in the spirit in which they were intended.

As for the trade negotiations, which are the concern of Mr Juppé, Mr Seeler, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Moorhouse and Lady Elles, I think I mentioned at the beginning the line which the Commission is taking on this, how it is determined to achieve consensus among the Member States and what its intentions would be at the preparatory meetings. As I said before careful preparation is needed. As far as we the Commission are concerned, we are working on files — indeed we have almost finished — on every subject which might be covered in this new commercial round, with the strengths and weaknesses of the European economies, what concessions we can make and the areas on which we must remain absolutely firm even if only during a transitional period. So I think we will be in a position to put forward precise figures to the other countries, just as the United States, Japan, Brazil and India are each making their own preparations for the new round.

Secondly we hope that progress will be made in all fields simultaneously and that we will not concentrate

on, say, agriculture because it is a traditional subject with which we are all familiar.

Ladies and gentlemen, we will stand firm on the need to deal with every subject. But our arguments must still be convincing. And if they are to be convincing — I will speak frankly because otherwise there is no point in talking about it — when the next decision on farm prices is taken we must not give any sign that we are turning back from the courageous line taken by the Community last year. If we do so we will not have much of an argument left, particularly if the United States reduces its subsidies to its farmers.

I think we must show that our policy is neither protectionist nor does it involve amassing surpluses for the sake of it. We must put our own house in order if we are to be in a stronger position to defend the future of European farming and Europe as an agricultural power.

This is why everything is connected. We cannot make fine speeches about Europe on the one hand and, every time a decision is taken against our interests, take decisions which are contrary to the general declarations we have made.

This is all I want to say on dealing with the various subjects simultaneously.

Thirdly, we hope to get the agreement of the developing countries. This is particularly important because, as far as they are concerned, some concessions which they will have to make could affect their autonomy and development capacity in the future: I am thinking particularly of satellite communications and other areas. So we must also get their agreement.

We must divide up the burden, everyone must take his share.

These are the conditions, as I would remind Mr Juppé in particular, under which the Commission will propose that the Community enters the new commercial round.

What form will the round take? There will probably be a meeting of top-rank civil servants in the late summer or early autumn to establish a framework for the negotiations. What are the subjects to be discussed? How will they be approached? Only after that will the Ministers be able to meet to launch the operation.

I said at the Bonn Summit that fighting over a date for the Ministers' meeting was not solving anything. I remember that in Tokyo we decided to hold a new round and we had to wait two and a half years for any effective negotiations because of a lack of careful preparation.

As far as Japan is concerned I myself have arrived at a very simple conclusion. With Japan's level of prosper-

Delors

ity, given that it does not have the military expenditure which other countries have, and the hermetic nature of its market, and whatever efforts we still have to make, as Lady Elles was quite right to stress, I think that Japan will show that it shares the world's responsibility if it gives itself the target of increasing percentage of imports in relation to its gross national product. In my opinion this is the only way to achieve results. It is the only indicator which will enable us to judge whether or not Japan is playing an effective part in the world economy.

I will move on now to the monetary questions raised by Mr von Wogau and Mr Brok and the question on the European Monetary System raised by Mr Juppé and Mr Franz. The European Monetary System is increasingly attracting the attention of monetary specialists. I was even asked questions about it when I was in the United States. Not that anyone thinks that the system as it stands can be transferred on an international level, but people are impressed by the fact that countries which started out with diverging economic policies and different traditions have succeeded in creating an area of relative monetary stability where the transparency of the exchange market benefits every contractor and everyone involved in the world economy. So we can say that the European Monetary System is now regarded as a full-scale experiment and not just as an oddity or a temporary solution.

As for the rest, Mr Juppé, I think that the main proposals we can make to try to reduce — I won't say any more than that — the world's monetary troubles are as follows.

Given the dominance of the American economy, it is essential to reduce their budget deficit. We are simply asking too much of the dollar. Too much is being asked from inside because of the budget deficit, and too much is being asked from outside.

Secondly, if we want to avoid the financial problems which have also hit the banking community and the world monetary system, we must tackle the short-term economic problems and the structural problems of countries in difficulty at the same time.

It would therefore be appropriate for the Monetary Fund and the World Bank to cooperate more closely. Speaking from experience — I dealt with 40 cases of countries in difficulty while I was minister — I said that you don't try to cure pneumonia with a packet of aspirins. Asking a country in difficulty to restore its balance of payments within 18 months is not enough. If you do not help it to exploit its own resources, to develop its own food crops, to develop its agricultural areas and to improve its management of the production sector, in another two years it will relapse into the same illness again. So everything we give in terms of technical aid and support to these countries is equally important.

Thirdly, there is one point on which the Americans disagree with us in Europe: they regard the exchange rate as the result and not an indicator of economic activity. Being a result, nothing can be done about it. We in Europe, on the other hand, or at least most of us, regard the exchange rate as an indicator of economic activity, and when it deviates too far from the basic economic data, we must have a look at the indicator and see what we can do about it.

These questions and others will be dealt with at two meetings, the meeting of the Group of Ten, in the second half of June in Tokyo, and the meeting of the Interim Committee during the annual session of the Bretton Woods signatory countries in October in Seoul.

Of course I could say more about this, but I think that just those three points which I mentioned — and you will see now that this is not just an academic question — would in themselves bring more realism, stability and transparency to the exchange markets.

I have always made a point of not discussing the problem in terms of flexible or floating currencies or fixed currencies. I have even avoided talking about a target zone as we do for the EMS so as not to alarm anyone. And if I maintained my reserve at the Bonn summit, it was because, quite clearly, even if not all the doors are shut, I would say that they are not completely open either, and there is still an obvious reluctance to tackle these problems. I will leave it up to the individual to wonder why!

Mr d'Ormesson asked me about development. I would say in reply that in the text of the summit communiqué there was, as I have said, a narrowing of the differences between the various views, and we, the seven most highly industrialized countries, are going to try to do something in particular for Africa, although Africa's problem is also faced by all the developing countries. The countries of the southern Sahara deserve special attention because of historical and geographical conditions, but we must give selective treatment and deal with each case individually.

I come now to the question of technology raised by Mr Galland, Mr Ippolito and Mrs Charzat. Once again the situation is not the fault of the Community, but it is still lamentable. Europe lacks drive when it comes to initiative. If we are now all too eager to do something about technology, it is unfortunately only because the Americans have launched their IDS project. To Europe's cost. However, I would remind you that at the Dublin European summit last December, the Heads of State or Government there asked the Commission to submit guidelines on the subject of technology and competitiveness. We submitted those guidelines with the feeling that the matter was urgent. We put forward six clear proposals incorporating operational factors, realistic ideas and suggestions for immediate action. Unfortunately the European Coun-

Delors

cil in Brussels wrote this document off, if you will pardon the expression, having failed to study it in detail, and today we are again facing the prospect of even faster technological progress in the United States. We are finding that the American authorities are canvassing our own firms, in other words they are window-shopping in Europe for whatever is useful to them in technological terms and we in Europe do not even have a framework for broad discussions with the Americans. That is why any proposal is a good one. Whether we are talking about France's proposed Eureka project or Italy's Iris project — which is also very interesting because it links technology, social progress and the social management of technology — the time is now ripe for *action*. And I can tell you that, in three weeks' time, the Commission will have finished drawing up an overall proposal to enable the Community to make qualitative technological progress.

(Applause)

We shall state our objectives: technology, competitiveness and employment and feasibility. We shall assess the human, technical and financial resources at our disposal. We shall indicate the administrative framework which we are to use for each project. We shall probably also propose a general framework for a technology community. We shall suggest various ways of financing the projects. We shall request that our technology community be open to cooperation with other European countries which are not members of the Community and which have showed interest in such cooperation.

Finally, there is one question which we will have to settle once and for all: can the technology community be achieved under the present Treaty, or will it require either a special Treaty or institutional changes? We shall be answering all these questions within the next three weeks. Then it will be up to the governments to give their views. And as I have said, I hope that the Milan summit will give us some hopeful sign in a field where we have been dragging our feet too long in spite of our considerable resources. We do not have weaknesses and handicaps in every field. We are still among the leaders in space matters, transport and even telecommunications. But if everybody else is forging ahead, we must do so too. Since the Milan talks are to cover the Community's progress into the future, having settled the problems of the past, I think that technology and the internal market should be two priority subjects. In any event, the Commission will be there.

(Applause)

President — Mr. President, we thank you for your proposals and consider that in Milan the Parliament-Commission 'tandem' will bring forth decisions by the Council.

4. Question Time

President — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-267/85). We shall begin with questions to the Council.

I call Question No 71, by Mrs Banotti (H-716/84):

Subject: British Prevention of Terrorism Act.
What action has the Council taken in response to the Banotti resolution, calling for an investigation into the use of the Prevention of Terrorism Act by the British authorities, which was adopted by the European Parliament in January 1985?

Mr Forte, *President-in-Office of the Council*. — *(IT)* The Council notes that paragraph 2 of the resolution referred to by the honourable Member stipulated that it would be forwarded to the Commission and the Governments of the Member States.

Mrs Banotti (PPE). — I note the limitations of Council's competence in this matter. I also note the decrease in numbers detained under the PTA in Britain in recent months. However, I would ask the President-in-Office whether he would not agree that laws which include such wide-ranging powers and which have a direct influence on the ability of citizens from Member States to travel freely from one country to another must be implemented with particular care for the rights of citizens of Member States and that as long as the percentage of those who are detained and eventually charged with any crime remains what it is — the rate at the moment is 14%, and this sometimes after detention of up to seven days — this Act must be scrupulously monitored in Britain?

Mr Forte — *(IT)* As the honourable Member and everyone else in the House is aware, this matter falls within the competence of the Member States. All that we in the Italian Presidency can hope for is that there will be as many intergovernmental agreements on this as possible, since there is no doubt that there is a connection between the extent of such agreements and the possibility, which we are pursuing, of gradually reducing the barriers to movement between the Member States.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Would the President-in-Office of the Council accept that the Prevention of Terrorism Act which was introduced by a cabinet of which Mrs Castle was a member, and was approved unanimously by the House of Commons in 1974 — a House of Commons of which Messrs Huckfield and Cryer were members — has, in fact, saved innocent lives, that any monitoring of the Prevention of Terrorism Act is the

Marshall

responsibility of the British Government and the British House of Commons and that any inquiry by the European Parliament or by the European Community into this Act would be regarded by the British people as a gross impertinence?

Mr Forte — *(IT)* These are clearly matters for the Member States.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — With regard to the President-in-Office's reply, whilst he referred to paragraph 2 of the resolution, which asked that this resolution be forwarded to the Commission and Member Governments, surely his government did receive a copy of that document? Could he give us some ideas as to what his government meant? As to the question asked by Mr Marshall, whether he likes it or not Parliament passed the resolution condemning this particular Act in January 1985, and the British Government and Mr Marshall should realize now that the time has come for it to go. However, I would ask the President-in-Office if he could give us his view as a member of the Italian Government which has received a copy of the resolution.

Lady Elles (ED). — With respect to the previous statement, there was no resolution adopted in this Parliament to condemn the Prevention of Terrorism Act. Mrs Banotti asked for an investigation. There was no condemnation. There was a resolution condemning it, but that was rejected by this Parliament. I merely wish to put the record straight.

Mr Forte — *(IT)* The question which has been raised concerns the Italian Government. I should like to state that I am here in my capacity as representative of the Council and not of the Italian Government.

President — I call Question No 72, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (H-773/84):

Subject: Validity of the European passport. The purpose of the European passport is to strengthen the feeling of unity amongst EEC citizens and also to reinforce the image of the European Economic Community outside its external frontiers.

Can the Council indicate the precise validity of this passport outside the EEC? If it is only partial, what action does the Council intend taking to make it complete?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* The uniform passport is issued by the authorities of the Member States. It is for them to define, where appropriate, its territorial validity.

The Council is aware that some of the first holders of the uniform passport have met with difficulties when wishing to use it. These difficulties are due to the fact that certain immigration authorities were not adequately informed of the introduction of the uniform passport. The Presidency has asked the Member States to take the necessary measures so that passport authorities are aware of the introduction of the uniform passport.

Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, thank you for your reply, but I must say that I am a little disappointed by it. I do not normally use strong words to express myself, but I consider that the Council's lack of application with regard to the European passport is pretty deplorable. I know you said that it depended on each country, but we have been told often enough since Fontainebleau that the passport question is settled. It is not settled at all, since it is not a measure which has been made impossible for financial reasons, but it is above all and solely a measure which reflects or does not reflect genuine political will and genuine European conviction.

The European passport is not valid outside our borders — I know this from personal experience — and there is not a single customs official who is familiar with it. Even within the Community they are not familiar with it, leave alone outside it. So it is not even valid inside the Community. We may wonder whether this is a case of political gimmickry rather than the will to introduce a tangible and — which is also important — symbolic means of emphasizing the European identity of the citizens of the Community countries.

So I would ask the Council to take the necessary decisions as soon as possible and to urge the Member States to act so that this European passport can become a reality. If any of them do not want it, you should enable those who do want it to have it, and you should also see to it that it is of some use outside the Community's frontiers. When we show the European passports we have been issued with as Members of Parliament, it makes us look foolish when no one knows what it is.

So don't keep on telling us that the question of the passport is settled, as we were told at Fontainebleau, when there is in fact nothing at all.

Mr Forte — *(IT)* That is an attitude I can well understand. I should like to point out that the Council has done everything in its power, both legally and politically, to bring about the introduction of the passport and to get the Member States to implement it.

The Member States seem to be having both practical and financial problems in introducing these passports. In view of this, the Council obviously has no option but to respect what the Member States are doing. So

Forte

the appeals made by Parliament should clearly be addressed to the Member States.

President — Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 73 and 74 will receive written replies¹

I call Question No 75, by Mr Papoutsis (H-824/84):

Subject: USA protectionism in the steel industry
Seeing that USA protectionism in the steel industry is having serious effects on the economies of the Member States of the Community and is contributing to the increase in unemployment and since, to judge from recent indications, the USA intends to apply the same tactics to other steel products — in addition to steel pipes — such as the 17 products under negotiation, what measures does the Council intend to take to avert such a development and to protect the interests of the European steel industry?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) At its meeting on 26 March 1985 the Council adopted a statement on relations with the United States in the steel sector. In that statement, the Council strongly emphasized that the Community would act most forcefully against any unilateral measures which might be imposed and asked the Commission to examine immediately all possible counter-measures.

Discussions to work out possible retaliatory measures are currently being held by the Council.

The Council does, however, hope that talks between the Commission and the United States Administration will make it possible to find acceptable solutions with respect to the arrangements already concluded in the steel sector.

Mr Papoutsis (S). — (GR) I thank the President-in-Office for his reply. I really hope that a solution can be found through dialogue.

However, I should like to ask him two further questions. Firstly, is there any likelihood of the USA adopting further measures in sectors other than the steel sector?

Secondly, why does the Council not use the powerful weapon of political pressure to prevent the United States measures in the steel sector, when there is a grave risk of a considerable increase in unemployment in the European Community.

Mr Forte — (IT) We are looking not only at the specific sector we have spoken about, that of steel, but

also at the various possible protectionist measures which may be adopted by the United States or other countries; and the very thing we are trying to do is develop counter-measures and actively pursue dissuasive measures, which are obviously more important than countermeasures.

President — I call Question No 76, by Mr Christodoulou (H-6/85)

Subject: Greek Government Development Programme.

In reply to my previous question on the financing of the five-year Greek Government Development Programme, the Council stated (last December) that it was awaiting the Commission's proposals and the Commission replied that it was examining the matter and proposals and decisions would be forthcoming 'soon'. As some considerable time has already passed, with no new developments, would the Council state what the situation is regarding this matter and what stage of the decision-making procedure has been reached?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council — (IT) The Commission proposal on this matter has not yet been referred to the Council. There may be some confusion between the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes and the Greek Government's Five-Year Development Programme, on which, I repeat, nothing has yet been referred to the Council.

Mr Christodoulou (PPE). — (GR) This is already the third year of this five-year programme, and the Community funding for it, which the Greek Minister responsible, Mr Roumeliotis, stated last October would amount to 600 million ECU, does not appear to be forthcoming. I should like the President-in-Office of the Council to explain to me how the Community will be able to carry out the planned funding of the five-year programme when three years have already elapsed, when amounts are mentioned such as 600 million ECU which, as the President-in-Office has said, is not forthcoming, and when there are only two years left until the end of this programme.

Mr Forte — (IT) It does not appear that the Council has taken any decisions on the matter, since no proposal has been received by the Council.

President — I call Question No 77, by Mr Elliott (H-36/85):

Subject: Aid and trade provisions of the Lomé Convention.

Bearing in mind that although the Third World countries covered by the current Lomé Convention include

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

President

well over half the individual states, these account for less than one quarter of the population of the Third World. Would the Council be prepared to consider as a future goal the extension of the special aid and trade provisions of the Lomé Convention to the massively populous countries of the Indian sub-continent with which some European countries, notably the United Kingdom, have such close links?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) Community aid to third countries takes various forms and takes account of various factors depending on the countries or regions for which it is intended. As regards the ACP-EEC relations referred to by the honourable Member, they concern a group of countries which include the vast majority of the least developed countries in the world. It is true that the countries of the Indian sub-continent are not among the signatories to this Convention, but the Community responds to their development needs by other measures.

India, for example, receives major financial and technical assistance as part of the aid programme for non-associated developing countries. For the 1976-1983 period, India received an amount of 233 million ECU of aid. India also benefits from the Generalized System of Preferences and from provisions on the supply of 10 000 tonnes of sugar annually at guaranteed prices.

Finally, India is also one of the main beneficiaries of Community food aid. This programme, which has been running in India for 15 years and is known as 'Operation Flood', is, in terms of both its length and its size, the primary multiannual food programme of the Community. Other countries in the Indian sub-continent benefit from Community aid as part of the programme for non-associated developing countries. For the 1983 period, Bangladesh received 85.3 million ECU, Bhutan 3.4 million ECU, Nepal 14.2 million ECU, Pakistan 44.1 million ECU and Sri Lanka 41.7 million ECU. These countries also received Community aid on various other bases, e.g. food aid and trade promotion and aid through NGOs.

Mr Elliott (S). — I appreciate the answer given by the President-in-Office, and it was indeed interesting to hear the detailed information about the aid programmes for the various countries in the Indian sub-continent. Indeed, I feel that this aid — which, frankly, I do not think is adequate, but nevertheless is valuable — should be more widely known. I think it is unfortunate that the relationships in terms of aid and trade between the Community and the various countries of the Indian subcontinent do not receive the publicity that is given to the countries covered by the Lomé Convention. I make that point in a helpful way.

The point of my question was not so much to look to the past as to look to the future. Does the Council of

Ministers not feel that as a future goal and objective, looking ahead to the next Lomé Convention in some years' time, it might be desirable that the very populous countries of the Indian subcontinent should be linked into a more unified aid programme, linking together the existing Lomé Convention and those other areas where aid is already given? I ask this because whilst it is true that the countries covered by the Lomé Convention constitute the majority of separate sovereign States within the Third World, they are, in fact, only a small proportion of the total population in the Third World. Their population is small compared with the vast populations of South-East Asia. One cannot, for example, do other than accept that Bangladesh has a *very* large population living in conditions of extreme poverty. As a long-term future objective, would it not be desirable that we should link together our aid programme and our trade arrangements between the Community and the Third World into an integrated whole? Would it be acceptable to the Council? Would it accept that that should be a long-term objective?

Mr Forte. — This question obviously falls within the Commission's field of responsibility. If the Commission draws up such proposals, the Council will examine them and obviously take account of its assessment. Hitherto the bilateral approach has seemed to be the most desirable, particularly from the point of view of the countries receiving aid, and so this is the approach which has so far been adopted. I repeat that the Council is prepared to assess anything which the Commission might come up with regarding this policy. We obviously have no means of knowing whether or not the Commission has a different approach from the one which has, I would say, worked satisfactorily within the limits of the available resources.

President — I call Question No 78, by Mr Toksvig (H-51/85):

Subject: European aerospace policy

In view of the continuing global dominance of US aerospace firms with their vast home market for civil and military aircraft, is it not high time to demonstrate Community solidarity by concentrating all civil aircraft design and development in European Airbus Industries and by concentrating all military aircraft design and development in the European Panavia Consortium, both industrial organizations having proved their capability in managing multinational multi-firm cooperation?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) The Council does not have before it a proposal from the Commission, which has the right of initiative, in the industrial sphere to which the honourable Member refers. I would also add that, as you know, the

Forte

European Community has no powers in the military domain.

Mr Toksvig (ED). — (*DA*) It is a fact that a pen can be used to sign either a peace treaty or a declaration of war. In both cases it costs money. It is also a fact that the European aerospace industry and the Member States of the Community have had to spend money to acquire fighters for defence purposes. The money spent by the Netherlands, Belgium and my own country, Denmark, for example, on the F16 contracts went to the United States. I should like to ask the Council whether in this case — even if defence questions are involved — it is prepared to look into the effects of the F16 contracts as regards employment in particular — since this is something we discuss a great deal but do very little about — and the general economic situation in Denmark, Belgium and the Netherlands. What would have happened if this money had been spent in Europe?

As regards civil aviation, which is a less controversial matter for the Council to take an interest in, the success of the Airbus Industries has been so great under French leadership that we have won a share of the America market. Would it not be madness, therefore, to throw away all the experience gained instead of giving active support to the successors of the Airbus, i.e. the TR9 and TR11, and seeing how we in the Community can actively promote cooperation of this kind? Is it not, after all, the whole point of the Community that we should work together to solve problems which are best solved jointly? In other words, is the Commission prepared to play a part in supporting further developments in both these areas?

IN THE CHAIR: MR FANTI

Vice-President

Mr Forte. — A short while ago Mr Delors said that the Commission is preparing initiatives and proposals in the technology sector, and we can suppose that it has also covered this subject, which, as you know, has so far been governed by bilateral or multilateral agreements between the Member States. As was stated a short while ago, there are Commission initiatives to develop a technological Europe. Naturally there are also institutional aspects concerning this 'technological Europe' which will be taken into account.

The Council is obviously prepared to examine these proposals very closely, and the Italian Presidency considers that priority for technology is absolutely essential.

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 79, 80 and 81 will receive written replies¹. I call Question No 82, by Mr Evrigenis (H-88/85)²:

Subject: Distribution of food aid in African countries

With its food aid to the peoples of Africa who are cruelly afflicted by famine, the European Community has set a laudable example, throughout the world, of international solidarity. It should, in particular, be stressed that this aid is politically disinterested and is of a purely humanitarian nature.

Recently, however, the international press has been reporting with increasing regularity and in sharply critical tone on the conditions under which international and Community food aid is being distributed by certain African governments. The reports create the impression, if not the conviction, that this aid is being distributed among the population on the basis of political criteria and that its administration serves the political ends of dictatorial regimes, so that certain sections of the population or areas which do not happen to enjoy the government's favour are left out.

Is the Council in possession of information which refutes or corroborates these allegations and which could be passed on to the House?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (*IT*) The Council is kept informed regularly by the Commission, which is responsible for ensuring the proper management of Community food aid, of the conditions under which aid is distributed to the peoples concerned and of any difficulties that arise. Vice-President Natali recently submitted a first report, following his visit to Ethiopia, on the situation in that country, in Sudan and in other countries affected by the drought. Similar information is provided by the Embassies of the Member States. In the light of this information, the Council is continuing to watch developments in the situation in the African countries which receive food aid from the Community.

The Development Council will give the subject all the attention it deserves at its next meeting on 23 May 1985. The Italian Presidency very much shares the concern expressed by the honourable Member, and it is naturally very concerned that the various tragedies in different parts of Africa should not be an obstacle to the humanitarian approach in the provision of food aid. I would stress that this is a tragedy to which there is no easy solution.

Mr Evrigenis (PE). — (*GR*) I should like to ask the representative of the Council whether the Natali

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

² Former oral question without debate (O-138/84), converted into a question for Question Time.

Evrigenis

report to which he refers has been communicated to the Members of Parliament or not.

Mr Forte — *(IT)* This report has been forwarded to the Committee on Development and Cooperation by Mr Natali, who himself dealt with this subject.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — Has the Council looked at the report brought back by three Members of the European Parliament, including Mr Andrews (a member of my group), who visited Eritrea and brought back on film evidence that EEC food aid had been sold on the black market by Ethiopian soldiers to Sudan, where it was again sold on the black market to the starving people of Eritrea? This is the second time I have raised this question. If the Council does not know about this, could it please study the report brought back by these Members, because it seems to me to have a bearing on this question?

Mr Forte — *(IT)* The Natali report deals with the points raised here, and so I would refer you to that document.

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Mr President-in-Office, the House would like further information on these matters.

If it is established that food aid from the Community to a particular country does not get through, as Mrs Ewing has stressed, could we make it a rule in the Community that no more aid will be given to the country in question unless the Community itself distributes it.

Mr Forte — *(IT)* The problem of distributing food aid is not as simple as the Member seems to suppose, perhaps because he has never been closely involved in the question.

Obviously all possible means must be employed to distribute aid. In any case, unfortunately, the only possible means, apart from government and nongovernment organizations, which cannot always be on the spot in sufficient numbers, are precisely the local authorities. If part of the aid is unfortunately diverted, as sometimes happens, we still do not want aid to be stopped, which would only bring about an even more serious situation. I repeat that the Community is doing everything possible to avoid such difficulties, and I thank Parliament for pointing out certain cases, and I thank all those who, with good will, have pointed them out. I repeat that while such aid is granted, there will inevitably be some waste. It is a question of minimizing such waste and making sure that these populations are not penalized as a result.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, whilst I welcome the words of sympathy that you have expressed in

relation to food aid, do you not think it would have been better if the Council, when considering the 1985 budget, had been more generous in the budgetary provisions it made for food aid, rather than talking about the serious need and the serious problems and then denying the resources to cope with those problems?

Mr Forte — *(IT)* The Council has fully met these requests, as was also stated at the United Nations General Assembly in Geneva. It is not a question of making theoretical provisions for supplies but rather to see that such supplies get there.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Is the President-in-Office aware that the situation is changing with the deteriorating weather in Ethiopia and that transport is now the main problem? There is plenty of food there, but it needs to be transported. Secondly, is he aware that there is a new need—namely, for seed corn and seed wheat for next year's crop. Is he aware of these two new requirements?

Mr Forte — *(IT)* The situation has been brought to the attention of the Community, and at the moment lorries and seeds are being supplied.

President — I call Question No 83, by Mr Lalor (H-759/84):

Subject: Reclassification of disadvantaged areas

Will the Council state whether or not it has yet received a proposal from the Commission based on a revised Irish submission to extend the present disadvantaged areas scheme in Ireland, and if not, will the Council give due reason as to why this has not been possible?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council — *(IT)* In response to a request from the Irish Government, the Commission submitted to the Council on 3 April 1985 a proposal for a directive concerning the extension of the disadvantaged areas in Ireland within the meaning of Directive 75/268/EEC. The European Parliament was consulted on this proposal on 29 April 1985.

Mr Labor (RDE). — In view of the submission made by the Commission to the Council on 3 April, could the President-in-Office of the Council state whether it indicated why the date of application for the designation of the additional areas in Ireland was not fixed at 1 January 1985, rather than 1 January 1986? Moreover, in view of the fact that the Commission accepted as disadvantaged all of the areas that the Irish Government submitted, does the Council not agree that this would indicate that there are still very many areas in

Labor

Ireland that could qualify for designation as disadvantaged if the Irish Government would so submit?

Finally, could he say what is the cost to the Community per annum of the increase in the disadvantaged areas?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* The first question concerns the Commission, and the second concerns the Irish Government. The Council obviously needs suggestions or requests from the Irish Government so that it can take decisions on the matter.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Would the President-in-Office of the Council not agree that the best way of dealing with the disadvantaged agricultural areas is to come to a speedy decision on agricultural price-fixing, in line with the Commission's proposals, so that we can avoid wasting money? Will the Council maintain a solemn determination to ignore the vote of this House which wanted to spend more money on the affluent areas of agriculture and use the resources more sensibly to deal with poverty?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* At a time when attempts are being made to achieve results on the question of prices, as Mr Delors mentioned earlier on, it does not seem appropriate for me to express an opinion.

President. — I call Question No 84, by Mr Barrett (H-770/84):

Subject: Quick-frozen food products

In an effort to guarantee the Community consumer very high-quality quick-frozen products the Commission transmitted a proposal last September to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States related to quick-frozen foodstuffs for human consumption. Will the Council now state whether or not it has examined this proposal and, furthermore, will it outline how the consumer rules proposed covering manufacturing, transport, distribution, retail sale and labelling could affect Ireland?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* The proposal to which the honourable Member refers in this question was submitted to the Council by the Commission on 24 September 1984 and the European Parliament has not yet delivered its Opinion. Accordingly the Council has not yet examined the proposal and is not at this stage in a position to appreciate the possible implications of the provisions proposed for the rules or practices in force in the Member States and in Ireland in particular.

Mr Barrett (RDE). — Could I ask the President-in-Office whether I understood him correctly to have

said that the Council is waiting Parliament's Opinion on this report?

Mr Forte — *(IT)* That is so.

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 85, 86, 87, 88, 89 and 90 will receive written replies¹.

I call Question No 91, by Mr Adam (H-78/85):

Subject: Energy imports

The Energy Council on 15 March 1985 asked the Commission to prepare a report on problems relating to oil imports. Will the Council call for an in-depth study of coal imports into the Community?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* The import of solid fuels has always played an important part in the Community's energy supplies.

In the case of hard coal, imports originating in third countries are subject to Community surveillance under Decision 77/707/ECSC, as subsequently amended by Decision 85/161/ECSC. The actual terms of the Decision state that this arrangement has been set up in order that the Commission may be able regularly and better to judge developments in all Community coal markets, with particular regard to imports of hard coal originating in third countries.

Furthermore, with regard to the trends in imports of solid fuels, the Commission sent the Council a working paper at the beginning of March 1985 entitled 'Energy 2000 — A reference projection and its variants for the European Community and the world to the year 2000'.

That document contains very useful information on trends since 1973 and on potential developments — 'scenarios' based on different working hypotheses.

In view of this information the Council has not so far asked the Commission expressly for an additional study on the question raised by the honourable Member, namely imports of solid fuel.

Mr Adam (S). — I am extremely grateful to the President-in-Office for that very lengthy and detailed reply. Could I just say to him that I am concerned at the rising trend in imports of solid fuel into the Community, and by the fact that imports into Britain during the recent dispute caused prices to go up by something like one-third. There have been conflicting reports in this area, and I am particularly anxious that the trend of rising imports and possible rising prices of coal

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Adam

should be properly monitored. I hope that the President-in-Office will look at that and give an assurance that the Council will keep that in mind.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* The Presidency will bear this matter in mind, and I thank the honourable Member for raising it.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Is it not true that, in general, imported coal is cheaper than indigenous coal owing to the fact that being mainly on the surface it is easier to mine, whereas ours is deep and difficult to mine? Therefore, if we are to have cheap coal, a competitive industry and competitive electricity supplies in the Community, we must be free to import at least a reasonable proportion of our coal needs to keep our industry and electricity competitive.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* Certainly coal imported from third countries is cheaper for the reasons stated, namely that it is mainly obtained from surface deposits which are cheaper to mine. However, in the fuel sector — and this does not only apply to coal — apart from the price factor there is also that of security of supply.

At the very beginning of the European Coal and Steel Community there was a concern to insure security and continuity of supply, which, let us not forget, becomes particularly important in times of crisis. Such availability of supply has, as it were, a dissuasive effect on any factors which might disturb the market. Therefore it is difficult to assess the economic factor of security, which in this way also works as a curb on rising prices for all fuels and, of course, for coal itself. There is no doubt that, besides other well known considerations, this factor justifies on the part of the Community a policy seeking to reduce its international energy dependence.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — May I thank the President-in-Office for the last assurance about the concern for security of supply and ask him whether he has read the case for Scottish coal — a very learned and full document, produced recently. If not, I would be delighted to send him a copy. Would he accept that one of the points in this document was the sulphur free content of Scottish coal? Would he not agree that we know that the reason why South African coal is cheaper is the kind of wages which are paid in South Africa?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* These remarks go rather too far, since they seek to introduce controversial elements which were neither in the questions nor in the replies.

However, we shall be interested to look further into this specific problem of Scottish coal, which hitherto, in view of the enormous problems in this area, has

escaped attention. We shall therefore be pleased to receive any documentation on the subject.

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Can you explain something which Mr Adam claims has happened, namely that coal imported 40% cheaper carriage paid becomes 30% more expensive when it is sold in the country? That seems incredible.

Secondly, do you not think that, in order to obtain cheaper energy, it is not energy obtained from coal that we must promote for our electricity needs but civil electro-nuclear energy?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I think that the honourable Member is referring to a particular period during which the United Kingdom market was in a particularly disturbed state.

Without going into the subject of strikes, this problem has nothing to do with energy questions in general. I should simply like to point out that this is a trade union matter.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 92 will be given a written reply¹.

I call Question No 93, by Mr Chanterie (H-89/85):

Subject: Proposal for a Council resolution on a second programme of action of the European Communities on safety and health at work (submitted to the Council by the Commission on 4 November 1982)

The abovementioned proposal for a resolution expresses the political will to take, in keeping with the urgency of the matter and bearing in mind what is feasible at national and Community level, the measures required so that by the end of 1988 priority actions can be undertaken in connection with protection against dangerous substances, protection against accidents and other hazards, organizational aspects, monitoring, training and information, statistics, research and cooperation.

Will the Council state what actions are to be given priority and whether it will be possible to put the abovementioned programme of action into effect by 1988?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* After receiving the Opinion of the European Parliament on 20 January 1984, the Council in fact adopted on 27 February 1984 a Resolution concerning

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Forté

the second programme referred to by the honourable Member.

In that Resolution the Council listed the priority actions to be undertaken and requested the Commission 'to prepare annually, after consulting the Member States, a forward outline of the work it intends to carry out on the implementation of this Resolution'.

In implementation of that programme, Council bodies are examining a proposal for a directive on protection from the risks resulting from exposure to noise, and the Italian Presidency is making every effort to promote the approval of that proposal at the next Social Affairs Council on 13 June. The Council is also examining a proposal for a directive on the protection of workers by means of a ban on certain specific substances or certain working activities. In that connection it is, however, still necessary to study various problems in detail, and it will therefore not be possible to submit the proposal to the next Council meeting of Social Affairs Ministers.

Technical clarifications may come from a special meeting to be organized in Rome next June by the Italian Government in order to collect the technical data on which the directive is to be based.

Other proposals for directives forming part of the above programme are at present being prepared by the Commission.

Mr Chanteric (PPE). — *(NL)* I thank the President-in-Office for his reply and should like to ask him the following supplementary question: has the European Commission submitted its proposals for 1985 with a view to the implementation for the 1984 Resolution? Can the President-in-Office tell me the content of these proposals for 1985?

Mr Forté. — *(IT)* I think I have already explained what is involved in these proposals.

President. — I call Question No 94, by Mr Lomas, for whom Mr Tomlinson is deputizing (H-91/85):

Subject: Aid to Turkey

The Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom has said that he supports the Turkish Junta's demands for the unblocking of EEC aid.

Will the Council confirm that, in view of the Continuing abuses of human rights in Turkey, including the arrests of trade union and peace activists, widespread torture and the imposition of death sentences, there is no possibility of the aid programme being resumed?

Mr Forté, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* The Council would remind the honourable

Member that it is not at liberty to comment on statements such as that to which he refers. Nonetheless, as regards the substance of the honourable Members's question, I would reply by referring to the reply given by the President of the Council at the April part-session to Question No H-39/85 by Mr Wurtz.

I can therefore confirm that discussions have taken place at various levels within the relevant Council bodies on the position the Community should adopt with regard to Turkey, particularly as regards financial cooperation, following political developments there. These discussions have not yet been completed. No decision has therefore been taken on the possible release of the 600 million ECU laid down in the fourth EEC-Turkey Financial Protocol, which, I would remind you, has not yet been signed.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — I can understand and accept the reluctance of the President-in-Office of the Council to comment on every idiosyncratic utterance from the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom.

Concerning the substance of the question, will the President-in-Office firmly take note of the fact that a large number of Members of this House will be outraged if any decision is taken in the Council to release any of these funds while the abuse of human rights against trade unionists, pacifists and other citizens of Turkey continues? Will he make it quite clear to his colleagues in the Council that this House will not lightly tolerate financial arrangements being remade with Turkey while this abuse of human rights continues?

Mr Forté. — *(IT)* The answer is yes.

Mrs J. Hoffmann (COM). — *(FR)* To follow on from what the previous speaker has just said, I should like to ask the Council whether it can tell us what it has done to implement the resolution adopted last April by Parliament calling on it to exert all possible pressure to put a stop to the death sentences and executions and to ensure respect for the human rights and liberties of the Turkish people.

Mr Forté. — *(IT)* As we have had an opportunity to state in response to questions in the more appropriate forum of political cooperation, the Council continues to exert pressure in defence of human rights, and, as we have stressed, the financial aid to Turkey has not yet been released, which is an indication of the fact that we are taking strong action, both persuasive and dissuasive, to obtain the results we all hope for.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* I should like to ask the Council representative if he could give us his opinion on the three amendments tabled by Parliament's

Alavanos

Committee on Budgets, which expects them to be adopted by the House at tomorrow's sitting, as they were at the previous readings. These amendments actually involve the freezing of appropriations for the third and fourth Financial Protocols and of special aid to Turkey. If he gives us a satisfactory answer, his previous words and his general position on the question will have a practical reward and will not remain simply words, which is what we have become accustomed to, particularly with regard to Turkey.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* What the honourable Member has referred to is an integral part of the budgetary procedure, and obviously those who are responsible for this procedure, and that includes own initiatives by Parliament, can make such amendments, but this is not the right place.

Mr Wedekind (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President-in-Office, do you not think that, if the attacks that are constantly being made in this House against Turkey on the grounds of alleged torture and alleged unjustified death sentences are carefully studied and are used as a basis for policy decisions, then we must do the same for other countries, i.e. all the Arab countries, in which there is no democracy? Turkey is the only Islamic country in the world where there is genuine democracy. Genuine democracy does not exist in any other Islamic country.

Does the Council also consider that, if these matters are subjected to such a critical approach as that adopted by some people in this House, then it should be pointed out just as critically that in the 40 dictatorial countries of Africa to which we have granted 16 000 million ECU under the Lomé Convention — and I agree that they should be given it — torture, death sentences and the abolition of democracy are to be found everywhere to a far, far greater extent than in the democratic country of Turkey? Shouldn't we be just as critical about them and not be so dreadfully one-sided as some people in this House are?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* That was a very interesting speech, for which I thank you.

Mr Prag (ED). — Would the President-in-Office not agree at least that the civilian government in Turkey has made notable efforts to improve the situation concerning human rights, that while the situation may be far from perfect, some 75% of all political prisoners have been released since it came to power, and that we should approve at least this substantial progress that has been made?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* As I have pointed out, our approach is to try to encourage this development and, naturally, to see to it that it is satisfactory.

President. — We shall now move on to the questions to the Foreign Ministers.

Mr Pearce (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President, I am just rising to congratulate you on having proceeded with more questions to the Council than have ever been taken in one hour before. I am mortified by the fact that I was not here for my question. Never in the history of this Parliament has any President done 17 questions in an hour — I am sorry I missed it! I will put down the same question and I hope to have an oral answer next time. I congratulate you. As my question to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation is also the 17th question addressed to them, I hope you will call me for that.

President. — Mr Pearce, you will, like the others, receive a written reply. It is not to my credit that 17 questions have been dealt with, but to the discredit of those who are absent.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — On a point of order, Mr President, I find myself for a strange reason in the same boat as a British Conservative. Because of your efficiency and competence, I too, like him, missed my question on employment, which, as you know, is so important. Could I ask your permission to have it resubmitted for the next part-session?

President. — Mr Fitzgerald, in accordance with our Rules of Procedure, you will receive a written reply. Unfortunately, this reply will be a personal one to you, and so it will not be brought to our attention, as would have happened if you had been present.

I call Question No 107, by Mr Christodoulou (H-807/84):

Subject: Human rights in Albania

Amnesty International recently published a report on Albania, confirming once again the odious, blatant and systematic violation of human rights in this country, particularly against the Greek community in northern Ipirus.

Do not the Foreign Ministers consider that the time has come to take an interest in the matter and take whatever measures are necessary?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — *(IT)* The Ten pay close attention to the problem of human rights and the defence of basic freedoms, wherever it may be. It is to be hoped that, after the recent indications that Albania is opening up slightly to the outside world, other positive developments may follow with regard to human rights and basic freedoms.

Mr Christodoulou (PPE). — (GR) I am pleased to hear the President-in-Office giving us some hope on this matter. I should like to ask whether, after the change of leadership in Albania following the death of Enver Hoxha, now is perhaps the time for this cautious approach to take on a slightly more substantial form and to start being expressed more firmly. If we continue simply to adopt this cautious approach towards such matters, we shall end up in a situation like that which we have with the Greek minority in Turkey, which ultimately dwindled to nothing as a result of a cautious approach.

I should like to ask the President-in-Office to take advantage of the change of leadership in Albania to proceed to more concrete measures, since according to the evidence collected by Amnesty International Albania is currently the only place in which citizens whose origin is in a Community country are subjected to harassment and torture.

Mr Forte. — (IT) This is indeed the direction in which we are moving. I should like to state that during 1984 two important visits took place at government level: the Albanian Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr Kaplani, visited Athens in June, and the Greek Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister, Mr Papulias, visited Tirana in December.

The political significance of the exchange of visits was also demonstrated when, during the visit of Mr Papulias, five agreements were signed in Tirana on transport, postal arrangements, telecommunications, and scientific and cultural cooperation, with a view to fostering relations between the two countries. And on 12 January the Cacavia border pass, which had been closed for 40 years, was reopened.

Better relations between Greece and Albania should, we think, gradually bring about an improvement in the situation of the Greek community in Albania and thus an improvement in the human rights situation.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 108 will receive a written reply¹.

I call Question 109, by Mr Habsburg (H-826/84), for whom Mr Wedekind is deputizing:

Subject: Situation in the Baltic States

On 13 January 1985, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on the people of the Baltic States by a substantial majority. Since then the situation in the Baltic States has, if anything, deteriorated.

Will the Foreign Ministers meeting in EPC inform this Parliament whether they have considered the situation

in the Baltic States again since the most unsatisfactory answer given by Mr Genscher? If so, what was the outcome of their deliberations and, if not, are they now prepared, bearing in mind the USSR's systematic repression of the Baltic States, to remind Moscow of the rules of international law and of the Helsinki Final Act and to demand that they be respected?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (IT) As stated in the reply to Oral Question No H-555/84, the Foreign Ministers of the Ten meeting in European Political Cooperation noted the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 13 January 1983, to which the honourable Member refers. In their constant concern to ensure full compliance with the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and of the Madrid follow-up text, the Ten have on numerous occasions expressed to the appropriate quarters its preoccupation about the respect of the rights enshrined in those documents. The Ten will continue to assess carefully when it is the right time to carry out any action likely to bring about practical results, since when it comes to human rights it is practical results which concern them.

The Ten also consider that the Ottawa meeting on human rights, which is due to take place this month, is an important opportunity, in a particularly appropriate forum, to make further moves regarding a situation which at the moment and in more general terms can certainly not be considered satisfactory.

Mr Wedekind (PPE). — (DE) In the resolution in question we asked for the question of the Baltic States to be brought before the UN Decolonization Committee, and a large majority in Parliament voted for it. We expect the Council to tell us what it intends to do on this matter.

Mr Forte. — (IT) As I have already said, the context in which we operate is the one which remains valid for us. Obviously those concerned may apply to the United Nations in order to pursue the matter further.

Mr Seeler (S). — (DE) I should like to ask the President-in-Office the following supplementary question following on from Mr Wedekind's question: no one in this House disputes that it is at present politically impossible to restore independence to the three Baltic nations. But everyone knows that Helsinki, among other things, makes the cultural and ethnic independence of the peoples within the Soviet Union possible. I gathered from your answer, Mr President-in-Office, that the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation feel that they are not able to put this most basic requirement of the Helsinki act into practice. Do you agree?

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I am unable to agree with this conclusion. The Council seeks to ensure compliance with the Helsinki Final Act.

Mr Seligman (ED). — In view of President Reagan's moving resolution this afternoon to unite East and West in Europe and have a free passage from Moscow to Strasbourg, will he send a message of hope to these Baltic States that that is our resolution in the long run?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* Of course this is what we wish to see in the long term.

President. — I call Question No 110, by Mr Flanagan (H-828/84):

Subject: Pressure on the Nicaraguan Government

Are the Foreign Ministers aware of the severe pressure being put on the democratically elected Government in Nicaragua by the President of the United States, who is at present seeking Congressional approval of \$ 14 million in aid to the rebels, and will the Foreign Ministers state their view on this very serious situation?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — *(IT)* The Ten have in fact been informed of the particular move to which the honourable Member refers. The Ten have constantly expressed their conviction that the problems of Central America, including those of Nicaragua, cannot be solved by force, but only by a political settlement emanating from the region itself. With this in mind, the Ten have repeatedly expressed their support for the Contadora initiative, which seeks to bring about a peaceful and global solution to the problems of the region.

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — In view of the high-sounding words used today by the President of the United States of America, could I ask the Council and, indeed, Europe as a whole to redouble efforts to find a peaceful solution in Central America along the Contadora lines? And would the Council agree that 75 years of interference by various Presidents of the United States from 1911 onwards is a very long period of American interference in the affairs of the people of Nicaragua?

In the light of all the sentiments expressed today by the President of the United States, would Europe redouble its efforts, especially in the matter of trade with people who are being economically forced into poverty by the action of the President of the United States, not by the Congress or the people of America but by the President and his Administration? This initiative by Europe could prevent driving another whole section of the world into Soviet hands — the very

thing which the President so enthusiastically objected to today. Would this not be a good occasion to start this initiative — the day the President spoke to us?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* An initiative entitled 'Troika' is in progress with a view to organizing in Europe a conference of the Contadora Group countries, or rather the countries of Central America, which might lead to both political and financial solutions. The aim of this initiative is broadly the same as that which the Ten are trying to achieve, namely to seek peaceful solutions which are adopted by the countries themselves.

Mr Newens — *(S)*. Is it not utterly deplorable that the United States should be supporting rebels many of whom were supporters of the appalling Somoza dictatorship, which for many years ruled by means of imprisonment, torture and execution? One cannot possibly declare it democracy to be supporting such people. Can it be placed on record today that the Ten not only deplore the use of force — and this includes any possibility of invasion by United States forces as well as support for the Contras — but also deplore the American trade blockade and will continue to encourage Nicaraguan exports to Europe?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* The American trade blockade has not yet been discussed. For the rest, I note what you have said.

Mrs Dury (S). — *(FR)* I believe very strongly in initiatives such as the Troika, to which reference has been made, but I wish to state that an economic blockade can strangle a country very rapidly. I should like to ask the President-in-Office when he intends to meet the Nicaraguan authorities to see what their needs are and how we can respond in the immediate term to this type of strangulation being practised unilaterally by the United States and which is going very much against the people of Nicaragua.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* One of the tasks of the Troika mission is to visit Nicaragua to see the situation at first hand.

For my part, I should like to put a small point to you. If in certain agricultural sectors the policy of the European Economic Community were slightly different from what is at present — and many of those who express these concerns could do something about it — everything would be easier.

Mr Schinzel (S). — *(DE)* Mr President-in-Office, if the Council has not yet got an idea on how to offset the trade blockade against Nicaragua by European measures, is the President-in-Office prepared to bring such an initiative before the Council so that the effects

Schinzel

of this American trade embargo can be offset by European measures?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I said that the question of the embargo has not yet been discussed by the Ten. Information is being collected, and so we cannot for the moment prejudge any decision by the Ten.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* The last reply given by the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation is, to say the least, regrettable, and I hope he is not speaking for all the Ministers. According to his answer, there is a problem in obtaining information about the trade embargo.

In this connection I should like to repeat the question put by the previous speaker, which was as follows: is the Italian Presidency prepared to bring before the first meeting of the Foreign Ministers meeting in a Political Cooperation the problem of the American trade embargo against Nicaragua and the adoption of suitable counter-measures by the European Community? In view of the crucial nature of this subject, I would ask that, for once, we should be given an honest answer.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I fail to see why you imagine that we find it difficult to answer on this subject. The matter in question is, I believe, being dealt with this very day by the Political Committee in Rome. This means that we are looking into it.

Mr Wurtz (COM). — *(FR)* The embarrassment of the Council representative in answering a straightforward question is, I think absolutely incredible. So I apologize for being, I think, the fifth speaker to ask the same question. Is there any need to go to Nicaragua to collect information on a measure such as the blockade imposed by the United States, which so obviously runs counter to the Contadora process to which the Community has given its backing? In such a case, or I would say even before it arises, since it was foreseeable, are there or are there not plans for financial and food aid measures to prevent a situation in which, when the matter actually comes before the Council, it will be too late because disaster will already have struck Nicaragua?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I think I have already given an adequate reply. Furthermore, it seems to me obvious that all these questions are the same and serve one particular purpose, namely that each Member can ask a question. But since I am only one person, I can also refer to the previous replies.

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Mr President-in-Office, you will be pleased by the question I am about to ask you,

since it has nothing to do with the previous ones. Do you not think, Mr President-in-Office, that one of the major problems which face this part of the American continent, and the consequences of which we can see here, arises from the attempts by the Soviet Union to penetrate and destabilize this part of the world?

(Protests from the Socialist Group)

I am sorry to upset you, ladies and gentlemen. You are very quick to react on a certain number of subjects but you remain very silent on others!

President. — I think that the political problem raised by Mr Flanagan's question is extremely important, as has been demonstrated by the breadth of the debate in the various meetings. It is being discussed by the Committee on relations with the Latin-American Parliament and we shall be discussing it tomorrow under urgent procedure. However, I think it would be better to ask the Council for information or facts on which it can reply more directly.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* The Ten are convinced that the problems of Central America cannot be solved by military means but only by a political solution emanating from the region itself and which respects the principles of non-interference and the inviolability of frontiers.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — I rise to ask one brief supplementary question. I welcome the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on behalf of the Council. However, is he aware of a report by a delegation from this Parliament who went there to supervise the elections that were held? Whilst I very much welcome the visit of the United States President here today, I must put the record straight. He said: 'I have been in Nicaragua, you have not.' But there was a delegation from this Parliament in that country. Is the President-in-Office of the Council aware of the report of that delegation?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I am unaware of this.

President. — I can point out that the Political Affairs Committee is drawing up a report on Nicaragua. The Council will receive this document when Parliament has debated and adopted it.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* Thank you, Mr President.

Mr Fellermaier (S). — *(DE)* Mr President-in-Office, if the Political Directors are meeting in Rome today, you must surely be able to answer the following specific question with yes or no: is the question of offsetting the policy of the American President towards

Fellermaier

Nicaragua, i.e. the economic blockade, on the agenda of the preparatory meeting of the Political Directors for the next session of the Foreign Ministers meeting in European Political Cooperation? This can only be answered by yes or no.

Mr Forte. — The question on the agenda is Central America.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (*GR*) I have followed all the answers given by the representative of the Foreign Ministers. He gave me the impression that he constantly put forward the argument that the Council is collecting information. My question is: What information is he collecting? Is it or is it not a fact that the United States has declared a trade embargo against Nicaragua? What does he want? To confirm the fact? It is common knowledge. We wish to be told what the position of the Foreign Ministers is on this subject.

Mr Forte. — (*IT*) Since the meetings are still going on, I cannot say what their result will be.

If the Greek Member considers that there is no point in obtaining information, then it will obviously be wasted on him, but it will be useful to others.

President. — Question Time is closed¹.

Mr Prag (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. Would you please ensure the removal of the offensive litter which still remains on that side of the House as witness to the cheap gimmicks and tasteless gestures directed against our great ally at whose side some of us in this Parliament fought and without whom we could never have won the Second World War, without whom we could never have destroyed Nazism and Fascism and restored freedom and democracy and prosperity to Europe?

(*Mixed reactions*)

President. — Mr Prag, the Chamber is usually cleared at the end of the sitting.

Mr Newens (S). — Mr President, on a point of order, is it not in order for Members of this Chamber to demonstrate their views in the dignified way that they did against President Reagan when he came here? He is, in our view, seeking to prostitute democracy in many parts of the world. Was it not a demonstration here of a genuine and proper use of democracy on this occasion? Ought not Mr Prag, whilst he disagrees

with us, to at least have the decency to respect the manner in which we put our point of view?

President. — Mr Newens, I have already given a reply. I do not think there is any point in having a discussion on this matter, although everyone has the right to express his own opinion.

Mr Elliot (S). — Mr President, I do not want to start a debate, but if we are talking about being offensive, I find the remarks of Mr Prag somewhat offensive. It is quite unjustified to accuse Members on this side of the House of being anti-American. We are not anti-American. We are merely opposed to the present political régime in America. That is what we were demonstrating about. We are not against the American people.

5. *Mediterranean Countries*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the interim report (Doc. A 2-24/85), drawn up by Mr Galluzzi on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the economic and trade relations between the EEC and the Mediterranean countries pending the development of the plans to enlarge the EEC to include Spain and Portugal;
- the report (A 2-27/85), drawn up by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the cooperation agreements with the developing countries of the Mediterranean region in the context of a global Mediterranean policy of the Community¹.

Mr Galluzzi (COM), rapporteur. — (*IT*) The report I submit on behalf of the Committee for External Economic Relations proposes — bearing in mind the existing agreements between the Community and the third countries of the Mediterranean and the accession agreements recently signed with Spain and Portugal — some general guidelines and certain steps to be taken in order to avoid any adverse effects of enlargement on the economy of the Mediterranean countries and at the same time to boost — by gathering all the opportunities enlargement can offer and these far outnumber the drawbacks — the potential for fostering relations between the Community and the entire Mediterranean sphere.

As is pointed out in the draft resolution submitted to Parliament, this is an interim report, a preliminary

¹ Also included in the debate is the oral question (Doc. B 2-181/85) put by Mr Blumenfeld and Mrs Boot on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party to the Council, on foreign trade policy with respect to the Mediterranean countries.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Galluzzi

examination which the Committee for External Economic Relations offers as the basis for further research to be conducted *inter alia* in the light of an in-depth analysis of the accession agreements which are not yet common knowledge in that the details were agreed upon only recently. The objective is to be in a position to submit guidelines and final proposals as soon as possible.

I repeat: this is an interim report to serve as a platform, but it must nevertheless be approved in that it has to provide the wherewithal for this in-depth analysis without having to start all over again from scratch. On this subject I note — and I shall be repeating when I conclude — that these general guidelines have been approved by the Committee for External Economic Relations with only three abstentions and no opposing vote, which attests to the fact that the need does exist for a general guideline.

Ladies and gentlemen, the need for rethinking and improving the relationships between the Community and the Mediterranean countries does not arise from enlargement. Today's state of affairs is a sad one and far removed from the hopes which had followed in the wake of the beginning of bilateral relations and the 'global Mediterranean approach' launched by the Commission.

The trade balance of these countries is worsening; financial aid has been halved by inflation; economic cooperation appears increasing limited and episodic. In other words, ladies and gentlemen, the rift between the strategic, political, economic and commercial importance of the Mediterranean area as well as the rising demand for Europe's presence and intervention in this area from Mediterranean third countries on the one hand, and the actual state of affairs between the Community and these countries on the other, is widening.

This being the case, the Committee on External Economic Relations feels that unless enlargement is consolidated by new and bold options, not only when it comes to trade and cooperation policy but also when it comes to the Community's internal policy, there may be adverse affects not only on the poorer regions of the Community — the very two risks mentioned by Mr Andreotti when he spoke this morning — but also on the economy of these countries, thereby jeopardizing their growth potential to the greater detriment of security and stability in an area of the Mediterranean so vital to Europe's peace and future.

To obviate these risks, the Committee for External Economic Relations proposes in the motion for a resolution submitted certain indispensable options. Firstly, the vital overhaul of the existing agreements must be set in an overall plan designed to foster the whole Mediterranean area.

Secondly, new funds must be made available, certain internal Community reforms must be carried out —

the most important concerning the common agricultural Policy — the integrated Mediterranean programmes must be implemented and certain steps designed to boost the industrial and agricultural diversification of the applicant countries.

Thirdly, all financial aid and compensation made necessary by enlargement must be backed up by agreements of economic, financial and technical cooperation to help the internal development of these Mediterranean countries.

Lastly, the Committee proposes that the method of prior consultation between the Community and these countries — a method which in fact has already been initiated by the Commission by Commissioner Cheysson who has had contacts with the Ambassadors and has held meetings with the representatives of these countries — to decide on the major options and to adopt a common stance as regards any problem that might arise, be made permanent so as to involve these countries in the major issues and thereby make a positive contribution to the stability of the region.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we will, as I have already stated, be coming back to these proposals in the context of the final report which we hope the Committee for External Economic Relations will submit to Parliament as soon as possible. What we should like to stress today is our conviction that these preliminary guidelines, so essential for the follow-up work in depth and detail, case by case and in general, will receive the support of all the political groups and all the members of this Parliament — as was the case in the Committee for External Economic Relations which voted through this preliminary report with the backing of all the political groups.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, the recent Council decision to launch the integrated Mediterranean programmes has once again focused attention on the plight of the southern regions of the Community and the importance of the Mediterranean policy in the context of the enlarged Community.

As the Commission's declaration to the Council also indicates clearly, the balance and political stability in the Mediterranean basin are very much dependent upon the existence of harmonious trade relations between our Community and all the countries in this area.

It is therefore essential — and the Committee on Development and Cooperation stresses this — to foster a Mediterranean policy which is overall and consistent and which safeguards the social and economic interests of the developing countries of the southern region, and which at the same time takes due account of the situation of the other countries with which the

Cassanmagnago Cerretti

EEC has cooperation agreements, e.g. Yugoslavia and Malta.

Cooperation with the Maghreb and Mashreq countries and also with Israel must be consolidated and extended so that it becomes an effective factor in favour of peace and I therefore ask the Commission that the existing cooperation treaties be reviewed in the light of the impact of enlargement in order to establish a sound basis for future agreements.

The ground for a global policy can be smoothed by an economic political *rapprochement* in the context of the Euro-Arab dialogue with a view to bolstering the development and cooperation policy, which is also a key policy in enhancing economic growth and social progress in the light of the structural changes to which the enlargement of the EEC will give rise.

The current trade patterns with the EEC as regards the so-called sensitive products, particularly in the case of Tunisia, Morocco and Israel, must be maintained in order to safeguard not only the crucial economic sectors which these represent for them but also their social and cultural heritage.

In view of the present estimates concerning demographic trends in the region, absolute priority in EEC relations with the developing countries of the Mediterranean must be given to the creation and implementation of food strategies through agricultural cooperation measures aimed at increasing food self-sufficiency.

In line with this principle stands the programme for food self-sufficiency launched by the Algerian Government. I therefore urge the Commission and the Council to take the necessary steps to allow the EEC to actively assist in this programme.

Priority must also be given to the implementation of regional development projects, covering infrastructures, transport and the environment as well, which should be financed at a level commensurate with the real requirements involved in their implementation.

The South-South economic and commercial relations between the Mediterranean countries must become closer and extend also to those of the Lomé Convention on both regional and multilateral bases. The financial resources made available to the Maghreb and Mashreq countries should be increased taking due account, as I have already stated, of the increase in population, of inflation rates, of currency levels and all other related factors.

The contents of future cooperation and financing agreements must be the focus of our Parliament's attention and I therefore urge the creation of new and more effective institutional mechanisms capable of monitoring their development and in order to involve Parliament more directly in such mechanisms.

We should like Commissioner Cheysson, whose field of responsibility this is and who has always shown himself sensitive to development problems, to enlarge on this. It is also vital that the Commission and the European Investment Bank conduct a study of more effective measures to increase the volume of investment in the areas concerned.

In the social context, the European Community must above all help these countries to develop their own educational and vocational training programmes, and to increase the possibilities of entrance to European schools for their citizens, by improving the social and cultural measures which foster true integration of migrant workers and their families, in a concerted effort to combat racialism in the EEC. In this connection, the Commission should introduce, in conjunction with the Member States of the Community, new measures to assist those migrant workers who wish to return to find work in their countries of origin and contribute to their economic development.

To wind up, I feel that the Community should organize as soon as possible a Conference of the Mediterranean Region between parliaments and representatives of the countries involved in order to set the problem in its overall political context. For let us not forget that over and above the attainment of trade relations, the main goal is constituted by harmonious political relationships to guarantee political stability in the whole of the Mediterranean region.

(Applause)

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to answer the oral question put by Messrs Blumenfeld and Boot.

In the context of the procedure decided upon in January 1983, the Council — partly on the basis of communications from the Commission — has pursued its examination of the problem of the enlarged Community's Mediterranean policy in full awareness of the misgivings voiced on a number of occasions by the Mediterranean partners during exploratory talks held by the Commission and at various sessions of the Cooperation Councils.

In the context of this procedure the Council, aware of the misgivings of the Mediterranean partners as regards the possible consequences of enlargement on their exports into the Community, therefore considered it essential, at the crucial phase of the negotiations for enlargement during the marathon session of 28, 29 and 30 March 1985 which led to an agreement with Spain and Portugal on the main problems outstanding, to publish a statement on the enlarged Community's Mediterranean policy.

After reiterating on the one hand the importance of the Community's cooperation and association rela-

Forte

tions with its Mediterranean partners and the resolve to further strengthen these with the enlargement of the Community and, on the other, the overall concept of Mediterranean policy, the Council in that statement declared that the Community would seek mutually satisfactory solutions to allay the misgivings voiced repeatedly by the Mediterranean countries as regards the possible consequences of enlargement on their traditional exports.

In this context, the Council stated that the Community intended to maintain these traditional flows and take action to consolidate effectively the endeavours made by these countries to reduce the agricultural and food deficit and steer a steady course towards food self-sufficiency, a goal which obviously entails diversification of their production and, therefore, also the attenuation of certain problems of South-South competition.

The Council also stressed that in an overall outlook and in the long term, the Community would be seeking to continue with its Mediterranean partners a financial and technical cooperation in order to contribute effectively to economic growth and social development in those countries.

Lastly, in line with the decision of January 1983, the Council has decided to speed up work on the internal front as regards the enlarged Community's Mediterranean policy. The Council has stated that it expects the Commission to put forward as soon as possible negotiation directives with a view to adaptation of the Cooperation and Association Agreements which exist with several of these countries.

It should also be pointed out that in the context of the decisions taken during the negotiations with Spain and Portugal, on which Parliament was informed by the Presidency and in a specific document, the measures concerning the transitional period — particularly concerning the fruit and vegetable and olive oil sectors — will take due account of the interests of the Community's Mediterranean partners as well.

As for those aspects more closely connected with the rules of the common agricultural policy, it should be remembered that reference price trends move as a function of market price trends. What the Council in fact sought to avoid by means of Regulation No 3284 of 1983 was too marked a divergence between the reference prices and the market prices.

Furthermore, for the purposes of market management the Commission has a measure of discretion for influencing, by means of the reference price level, the market trends and therefore the trade in citrus fruits. It is very difficult, not only because of the vagaries of the weather which affect annual production — this year's we all know to have been seriously affected by frost — but also because of other imponderables to make any predictions which would permit reliable medium-term forecasts.

In view of the endeavours made to conclude agreements with the Mediterranean countries, the Council does not therefore share the negative analysis of the members of this Parliament as regards the import trends of the Mediterranean countries concerned.

When it drew up the structural policy for the citrus fruit sector, the Council endeavoured to meet the objectives of Article 39 of the Treaty, including those of a special nature. In this connection, the Council has provided for a set of special measures — restructuring aid and aid for conversion to other varieties, marketing premiums — designed to restore the competitiveness of the Community citrus fruits sector *vis-à-vis* the main Mediterranean competitors. A part of this production is on the other hand destined to be surplus and is eliminated. As an intervention technique this is a debatable practice from the point of view of internal policy because it does not obviously admit of production growth inasmuch as the product to be eliminated does not, by definition, reach the market and does not therefore enter the market circuit. It is nevertheless an important factor in framing the Community's Mediterranean policy, which effects all the Mediterranean countries including those in which the 'withdrawal' of excess production is carried on, in that it makes it possible to maintain those flows from the Mediterranean countries to the Community to which we are committed.

Our view is that we must therefore move together in this direction. As we have said before and as we again stress this is the course we must steer towards agricultural diversification, which entails the development of food self-sufficiency, and to economic diversification, which entails technical back-up for the development and exploitation of the Mediterranean countries' natural, energy and all other resources, in order to improve the outlook of these countries for the greater good of the whole Mediterranean area while still respecting the traditional trade flows.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS

Vice-President

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, I should first like to thank the Committee on External Economic Relations and the Committee on Development and Cooperation not simply for having given me the opportunity to make my first speech to this Parliament since my return to the Commission, but particularly for having insisted on discussing — for the first time — the effects of enlargement of third Mediterranean countries during the debate on enlargement this morning.

Cheysson

It was important to do this because, as the two rapporteurs say, we should remember that relations with the southern Mediterranean countries are an essential part of Community presence in international affairs and lend weight to the Community. This is obvious in economic terms. May I remind you that the southern Mediterranean market represents 8% of Community exports and is equal to half the American market and three times the Japanese market; the Community's largest trade surplus — 10 thousand million ECU in 1983 — comes from this market and the Community market is absolutely essential to third countries. It represents 70% of Malta's external trade, 60% of Tunisia's, 50% of Algeria's and over 40% of Morocco's, Egypt's, Syria's and Cyprus's.

It is just as easy to cite the political advantages — this has of course already been done admirably in the reports and proposals for resolutions — for a region where there is considerable tension and where political stability is associated, as Ms Cassanmagnago Cerretti was saying a few minutes ago, with harmonious and stable political and commercial relations between the Community and the Mediterranean countries. Europe is therefore an aid to peace in this area and would wish to be so: once peace has been restored, Europe will play an essential part in cooperation between the countries of the Near and Middle East and their development and is better able than other industrialized powers to understand the cultural developments and political reactions of these countries, particularly as the population welcomes search for peace in the Near East. The European nations cannot be supreme; they have the ability to act independently, as the rapporteur for the Committee on Development and Cooperation has pointed out.

The President also stressed that the accession of Spain would accentuate these aspects. A policy in relation to the Arab states is essential for Spain and the accession of this country is going to mean that the Community has all the more need for a Mediterranean policy. Our approach must be global; there must be no discrimination and the rapporteurs are right to stress this. A global policy must include Israel in the Near East and consider the effect on other parts of the Mediterranean — Yugoslavia, Malta, Cyprus — and I would include the countries we are not discussing, such as Libya.

In other words, Europe is bound to a policy in relation to the Arab States — a Mediterranean policy — and the inclusion of Spain reinforces this situation.

But to get back to enlargement and look first at the positive side: I have mentioned the political commitment of Spain. We should not forget that enlarging the market will be an advantage to our partners as the market is now very carefully protected in Spain. Nor should we forget that Spain will be even more anxious than the rest of us not to compromise the future of certain Arab communities — in other words the future

of Morocco. If we do not behave as we have promised the parts of the southern Mediterranean which are extremely dependent on their relations with us could collapse.

This is why the Commission does not feel that these problems can be written off in terms of financial compensation. You cannot compensate a section of society for its destruction. Of course there are financial problems but the damage which would be suffered in the southern Mediterranean countries with the loss of the markets so vital to them — which were created during the colonial period and have gone on developing ever since — would be economic, social and political. There would be serious destabilization and there is no financial compensation for this.

Now, these products which are so important to some of the countries and some of the communities of the southern Mediterranean are, let us admit it, in absolute terms of marginal importance to us. Olive oil from Tunisia represents 4% of the total production of the Twelve.

But it represents 43% of Tunisian exports of agricultural products and 20% of the work of the active Tunisian population. The citrus fruits we are always discussing exported from Morocco or Israel are not a problem for the Community at the moment with a supply rate of 85% — but they are an essential part of production there and there is no substitute with the same level of employment and income, to say nothing of the cultural implications — think only of the kibbutz in Israel. For this reason, I would repeat — and the document from the Commission to the Council expresses the same sentiment — closing certain markets really would result in political destabilization in some countries.

This illustrates the importance of the Council statement of 30 March of this year, to which the President of the Council referred a few minutes ago, which confirmed the intention of the Ten to contribute to the development of third Mediterranean countries and included an undertaking to retain traditional patterns of trade.

How can we maintain these traditional trade patterns? How indeed! Well, let us start with a simple observation — today these traditions exist. Not only do they exist but, despite competition from Spain or elsewhere, when the products are of good quality trade expands. Is it known, for example, that exports of Moroccan oranges increased from 200 000 to 250 000 tonnes in five years while, during the same period, Spanish exports of products of inferior quality to the Community market decreased from 830 000 to 750 000 tonnes? This happens with the present form of competition between Spain and the southern Mediterranean countries. We must, Mr President, maintain this balance.

Cheyssou

During the transitional period granted to Spain we therefore undertake to establish these patterns of trade — in other words to ensure continuation of the present flow. We shall do this by using the mechanisms at our disposal.

After the transitional period, the Commission's proposal is that the balance between exports from the southern Mediterranean and those from the Spanish market should be maintained; here too we shall have to use the mechanisms available to us but these will now differ from north to south; however, as outlined in the motion for a resolution proposed by Mr Galluzzi and the REX Committee, we shall have to take into consideration the IMP's and other modus available to the northern countries.

You may well ask me how Spain, which is hoping to develop its production in this area by joining the Community, will react. I can only say that if the development of Spain's products at the expense of the maintenance of exports from the southern Mediterranean countries resulted in the destabilization of society there, Spain's political responsibility would be grave.

I have not, I do assure you, forgotten the problems of cooperation, the need for improvement, and the need to revise agreements concluded in another era — which would exist with or without enlargement. I would not however like you to think that by improving cooperation we can compensate for any political or economic destabilization which might occur.

Cooperation: yes, the results have been disappointing; trade has deteriorated; the countries of Maghreb, for example, are not yet used to dealing seriously with the Community and still deal on a bilateral basis. It is also true that funds have not been used satisfactorily — not that they have been inadequate — I find this somewhat exaggerated in the report. Let us not forget that in the past five years over a thousand million ECU have been made available to the southern Mediterranean countries and, if we take the Mediterranean as a whole, two thousand 600 million ECU will have been made available over 10 years. This has not however produced the satisfactory results. Returns have not matched objectives. We must therefore have another look at forms of cooperation and improve on them. I should therefore like, Mr President, to return to the two reports because they give a very good idea of the points we shall have to study.

A lot of space is given in the reports to the volume of financing. Of course the Commission wants growth. Initially, even before there are renewed negotiations, we should very much like to see present funds put to better use and used more quickly. And the Commission is against — and I say this in the presence of the Council of Ministers — a practice which has grown up whereby the silence or abstention of Member governments can block important projects for weeks, months and — let us be honest — sometimes years.

The Commission is determined to manage the budgetary appropriations responsibly. We are therefore asked to work out a procedure like that for the Regional Development Fund which will mean that governments cannot block projects for more than a reasonable amount of time and that the Commission has the last word unless there is a qualified majority vote against it in the Council of Ministers. We also need money for studies and are counting on the Parliament.

Our main task is nevertheless to have another look at forms of cooperation and its objectives for the sake of the development of the southern Mediterranean countries.

Is hall briefly go through the main headings.

Fishing certainly needs more attention — in both our interest and theirs.

It is important throughout the world to encourage small and medium-sized undertakings but it is particularly important here in view of the progress already made in crafts and the setting up of small organizations.

I am very pleased that the Arab countries are involving us more in their discussions on energy. My colleague, Nicolas Mosar, was in Algiers a few days ago for the third Arab Energy Conference. This is a form of cooperation but future industrial cooperation must not be restricted to energy. Investment in products of value to both southern and northern Mediterranean must not be haphazard; we should not leave it to isolated industrialists to decide on transfers to the southern Mediterranean without taking into account the effects this will have on our society; we cannot allow the southern Mediterranean countries or, further away still, the Gulf countries, rush into vast investment projects and the purchase of equipment encouraged by engineering companies or suppliers without ensuring that this is in line with the needs of the market which is primarily the Community market.

What we are asking is to get together with the oil, etc. producers — and the other Mediterranean countries — to look into the possibility of cooperation on large-scale industrial development, the placing of investments and the timing of these developments. The people involved in business have a very important part to play alongside governments — they may sometimes be more important — in cooperation with our partners and this also applies to other fields where cooperation with countries as advanced as the southern Mediterranean countries is particularly promising — in other words, all areas of scientific and technical cooperation. This means a great deal of training and I would go even further than the rapporteur to say that this applies not only to traditional training but to training specifically linked with technological developments — in-service training — some of which is provided by the firms themselves. And while on the subject of business,

Cheysson

it is of course important, in cooperating, to give more attention to the promotion of investment by all known methods.

I have not yet looked at one basic area — agricultural development. In far too many southern Mediterranean countries production is in a most unfortunate state which the countries themselves are beginning to regret.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti brought up the extremely ambitious project under the next five-year plan for Algeria. Initial contact has been made. We must help these countries develop food policies by devoting the time required and by recognizing that our food supplies can be adjusted to these policies. The problem we have here is that the governments have never accepted the principle of some kind of long-term contract for food supplies from the Community to the southern Mediterranean. Could we not come to some agreement based on the demands of these countries for long-term contracts for the supply of energy products and the long-term contracts we could arrange for food supplies?

We must take a sufficiently overall view of this and I am glad that the two rapporteurs stress the importance of regional projects, training, the development of an infrastructure, industrial cooperation although admittedly we have not so far had any specific requests.

There is therefore considerable scope for cooperation in these important areas. I have not discussed migrant workers because the authority of the Member States is decisive here. I would however — because it has been mentioned in the two reports — say that the Commission is entirely in agreement with the denunciation of racism and chauvinism. We should look into the suggestions, particularly those of Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti on the possibility not only of helping to educate the children of migrant workers but of finding some kind of training which would help workers reintegrate when they return to their own countries.

I should just like to say a little about political cooperation. We obviously have common political interests in the Middle East in the Mediterranean area. This is a fact. What happens in the Mediterranean area concerns us all. The rapporteur of the Committee on Development and Cooperation therefore feels that the time has come to hold a large political conference. I should prefer to be a little more cautious. It is difficult to have any dialogue between Europe and the Arab world while problems as serious as Palestine, the differences between Algeria and Morocco on the western Sahara and the position of Libya make it impossible for regions or even parts of regions on the Arab or Arab-Israeli side to speak with one voice.

We should nevertheless look towards this goal. We are perhaps hampered by institutional problems. I say perhaps because at the moment the Commission does not

have a clear idea of the restructuring required although the present structure obviously does not work. Do not forget the difficulty we have had in organizing parliamentary meetings, not to mention the indescribable irritation expressed at the Cooperation Council meetings about the present absolutely useless procedures.

I am sorry that this has been so long but it is the first time that this Commission has had an opportunity to voice its opinion on problems which are so vital to our partners and of the utmost political and economic importance to us.

I should like to thank the European Parliament for having organized this debate. It has an important part to play and it is not at all surprising that Parliament took the initiative and not one of the other Community institutions.

(Applause)

Mr Seeler (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. The two excellent reports which we are discussing make it clear that the enlargement of the Community will have a considerable impact on economic cooperation between the Community and the remaining Mediterranean States. Not all the details have yet been negotiated with Spain and Portugal. However, it is already certain that both countries will be well able to supply all the needs of the rest of the Community for Mediterranean products. I would not like to dwell upon the risk of surplus production if the unreformed agricultural policy were also applied to the products of these countries. This would certainly have dire results for trade with the Mediterranean countries and for their economic development.

It is advisable — this much is clear from the discussion, and Commissioner Cheysson has pointed this out several times — to analyse clearly as soon as possible and as thoroughly as possible the effects and consequences of accession on economic relations. Commissioner Cheysson has described the current situation by saying that Europe was condemned to a Mediterranean policy. I would go a little further, Mr Commissioner, and say that economic and political peace in the Mediterranean represents peace in the whole of Europe.

That the European Community has taken this issue seriously in the past is evident from the fact that it has concluded cooperation or association agreements with almost all Mediterranean countries. The agreements with the Maghreb and Mashreg countries have governed cooperation very comprehensively for many years. The Community has committed substantial funds to promote economic cooperation and production in these countries and to reinforce the economic infrastructure. Access to the European market is vital to these States but is also of great importance for the

Seeler

European Community as the currency earned from these countries' exports to the Community in used to finance the capital investment goods and other products we export to them.

This is particularly true of Israel, too. In the cooperation agreement with Israel the Commission has granted this country substantial concessions; in practice, Israel now has virtually unrestricted access to our market. Agricultural imports from Israel, which will chiefly be competing with Spain, represent a large percentage of Israeli trade with the Community. The political situation in the Near East makes Israel far more dependent on the European market than other Mediterranean States. The situation of the two island States Malta and Cyprus is, I should point out, rather special. There are association agreements with both States, envisaging step-by-step elimination of duties and introduction of free movement with a view to a definitive customs union. At present, however, it is apparent that the relationship between the European Community and Malta, for example, is stagnating and has been for several years. Malta, and the Maltese government itself, does not at present wish to move any further towards the projected customs union.

The situation is different in Cyprus. The European Communities' market is of great importance to the Cypriot economy, especially for agricultural exports but also for industrial products. I think that the European Community is Cyprus' main customer. However, the political situation in Cyprus is at present severely hampering full development of the abovementioned association agreement and also makes it extremely difficult for the European Community to take any action to improve economic and social conditions for the Cypriot people, which ought to be far and away our major preoccupation. Relations between the Community and another Mediterranean country, namely Turkey, are for more difficult as at least a partial military dictatorship is still in existence there. Financial aid has, as you know, been frozen. On the other hand exports from Turkey to the European Community have increased considerably, particularly for agricultural and textile products. The enlargement will have an effect on existing contractual commitments which will have to be analysed carefully.

The enlargement will have only a slight effect on the cooperation agreement with Yugoslavia, which is more significant in political rather than economic terms, although I should mention that the accession of Greece to the Community had an extremely beneficial influence on trade relations between Yugoslavia and the Community.

On the whole it is of paramount importance — Commissioner Cheysson and the current President of the Council of Ministers have pointed this out already — that the effects of accession on all existing cooperation and associations agreements be analysed carefully, so that the Community can prepare itself in good time for

the problems involved and can, if necessary, decide upon the necessary measures, including the development of an aid system. For many Mediterranean countries access to the European market is vital. Our aim must be to see the entire Mediterranean area as an economic unit and to help it to develop soundly as a whole.

It would be a dangerous illusion to assume that it is sufficient to aid the development of the Communities' Mediterranean States, including Spain and Portugal, and to neglect the others. The effects of such a policy could be catastrophic. Aid for the Community Mediterranean States could be ineffective if the other regions were to go into a decline. The Mediterranean region rests on two main supports, the northern coast, i.e. the Community and the south and east coasts. Only if both supports have sound economic foundations will this area, so critical for the whole of Europe, attain the economic and political stability which we must strive after in the interests of peace and our own future.

Mr Costanzo (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is logical that the opening of the Community's doors to Spain and Portugal would affect not only the European countries directly or indirectly concerned, but also, and in no small way, the other countries of the Mediterranean basin *vis-à-vis* which the Community has always pursued a policy of understanding and cooperation on the economic, commercial and political levels.

The Galluzzi and Cassanmagnago Cerretti reports provide us with an overview — which I find objective and realistic — of the new situations which will arise in the non-Community Mediterranean sphere consequent upon enlargement. A Community trade policy in the Mediterranean basin cannot but take account of the economic and social development requirements of the non-Community countries. As for the trade flows, it is not feasible to overlook the problem concerning certain typically Mediterranean lines of agricultural production considered to be sensitive in terms of Community jargon and logic. These problems will be exacerbated — and due account must be taken of this fact — to the south and to the north of the Mediterranean basin.

Enlargement should be the opportunity to take stock of and make the necessary adjustments to the whole cycle of global Mediterranean policy conceived at the start of the 1970s and which in actual fact has not in recent years been implemented in a systematic manner. Even existing cooperation agreements with the Maghreb countries, and certain preferential agreements with the Mashrek countries today require adaption in preparation for the 1990s on the financial, economic and social levels, and in a truly global approach.

As I see it, pursuing a global Mediterranean policy also entails harmonizing the agricultural and industrial

Costanzo

economies of those non-Community countries with the regional development requirements of the Community's Mediterranean countries. Due account must be taken in this context of the functions and role of the integrated Mediterranean programmes. As regards the accession agreements, great attention must be paid to the system of preferential trade applied today to certain agricultural products which do not come from the non-Community Mediterranean countries. This obviously does not mean that our partners' interests have necessarily to be sacrificed. On the other hand, the problems facing the agricultural regions of the southernmost part of the Community today, and even more so tomorrow, should not be underestimated. The state of dependence of a large number of Mediterranean non-Community producers on the EEC quite rightly prompted Commissioner Cheysson to state that the problem is not so much economic as social and political. In this context, we cannot underestimate the contribution made to Europe by these Arab countries over the last 25 years in terms of worker emigration; substantial numbers of these workers are employed in certain Member States of the Community.

In the context of enlargement and of the changes to be made in the cooperation treaties with the countries of the Mediterranean basin, a Community social policy is required which is open to the problems and needs of migrant workers, never losing sight of the fact that — and this we must state not only today as we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War in Europe and Africa — that a Europe which is civilized and concerned by the fate of the peoples of North Africa and the Middle East, with peace, with the development of the Mediterranean basin, cannot simply stop at opening the European market to commodities, i.e. goods coming from those countries, but must also and especially greet with respect and equality of rights all workers, who are people and not goods: those workers who come from Africa and the Middle Eastern countries.

We have heard a number of statements concerning readiness to open the European market to the goods of these countries of North Africa and the Middle East. I would like to see the same degree of willingness to treat and greet with dignity and respect the human components which may come to Europe from those countries, i.e. their workers.

(Applause from the centre and the right.)

Mr Seligman (ED). — Mr President, it is indeed an honour to speak in Parliament on VE day, which is a symbolic day. I therefore want to remind the House of the ongoing needs of a people who suffered more than anyone else in the war and the years leading up to the war, namely, the people of Israel. The 1975 trade agreement between the EEC and Israel committed us to work for the expansion of trade between us, and I believe this is the only such agreement we have with a

Mediterranean country. This agreement was reviewed in 1978 and was due to be reviewed again in 1983. But it was not so reviewed.

My first question, therefore, is: why has this agreement not been reviewed? While the President-in-Office and Commissioner Cheysson are right in saying that Mediterranean countries must develop their non-food industries, it is also vital to reassure Israel that her customary trade with the EEC will not be ruined by a flood of imports of fruit, vegetables and flowers from Spain and Portugal. Horticulturalists in my own West Sussex and elsewhere in Europe are equally concerned that Spain appears to be preparing a vastly increased production of fruit and vegetables by investing in new plantations and irrigation.

My second and final question is: can the President-in-Office and Commissioner Cheysson ensure that the final enlargement agreement includes measures to prevent vastly increased Spanish production of fruit, flowers and vegetables on a scale which would threaten the present pattern of horticultural trade in the EEC and the Mediterranean?

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Rossetti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the long-drawn-out negotiations for the enlargement of the Community and the misgivings that this event has elicited in the third countries of the Mediterranean illustrate that enlargement, something we have all welcomed wholeheartedly, is nevertheless, going to create a great deal of upheaval, upset the *status quo* of equilibrium and perhaps shake outdated mechanisms as well. It has, for instance, been pointed out that the third countries of the Mediterranean view with some apprehension the surpluses which will be produced by the Europe of the Ten in the case of certain agricultural products which currently represent a major item in their exports to us.

However, recommending that the present trade flows to Europe be maintained is not enough. Unless we also go for other options, not only on the commercial front, the guarantees we should like to give these countries will either come to nought or have adverse effects on the Mediterranean countries of the Community in the case of products which may be far from marginal for the countries which produce them. So there is a need for other options, which by and large I find in the two excellent reports submitted, but which I fear may be jeopardized by certain amendments tabled. The first option to be firmly taken by everyone is the overhauling of the Community's internal policies, starting with the agricultural policy, in order to restore to the weakest areas, i.e. the southern ones, a balance without which the contradictions and problems inherent in this unitary process will increase.

The second option is to concentrate with the Mediterranean third countries not only on trade relations but

Rossetti

above all on cooperation agreements on all sectors to help them develop their economies, their internal markets, to diversify their production and become less Eurodependent as regards agricultural exports. This leads to the third option, viz. overhauling of the present cooperation agreements which now prove financially insufficient and above all, structurally limited and therefore of extremely limited effectiveness: whence the need for a boost in cooperation on the financial front. This boost will in the long term benefit Europe economically and politically. The commitment referred to by the Commissioner, the commitment to a Mediterranean policy may turn into a reward, but we have to play our cards with far-sightedness in order to make the Mediterranean a haven of peace and trade.

Mr Romeo (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission and the Council are rightly concerned about the Mediterranean countries and they have in past years provided for a set of measures to bolster their development. However, I do not think I am going too far if I say that we should get one thing straight, i.e. that the salient feature of these measures is the possibility of exception to the Community preference in favour of these countries on the Community markets. The brunt of this policy on the countries of the southern Mediterranean is borne by the Mediterranean Member States of the Community which have to face competition against their typical lines of production. Yet they derive hardly any benefit from the advantages mentioned whereby the currency resources accumulated by these countries serve to boost the Community's industrial exports which obviously originate in regions different from those which take the full force of the effects of enlargement.

On top of this, it is precisely these countries which will suffer most from the economic consequences of the membership of Spain and Portugal; this is borne out by the fact that these Mediterranean programmes have been discussed for years and quoted so repeatedly that we have often detected more than a hint of an argument that in the final analysis too much was being made of this issue and too much emphasis being laid on Community intervention to support these regions. The upshot of this is nevertheless there: the appropriations earmarked initially by the previous Commission was reduced by the present Commission and further cut back by the Council. A look now at the amount involved in the Mediterranean programmes in terms of financing informs us that it is indeed very low in relation to the scale of the problem. Not to mention the fact that the mechanism provided for, which in part safeguards Greece against its undeniable problems, does so to the detriment of the requirements of the other Mediterranean regions, i.e. the Italian and French regions.

And the Community has not stopped there. For instance, it has adopted a stance concerning Mediterranean agricultural policy and in the Commission's pro-

posals has maintained an average 6% reduction in Mediterranean agricultural prices which is not matched by the reductions in other sectors. If we take the case of milk, there has even been a 1.5% increase. Then there was the 'Naples' integrated operation, which has been spoken about for years, but has become mere pie in the sky and has remained a complete dead letter.

What I am getting at is that when we come up against stands such as those illustrated in the questions of Messrs Blumenfeld and Boot, who seem more concerned for the countries which are outside the Community than for its Member States and who criticize the propping up of citrus fruit prices by the Community, then my view is that this overhauling of the Mediterranean policy should take account of overall European policy and not jeopardize the weaker countries.

Mr Musso (RDE). — *(FR)* According to the agenda, an oral question — that tabled by Mr Blumenfeld and Mrs Boot — should be added to this joint discussion. Having read this oral question and heard all that I could have up to now, I have been asking myself some questions.

Indeed, Mr Cheysson made a very correct point just now: we may well fear that, following enlargement and a drop in trade with the south Mediterranean, social, economic and human imbalances will be created in these regions. But the question I should like to ask is, should we not be concerned that an even more serious imbalance would be created within the Community, in its Mediterranean regions, if we were ready to sacrifice those regions, which are part of our own system, as well as various other southern countries? Under these circumstances, I say yes to the concept of a general policy for the Mediterranean basin, but no to the sacrifice of our own regions within the EEC, because the imbalance which we would witness would be even more serious and we would be living it on our own doorstep.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to concentrate on a number of aspects from the Cassanmagnago Cerretti report.

First of all, the accession of Spain and Portugal will now give the Community the opportunity to establish really fruitful contacts both with the Arab world and with Latin America. The Community will be given the chance to pursue its own policies independently of the major powers. Europe's image in the Arab world must be completely separate from that of the United States. The Community must be given the opportunity to give serious consideration to the social and economic interests of the Mediterranean countries. But Europe must also devote more attention to the environment and its increasing deterioration in the countries of the West, Africa and Islam with their ancient cultures.

Ulburghs

Secondly, Europe must be careful not to become embroiled in the legacy of its colonial days. The agricultural structure of many countries was based on exporting wine, fruit and similar products to Europe. Europe must therefore strongly encourage these countries to supply their own requirements in these foodstuffs. Europe must also be very careful about conflicts which actually started during the colonial period, such as the war in Morocco for control over what was previously the Spanish Sahara. We must not be drawn into wars which we reject and condemn.

Thirdly, we must further develop a responsible immigration policy concentrating on a) the integration of immigrants and b) promoting the economic development of the Mediterranean countries, with the primary aim of helping them to supply their own needs. The policy must aim to create opportunities for immigrants to take part in this process voluntarily and thus to contribute to the development of their own countries.

Fourthly, the inhabitants of those countries must see Europe as a community which cares about their human rights. This means human rights for the Kurds in Turkey, for the Palestinians in Israel and for the Saharawis in Morocco.

Mr President, these are a few starting points for a Community policy on the Mediterranean area to which we owe so much in religious, cultural and economic terms and where different cultures can live together in peace and harmony.

Mr Pery (S). — (FR) Mr President, the cooperation agreements concluded between the European Community and the Mediterranean countries are coming up against a double difficulty: the Community's economic crisis and its enlargement towards the South. I believe that it is worthwhile reminding ourselves that the Community representatives first voiced the need for a general Mediterranean policy at the 1972 Paris summit. This was a period of rapid growth for our countries and the years which followed saw a number of cooperation agreements between the EEC and the Mediterranean countries. Today we must ask ourselves to what extent these commitments can be honoured now that the Community is labouring under a real economic depression.

In addition, the entry of Spain and Portugal, which we have just hailed, will involve us in having to look for compromises and compensations. I am anxious to add that, while the enlargement of the EEC is causing a certain amount of anxiety in the Mediterranean countries for economic reasons, these same countries emphasize that Spain and Portugal will act as a bridge between the EEC and themselves. Last year, during a conference in Naples on this very subject, the representative from Algeria stated that the applicant countries had very deep and ancient cultural links with the Arab world and that they maintain long-standing rela-

tions of friendship and mutual consideration. This enlargement, therefore, will also facilitate dialogue, a coming closer together and cooperation. There is, however, some anxiety, as I was saying, which is quite legitimate when one considers that our market is vital for the countries bordering the Mediterranean. Some of them send 50% of their exports to the EEC and are obviously highly vulnerable in some sectors. Mr Cheysson gave us a series of figures. What is more, he said practically all that there is to say. I will therefore confine myself to mentioning the case of Morocco, which is perhaps the most vulnerable country in this respect and, once again, Tunisia, with its olive oil problem. I would remind you that two-thirds of the working population in this country is employed full-time on a seasonal basis on the land and that a quarter of this time is devoted to olive-growing. So it can be seen that any sudden changes in Community policy would provoke unbearable tensions for stability and security in all these neighbouring countries.

Development is an essential ingredient for security. By the end of this century, the Maghreb area will have a young and dynamic population of more than 100 million individuals, whose future will be built with or without Europe. It is in our interest that they should be with us, for obvious economic and political reasons. The Mediterranean countries as a whole absorb 13% of our exports. Nor can we forget the strategic position of the Mediterranean, being the crossroads of the East and West and the North and South. That is the area where the EEC has direct frontiers with the East and with the Third World. Historical events have divided the Mediterranean basin and have made it a diversified and fragile political area. We are also responsible for safeguarding stability and peace in this part of the world.

The Commission is aware of this and has recently sent a communication to the Council on what is at stake and what should be the targets of a Mediterranean policy. The Socialist Group supports this communication, which Mr Cheysson outlined to us a few moments ago. We must maintain effective access to Community markets of sensitive produce from third Mediterranean countries, even though these products are sometimes in competition with those of the enlarged EEC. Any reconversion, diversification of production or desirable new developments, particularly with a view to increasing self-sufficiency in food in the Mediterranean countries will require time and money. We must pursue financial, technical and cultural cooperation, which will support the efforts being made towards economic and social development of our Mediterranean partners and which will promote regional cooperation in the south.

The way in which we deal with the immediate problems and our enlarged Community's ability to put thesespeeches into deeds will be a test of its credibility and will set the scene for the future development of relations between the EEC and the Mediterranean

Pery

countries. One of these immediate problems — let us be open about it — concerns the situation of migrant workers and their families in our countries. The waves of anti-foreign feeling against immigrants can be largely explained by the present crisis. The Mediterranean countries, however, are expecting our Community to issue an unequivocal and clear statement about the important role played by these workers in Community production. Let us have solidarity with the Mediterranean countries from the EEC but let us also have solidarity with their populations inside our Community.

(Applause)

President. — We shall now suspend the debate, which will be continued tomorrow after the vote on the 1985 budget.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

6. Votes

Report (Doc. A 2-20/85), drawn up by Mr Hänsch on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the enlargement of the Community to include Portugal and Spain

Explanations of vote

Lord Bethell (ED). — I want to explain one extra reason why I shall be voting for Mr Hänsch's report. It is to emphasize a point not mentioned in his report, unfortunately, but which, nevertheless, needs to be made, that there is apart from Spain and Portugal a third territory on the Iberian Peninsula which has good reason to rejoice at the successful conclusion of enlargement negotiations. I mean the territory of Gibraltar, a mere five square kilometers, but nevertheless a community of more than 20 000 people, all of whom have been full citizens of the European Community since 1973.

The Franco régime blockaded Gibraltar, and for 20 years the Gibraltarians were unable to travel. All this has been put right as a result of the negotiations.

Mr Hänsch refers to equal voting rights in elections to the European Parliament. Unfortunately, this does not apply to the 20 000 people of Gibraltar. I would like to appeal to the House, particularly to Mr Bocklet preparing his report on uniform procedure, to put this

right and to the British Government to tackle an undeniable problem of natural justice.

I welcome this report, in particular with regard to the people of Gibraltar.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — *(GR)* We are not in favour of the Hänsch report, because we are against the enlargement of the Community. Our reasons for this are set out below.

Firstly, we want to be consistent in our attitude towards the position of our party and of a large part of the Greek people, which are against Greece's entry into the EEC and are endeavouring to obtain its withdrawal.

Secondly, we are against enlargement because we consider that the entry of Spain and Portugal will be detrimental to the interests of Spanish and Portuguese workers, who will have to bear serious negative consequences — the same as, or even worse, than, those which Greek workers have been suffering for four years.

Thirdly, we are against enlargement because it will multiply and aggravate the negative consequences both to the Greek economy and to the interests of Greek workers as a result of the flood of similar products from these two countries.

Fourthly, we are against enlargement because it emerges both from the report by Mr Hänsch and from what has been said in this House, particularly in the speech by the President of the United States, that this enlargement is being used for military ends, for the economic exploitation of a wider market, and to extend this exploitation to Latin America.

Lastly, we are against it because at the institutional level also the unequal representation of the countries is being continued and strengthened, and there are moves to abolish the veto, which is the only weapon which the small countries have to defend their vital interests.

Mr P. Beazley (ED), in writing. — The Hänsch report is in fact a technical report on the European Parliament's institutional responsibilities regarding enlargement. It welcomes the conclusion of the negotiations and approves the institutional agreements, whilst pointing out where they have been neglected.

I support particularly its pleas for the need for direct European elections in both Spain and Portugal as soon as possible, so that their Members may carry the full mandate of their peoples as do all other elected Members of this House.

P. Beazley

I support the right of the European Parliament to ratify these Treaties of Accession — as well as the need for reform of the number of Commissioners required to run the business of the European Commission.

The Hänsch report, therefore, should be carefully studied by the Council of Ministers and the Commission.

However, I should like to rejoice on this historic occasion — both for the Community and for Spain and Portugal. It is a truly historic occasion for all concerned, comparable with the greatest occasions in the long histories of these two great countries, which were always part of the European Community in a historical sense.

It is equally a great occasion for the Community, as each enlargement strengthens the European nature of the Community, widens its historical and cultural basis and adds to its power and influence.

Let us remember that the Iberian Peninsula is a unique part of Europe. How wrong were those old members of the Community who saw in their accession a further transfer of the centre of gravity of the Community to the South. It was from its western ports in Portugal and Spain that the great navigators sailed to discover new lands in the Americas, in Africa, in India and the Far East. It is the West of the Community which has been strengthened, and it is in the Portuguese and Spanish speaking parts of the world that the Community will discover new interests, greater influence and new opportunities and responsibilities.

Both the old members and the new must show some patience and understanding during the transitional period, but they must grasp the new opportunities and use them to achieve the necessary solutions to their existing problems.

Mrs Charzat (S), in writing. — (FR) I shall be voting in favour of my colleague, Mr Klaus Hänsch's report, but I hope that the European Parliament and the European Community will be able to reach positive conclusions on the following two points.

In the first place, a reinforcement of the privileged relations between the European Community and third Mediterranean countries. Maintaining and reinforcing these links means that we must guarantee the effective access of their products to our common market *in advance* and that, consequently, conditions for fair competition with Spain must be granted to third Mediterranean countries, both for regulated and unregulated products.

Secondly, some progress has been made in European political cooperation in the last few years. All the Member States are represented in each of the Com-

munity institutions. If Spain is to assume the presidency, therefore, this implies prior normalization of its diplomatic relations with Israel as part of a political cooperation exercise.

Mr Christensen (ARC), in writing. — (DA) The Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community is yet again obliged to protest strongly against Parliament's wish to usurp the right to ratify the accession of Spain and Portugal.

We would point out that the new weighting of votes in the Council of Ministers makes it impossible for countries with doubts about union to block majority decisions. The same applies to the northern European agricultural countries. Conversely the southern European agricultural countries will be able to block these decisions.

We should like to insist that the two new Member States, at the very least, recognize the Luxembourg Compromise expressly and without reservation.

The accession of Spain and Portugal is the turning point at which membership of the EC will actually cost Denmark money. As far as the Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community is concerned, membership of the EC has never been a question of money but of Denmark's right to self-determination; attention must now however be drawn to the economic side of the question for this was what originally decided Denmark's membership.

We are not against the accession of Spain and Portugal because they are poor countries but we should nevertheless like to draw attention to what has tended to happen to the regional agricultural funds in, for example, Italy.

This does not suggest that the EC is achieving social equality. We cannot support Mr Hänsch's resolution.

Mr Christiansen (S), in writing. — (DA) The Danish Social Democrat members are also pleased that the negotiations have ended in the accession of Spain and Portugal. It is a big step forward for the Community.

We have therefore voted for the Hänsch Report, Section 1: report on the conclusion of the negotiations with Spain and Portugal.

But I must repeat what I said in connection with the vote on the Formigoni Report on 17 January: in our opinion, once the ten national parliaments have ratified the Treaties of accession, the membership of Portugal and Spain is a fact. Article 237 of the Treaty of Rome makes it quite clear that ratification is the responsibility of the national governments and not a matter for the European Parliament.

Mr Pranchère (COM), *in writing*. — (FR) Following the European Council meeting in Brussels, the majority of this House will be confirming its agreement for the entry of Spain and Portugal into the Community by adopting Mr Hänsch's report. This majority has just received the support, a few hours ago, of Mr Reagan, who confirmed his will to reinforce the political cohesion of Europe under his control.

Faithful to their commitments to the French workers and farmers, the French Communists and Allies will be voting against the report of the Political Affairs Committee.

To approve of enlargement in our current circumstances is to take a serious decision which bodes ill for the future, because it will have grave consequences in all fields and on both sides of the Pyrenees, not only for agriculture and fishing, but also for industry. Enlargement means 3 million more unemployed in a Community which already has more than 13 million unemployed. A campaign is currently being orchestrated in two directions. Some people are trying to make us think that the drawbacks of enlargement will be avoided thanks to a few technical measures. Commissioner Andriessen has already dealt with this by stating:

The accession process will be painful for both parties. It would be absurd to believe that such wounds could be avoided.

Others, who are holding out the prospect of new markets for the so-called 'continental' agricultural products are merely building castles in the air. Naturally, there are some opportunities for exports, in very limited sectors, but the applicant countries are not committed to fully respecting Community preference from the time of their accession and they want to maintain their traditional trade patterns, with the United States and Latin America in particular.

We will have an opportunity to make ourselves quite clear on all these questions when the agreement is ratified before the national parliaments. In the meantime, it is our belief that the chips are not yet down and we are determined to pursue our campaign against enlargement by continuing to expose what is at stake and denouncing the dangers.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-4/85), drawn up by Mrs Marinaro on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-6/85) — COM(85)

48 final) on guidelines for a Community policy on migration together with a draft Council resolution¹

Proposal for a resolution

Paragraph 3 — Amendments Nos 35 and 120

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — (FR) Mr President, I simply wanted to remind you that we have asked for a roll-call vote for each amendment and each paragraph.

President. — Mr Le Chevallier, as long as there are not 21 Members who object, we shall proceed as we did yesterday in accordance with Rule 74(3) of the Rules of Procedure.

Paragraph 3(b)—Amendments Nos 121 and 162

Mr Welsh (ED), *chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment*. — Madam President, I have to say that the compromise amendment No 162 was adopted as a compromise in the committee. The Rules say quite clearly that you have to put that first.

If I may say so, with respect, you should not be allowed to be swayed in your judgment by the noise from my right!

(Applause)

President — I can only put the amendment to the vote if there are no objections.

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — (FR) Madam President, I just wanted to ask, in case you are going to put Amendment No 162 to the vote, that we vote on it item by item.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR) — (FR) Madam President, Mr Le Chevallier has requested an item-by-item vote on all the paragraphs, and that is what we must do.

President — That is right, Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr Luster (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, I should like to point out that there is a strong draught in this part of the Chamber, which I am sure is not intentional. But it is a risk to the health of those sitting around me, and I feel responsible for them.

(Laughter)

¹ The rapporteur was:
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 and 2.

¹ See debates of the previous part-session.

President — Mr Luster, I shall ask someone to check.

Paragraph 3(c) — After the vote on the fourth indent

Mr Le Chevallier (DR) — (FR) Madam President, I simply wanted to tell you that we have not seen the fourth indent in paragraph c. So what have we voted on?

(Laughter)

There is no fourth indent.

President — Mr Le Chevallier, in the Italian version before me there is a fourth indent.

Mr Coste-Floret (RDE). — (FR) I just wanted to point out that, as the previous speaker said, there are only three indents in the French text. My neighbour, Mr Pisoni, has shown me that there are four in the Italian text. According to the Rules of Procedure, any differences between the various language versions of a text mean that it should be referred back to committee. So you must refer it back to committee.

(Mixed reactions)

President — Mr Coste-Floret, let us not quibble; the vote on the fourth indent has already taken place.

Ladies and gentlemen, a check will be made, but the vote was in progress and so the problem is settled.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) Madam President, will you please make it very clear exactly what we are voting on, since my group has lost count.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — (FR) Madam President, the flaws in this text make it invalid. A text cannot be voted on by some countries of the Community and not by others. We ask for it to be referred back to committee.

President — Mr d'Ormesson, I have said that there will be a check and, if there is a mistake in the Italian translation, we shall attend to it before the end of the votes. Let us wait for clarification.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — (FR) Madam President, the Italian text, or the way the President has interpreted it, has given rise to error not only on the fourth indent but also on the preceding ones, since the numbering was not the same in all the languages. Thus it is not only the fourth indent but the entire paragraph which must be referred back to committee, failing which the

vote would naturally be invalid and each of us would be entitled to ask for it to be declared so.

President — Mr Guermeur you are right, but my documents are all in Italian and I can only put items to the vote as they appear in my language.

Mr Welsh (ED), chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — Madam President, if you had called me before, I would have been able to remind you that it is normal practice in the House that the language in which the report was originally written is the language that counts. This report was written in Italian and, as colleagues who follow these things will know, very frequently the grammatical structure of the different language is such that sometimes two indents are amalgamated. That is what has happened here.

However, I would remind you, Madam President, that in fact the House has adopted the fourth indent and that concludes the vote on paragraph 3c.

Mr Ducarme (L). — (FR) Madam President, I have been desperately asking to speak for five minutes. You asked us to cooperate, and I should like to say that a correction to the Marinaro report — corrigendum PE 95.676/final/corr. — states that paragraph 3(c) of the motion for a resolution should read as follows:

This subparagraph contains four indents and not three, the second being mistakenly included in the first and beginning 'Comprehensive information on private and public Community law, ...'

That means that the vote is correct.

(Applause)

Paragraph 3(b) — Third indent — After the vote on Amendment No 135

Mr Welsh (ED), chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — Madam President, the House had voted to reject that paragraph. The Tuckman amendment was also to delete the paragraph. You should not therefore have put the Tuckman amendment to the vote, because it in fact had fallen. This could apply to other clauses in this piece.

President — Mr Welsh, I have already said that I was adopting this procedure.

Paragraph 3(j) — Third indent — After the vote on Amendment No 161

Mrs Rabbethge (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, can you tell us until what time we will be voting this evening?

President — Mrs Rabbethge, your question is very relevant, since in view of the time I must suspend voting until tomorrow's sitting.

(The sitting was closed at 8.45 p.m.)¹

ANNEX

Formal sitting

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

(The formal sitting was opened at 2.30 p.m.)

Mr Pierre Pflimlin, *President of the European Parliament*. — (FR) Mr President of the United States, it is a great honour for me to welcome you today to the European Parliament on behalf of the directly elected representatives of ten democratic nations of Europe.

In coming to this Parliament, you are addressing the peoples of Europe, you are showing that you believe in the ultimate success of what we have been trying to achieve over the last 35 years in building the Community, and you are proving that the United States is behind us in our endeavours.

All our efforts bear witness to our resolve to overcome the rivalries of the past by mobilizing the material and intellectual forces of our continent and by giving it the means to assume its role in the world.

Let me assure you, Mr President, that we are happy and proud to receive in Strasbourg the visit of the President of the great American democracy, . . .

(Loud and sustained applause)

. . . which played a decisive role in restoring peace in Europe and in safeguarding its liberty.

(Loud and sustained applause)

We shall never forget what our peoples owe to others. I should like to express the confidence and high regard which your nation inspires in the vast majority of Europe's citizens, a nation committed to values which we share and which we have resolved to defend together.

(Loud and sustained applause)

Mr Ronald Reagan, *President of the United States of America*. — Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. It is an honour to be with you on this day.

We mark today the anniversary of the liberation of Europe from tyrants who had seized this continent and plunged it into a terrible war. Forty years ago today, the guns were stilled and peace began — a peace that has become the longest of this century.

On this day 40 years ago, they swarmed onto the boulevards of Paris, rallied under the Arc de Triomphe and sang the *Marseillaise* in the free and open air. In Rome, the sound of church bells filled St Peter's Square and echoed through the city. On this day 40 years ago, Winston Churchill walked out onto a balcony in Whitehall and said to the people of Britain, 'This is your victory!', and the crowd yelled back in an unforgettable moment of love and gratitude, 'No, it is yours!' Londoners tore the blackout curtains from their windows, put floodlights on the great symbols of English history and for the first time in nearly six years Big Ben, Buckingham Palace and St Paul's Cathedral were illuminated against the sky.

Across the ocean, half a million New Yorkers flooded Times Square and laughed and posed for the cameras. In Washington, our new President, Harry Truman, called reporters into his office and said, 'The flags of freedom fly all over Europe'.

On that day 40 years ago, I was at my post in an Army Air Corps installation in Culver City, California. Passing a radio I heard the words: 'Ladies and gentlemen, the war in Europe is over!' I felt a chill, as if a gust of cold wind had just swept past, and, even though for America there was still a war on the Pacific front, I realized I would never forget that moment.

This day can't help but be emotional, for in it we feel the long tug of memory. We are reminded of shared joy and shared pain. A few weeks ago in California an old soldier with tears in his eyes said, 'It was such a different world then. It is almost impossible to describe it to someone who wasn't there, but when they finally turned the lights on in the cities again, it was like being reborn'.

If it is hard to communicate the happiness of those days, it is even harder to communicate to those who did not share it the depth of Europe's agony. So much of it lay in ruins. Whole cities had been destroyed. Children played in the rubble and begged for food. By this day 40 years ago, over 40 million lay dead and the survivors composed a continent of victims. And to this day we wonder, how did this happen? How did civilization take such a terrible turn? After all the books and documentaries, after all the histories and studies, we still wonder — how?

Hannah Arendt spoke of the 'banality of evil', the banality of the little men who did the terrible deeds.

¹ *Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

Reagan

We know they were totalitarians who used the state, which they had elevated to the level of a god, to inflict war on peaceful nations and genocide on innocent peoples. We know the existence of evil in the human heart, and we know that in Nazi Germany that evil was institutionalized, given power and direction for the state and those who did its bidding. We also know that early attempts to placate to totalitarians did not save us from war.

(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)

They did not save us from war. In fact, they guaranteed war!

(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)

There are lessons to be learned in this and never forgotten. But there is a lesson, too, in another thing we saw in those days: perhaps we can call it 'the commonness of virtue'. The common men and women who somehow dug greatness from within their souls: the people who sang to the children during the *blitz*, who joined the resistance and said 'No' to tyranny, the people who had the courage to hide and save the Jews and the dissidents . . .

(Sustained applause)

. . . the people who became for a moment the repositories of all the courage of the West — from a child named Anne Frank to a hero named Raoul Wallenberg. These names shine. They give us heart forever. The glow of their memories lit Europe in her darkest days.

Who can forget the hard days after the war? We cannot help but look back and think life was so vivid then. There was a sense of purpose, the joy of shared effort, and later the joy of our triumph. Those were the days when the West rolled up its sleeves and repaired the damage that had been done; the days when Europe rose in glory from the ruins. Old enemies were reconciled with the European family. Together America and Western Europe created and put into place the Marshall Plan to rebuild from the rubble. Together we created an Atlantic Alliance which proceeded not from transient interests of state, but from shared ideals. Together we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a partnership aimed at seeing that the kind of tyrants that had tormented Europe would never torment her again.

(Sustained applause)

NATO was a triumph of organization and effort, but it was also something very new and very different. For NATO derived its strength directly from the moral values of the people it represented, from their high ideals, their love of liberty and their commitment to peace.

But perhaps the greatest triumph of all was not in the realm of a sound defence or material achievement. No, the greatest triumph after the war is that in spite of all the chaos, poverty, sickness and misfortune that plagued this continent, the people of Western Europe resisted the call of new tyrants and the lure of their seductive ideologies. Your nations did not become the breeding ground for new extremist philosophies. You resisted the totalitarian temptation. Your people embraced democracy, the dream the fascists could not kill. They chose freedom.

(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)

Today we celebrate the leaders who led the way: Churchill and Monnet, Adenauer and Schuman, De Gasperi and Spaak, Truman and Marshall. And we celebrate, too, the free political parties that contributed their share of greatness: the Liberals and the Christian Democrats, the Social Democrats and Labour and the Conservatives. Together they tugged at the same oar, and the great and mighty ship of Europe moved on.

If any doubt their success, let them look at you. In this room are those who fought on opposite sides 40 years ago, and their sons and daughters. Now you work together to lead Europe democratically. You buried animosity and hatred in the rubble. There is no greater testament to reconciliation and to the peaceful unity of Europe than the men and women in this Chamber.

(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)

In the decades after the war, Europe knew great growth and power, amazing vitality in every area of life from fine arts to fashion, from manufacturing to science to the world of ideas. Europe was robust and alive, and none of this was an accident. It was the natural result of freedom, the natural fruit of the democratic ideal. We in America looked at Europe and called her what she was, an economic miracle.

And we should hardly be surprised. When we Americans think about our European heritage, we tend to think on your cultural influences and the rich ethnic heritage you gave us. But the industrial revolution that transformed the American economy came from Europe. The guiding intellectual lights of our democratic system — Locke, Montesquieu and Adam Smith — came from Europe. And the geniuses who ushered in the modern industrial technological age came from — well, I think you know, but two examples will suffice: Alexander Graham Bell, whose great invention maddens every American parent whose child insists on phoning his European penpal rather than writing to him — and he was a Scotsman.

(Laughter)

And Guglielmo Marconi, who invented the radio, thereby providing a living for a young man from

Reagan

Dixon in Illinois who later went into politics — I guess I should explain, that is me — so blame Marconi. Marconi, as you know, was born in Italy.

(Applause)

Tomorrow will mark the 35th anniversary of the Schuman Plan which led to the European Coal and Steel Community, the first block in the creation of a united Europe. The purpose was to tie French and German and European industrial production so tightly together that war between them 'becomes not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible'. Those are the words of Robert Schuman. The Coal and Steel Community was the child of his genius. And if he were here today, I believe that he would say 'We have only just begun'.

(Sustained applause)

I am here to tell you that America remains, as she was 40 years ago, dedicated to the unity of Europe. We continue to see a strong and unified Europe not as a rival but as an even stronger partner. Indeed, John F. Kennedy, in his ringing 'Declaration of Interdependence' in the Freedom Bell city of Philadelphia 23 years ago, explicitly made this objective a key tenet of post-war American policy. That policy saw the New World and the Old as twin pillars of a larger democratic Community.

(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)

We Americans still see European unity as a vital force in that historic process. We favour the expansion of the European Community; we welcome the entrance of Spain and Portugal into that Community . . .

(Applause)

. . . for their presence makes for a stronger Europe, and a stronger Europe is a stronger West.

Yet despite Europe's economic miracle, which brought so much prosperity to so many, despite the visionary ideas of European leaders, despite the enlargement of democracy's frontiers within the European Community itself, I am told that a more doubting mood is upon Europe today. I hear words like 'Europessimism' and 'Europaralysis'. I am told that Europe seems to have 'lost' that sense of confidence that dominated that post-war era. Well, if there is something of a lost quality these days, is it connected to the fact that some, in the past few years, have begun to question the ideals and philosophies that have guided the West for centuries; that some have even come to question the moral and intellectual worth of the West?

I wish to speak in part to that questioning today. And there is no better place to do it than Strasbourg where Goethe studied, where Pasteur taught, where Hugo knew inspiration. This has been a lucky city for ques-

tioning and finding valid answers. It is also a city for which some of us feel a very sweet affection. You know that our Statue of Liberty was a gift from France, and its sculptor, Auguste Bartholdi, was a son of France. I do not know if you have ever studied the face of the statue, but immigrants entering New York Harbour used to strain to see it as if it would tell them something about their new world. It is a strong, kind face; it is the face of Bartholdi's mother, a woman of Alsace. And so, among the many things we Americans thank you for, we thank you for her.

(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)

The Statue of Liberty — made in Europe, erected in America — helps remind us not only of past ties but present realities. It is to those realities we must look in order to dispel whatever doubts may exist about the course of history and the place of free men and women within it. We live in a complex, dangerous, divided world, yet a world which can provide all of the good things we require, spiritual and material, if we but have the confidence and courage to face history's challenge.

We in the West have much to be thankful for—peace, prosperity and freedom. If we are to preserve these for our children, and for theirs, today's leaders must demonstrate the same resolve and sense of vision which inspired Churchill, Adenauer, De Gasperi and Schuman.

(Loud applause)

Their challenge was to rebuild a democratic Europe under the shadow of Soviet power. Our task, in some ways even more daunting, is to keep the peace with an ever more powerful Soviet Union, to introduce greater stability in our relationship with it, and to live together in a world in which our values can prosper.

The leaders and people of post-war Europe had learned the lessons of their history from the failures of their predecessors. They learned that aggression feeds on appeasement and that weakness itself can be provocative.

(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)

We, for our part, can learn from the success of our predecessors. We know that both conflict and aggression can be deterred, that democratic nations are capable of the resolve, the sacrifices and the consistency of policy needed to sustain such deterrence.

From the creation of NATO in 1949 through the early 1970s Soviet aggression was effectively deterred. The strength of Western economies, the vitality of our societies, the wisdom of our diplomacy all contributed to Soviet restraint; but certainly the decisive factor must have been the countervailing power — ultimately military, and, above all, nuclear power — which the

Reagan

West was capable of bringing to bear in the defence of its interests.

It was in the early 1970s that the United States lost that superiority over the Soviet Union in strategic nuclear weapons which had characterized the post-war era. In Europe the effect of this loss was not quickly perceptible. But seen globally, Soviet conduct changed markedly and dangerously. First in Angola in 1975, then, when the West failed to respond, in Ethiopia, in South Yemen, in Kampuchea, and ultimately in Afghanistan, the Soviet Union began courting more risks.

(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)

and expanding its influence through the indirect and direct application of military power. Today we see similar Soviet efforts to profit from and stimulate regional conflicts in Central America.

(Cries of 'Nicaragua, Nucaragua!' from the left — Applause from the centre and from the right)

They have not been there. I have.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

The ineffectual Western response to Soviet adventurism of the late 1970s had many roots, not least the crisis of self-confidence within the American body politic wrought by the Vietnam experience. But just as Soviet decision-making in the earlier post-war era had taken place against a background of overwhelming American strategic power, so the decisions of the late 1970s were taken in Moscow, as in Washington and throughout Europe, against a background of growing Soviet and stagnating Western nuclear strength.

One might draw the conclusion from these events that the West should reassert that nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union upon which our security and our strategy rested through the postwar era. That is not my view. We cannot and should not seek to build our peace and freedom perpetually upon the basis of expanding nuclear arsenals.

(Sustained applause)

In the short run, we have no alternative but to compete with the Soviet Union in this field, not in the pursuit of superiority but merely of balance. It is thus essential that the United States maintain a modern and survivable nuclear capability in each leg of the strategic triad — sea, land and air-based. It is similarly important that France and Britain maintain and modernize their independent strategic capabilities.

The Soviet Union, however, does not share our view of what constitutes a stable nuclear balance. It has chosen, instead, to build nuclear forces clearly designed to strike first, and thus disarm their adver-

sary. The Soviet Union is now moving toward deployment of new mobile MIRVed missiles which have these capabilities, plus the potential to avoid detection, monitoring or arms control verification. In doing this, the Soviet Union is undermining stability and the basis for mutual deterrence.

One can imagine several possible responses to the continued Soviet build-up of nuclear forces. On the one hand, we can ask the Soviet Union to reduce its offensive systems through equitable, verifiable arms control measures. We are pressing that case in Geneva. Thus far, however, we have heard nothing new from the other side.

A second possibility would be for the West to step up our current modernization effort to keep up with constantly accelerating Soviet deployments, not to regain superiority but merely to keep up with Soviet deployments. But is this really an acceptable alternative? Even if this course could be sustained by the West, it would produce a less stable strategic balance than the one we have today. Must we accept an endless process of nuclear arms competition? I don't think so. We need a better guarantee of peace than that.

And fortunately, there is a third possibility. It is to offset the continued Soviet offensive build-up in destabilizing weapons by developing defences against these weapons.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

In 1983 I launched a new research programme — the Strategic Defence Initiative.

The state of modern technology may soon make possible for the first time the ability to use non-nuclear systems to defeat ballistic missiles. The Soviets themselves have long recognized the value of defensive systems and have invested heavily in them. Indeed, they have spent as much on defensive systems as they have on offensive systems for more than 20 years.

This research programme will take time. As we proceed with it, we will remain within existing treaty constraints. We will also consult in the closest possible fashion with our allies. And when the time for decisions on the possible production and deployment of such systems comes, we must and will discuss and negotiate the issues with the Soviet Union.

Both for the short and the long term I am confident that the West can maintain effective military deterrence. But surely we can aspire to more than maintaining a state of highly-armed truce in international politics.

During the 1970s we went to great lengths to restrain unilaterally our strategic weapons programmes out of the conviction that the Soviet Union would adhere to certain rules in its conduct — rules such as neither side

Reagan

seeking to gain unilateral advantage at the expense of the other. Those efforts of the early 1970s resulted in some improvements in Europe, the Berlin Quadripartite Agreement being the best example. But the hopes for a broader and lasting moderation of the East-West competition founded in Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan and Nicaragua.

(Loud and sustained applause from the centre and the right)

Have we learned from those mistakes, and can we undertake a stable and peaceful relationship with the Soviet Union based upon effective deterrence and the reduction of tensions? I believe we can. I believe we have learned that fruitful cooperation with the Soviet Union must be accompanied by a successful competition in areas — particularly Third World areas — where the Soviets are not yet prepared to act with restraint.

(Some Members left the Chamber)

You know I have learned something useful: maybe if I talk long enough in my own Congress, some of those will walk out!

(Laughter and loud applause from the centre and the right)

Let me talk about the reflections which have moulded our policy towards the Soviet Union. That policy embodies the following basic elements:

- While we maintain deterrence to preserve the peace, the United States will make a steady, sustained effort to reduce tensions and solve problems in its relations with the Soviet Union.
- The United States is prepared to conclude fair, equitable, verifiable agreements for arms reduction — above all with regard to offensive nuclear weapons.
- The United States will insist upon compliance with past agreements, both for their own sake and to strengthen confidence in the possibility of future accords.
- The United States seeks no unilateral advantages and, of course, can accept none on the Soviet side.
- The United States will proceed in full consultation with its allies, recognizing that our fates are intertwined and we must act in unity.
- The United States does not seek to undermine or change the Soviet system, not to impinge upon the security of the Soviet Union. At the same time, it will resist attempts by the Soviet Union to use or

threaten force against others, or to impose its system on others by force.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Ultimately, I hope the leaders of the Soviet Union will come to understand that they have nothing to gain from attempts to achieve military superiority or to spread their dominance by force, but have much to gain from joining the West in mutual arms reduction and expanding cooperation.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

I have directed the Secretary of State to engage with the Soviet Union on an extended agenda of problem solving. Yet even as we embark upon new efforts to sustain a productive dialogue with the Soviet Union, we are reminded of the obstacles posed by our so fundamentally different concepts of humanity, of human rights, of the value of human life. The murder of Major Nicholson by a Soviet soldier in East Germany, and the Soviet Union's refusal to accept responsibility for this act, is only the latest reminder.

If we are to succeed in reducing East-West tensions, we must find means to ensure against the arbitrary use of lethal force in the future — whether against individuals like Major Nicholson, or against groups, such as the passengers on a jumbo jet.

(Applause)

It is for that reason that I would like to outline for you today what I believe would be a useful way to proceed. I propose that the United States and the Soviet Union take four practical steps.

First, that our two countries make a regular practice of exchanging observers at military exercises and locations. We now follow this practice with many other nations, to the equal benefit of all parties.

Second, as I believe it is desirable for the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union to meet and tackle problems, I am also convinced that the military leaders of our nations could benefit from more contact. I therefore propose that we institute regular, high-level contacts between Soviet and American military leaders, to develop better understanding and to prevent tragedies from occurring.

Third, I urge that the Conference on Disarmament in Europe act promptly and agree on the concrete, confidence-building measures proposed by the NATO countries. The United States is prepared to discuss the Soviet proposal on non-use of force in the context of Soviet agreement to concrete, confidence-building measures.

Fourth, I believe a permanent military-to-military communications link could serve a useful purpose in

Reagan

this importance area of our relationship. It could be the channel for exchanging notifications and other information regarding routine military activities, thereby reducing the chances of misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Over time, it might evolve into a 'risk-reduction' mechanism for rapid communication and exchange of data in times of crisis.

These proposals are not cure-alls for our current problems. They will not compensate for the deaths which have occurred. But as terrible as past events have been, it would be more tragic if we were to make no attempt to prevent even larger tragedies from occurring through lack of contact and communication.

We in the West have much to do — and we must do it together. We must remain unified in the face of attempts to divide us and strong in spite of attempts to weaken us.

(Loud and sustained applause)

We must remember that our unity and strength are not a mere impulse of like-minded allies, but the natural result of our shared love for liberty.

Surely we have no illusions that convergence of the Communist system and the free societies of the West is likely. We are in for an extended period of competition of ideas. It is up to us in the West to answer whether or not we will make available the resources, ideas and assistance necessary to compete with the Soviet Union in the Third World. We have much in our favour, not least the experience of those States which have tried Marxism and are looking for an alternative.

(Applause)

We do not aspire to impose our system on anyone, nor do we have pat answers for all the world's ills. But our ideals of freedom and democracy . . .

(Cries of 'Nicaragua' from the left)

Is there an echo in here?

(Laughter and loud applause from the centre and the right)

Our ideals of freedom and democracy and our economic systems have proven their ability to meet the needs of our people. Our adversaries can offer their people only economic stagnation and the corrupt hand of a State and party bureaucracy which ultimately satisfy neither material nor spiritual needs.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

I want to reaffirm to the people of Europe the constancy of the American purpose. We were at your side through two great wars. We have been at your side

through 40 years of a sometimes painful peace. We are at your side today because, like you, we have not veered from the ideals of the West — the ideals of freedom, liberty and peace. Let no one — no one — doubt our purpose.

The United States is committed not only to the security of Europe, we are committed to the recreation of a larger and more genuinely European Europe. The United States is committed not only to a partnership with Europe, the United States is committed to an end to the artificial division of Europe.

(Loud applause from the centre and the right)

We do not deny any nation's legitimate interest in security. We share the basic aspirations of all of the peoples of Europe — freedom, prosperity and peace. But when families are divided, and people are not allowed to maintain normal human and cultural contacts, this creates international tension. Only in a system in which all feel secure, and sovereign, can there be a lasting and secure peace.

For this reason, we will support and will encourage movement towards the social, humanitarian and democratic ideals shared in Europe. The issue is not one of state boundaries, but of ensuring the right of all nations to conduct their affairs as their peoples desire.

(Loud applause from the centre and the right)

The problem of a divided Europe, like others, must be solved by peaceful means. Let us rededicate ourselves to the full implementation of the Helsinki Final Act in all its aspects.

(Sustained applause)

As we seek to encourage democracy, we must remember that each country must struggle for democracy within its own culture. Emerging democracies have special problems and require special help. Those nations whose democratic institutions are newly emerged and whose confidence in the process is not yet deeply rooted need our help. They should have an established community of their peers, other democratic countries to whom they can turn for support or just advice.

In my address to the British Parliament in 1982, I spoke of the need for democratic governments to spread the message of democracy throughout the world. I expressed my support for the Council of Europe's effort to bring together delegates from many nations for this purpose. I am encouraged by the product of that conference, the 'Strasbourg Initiative'.

We in our country have launched a major effort to strengthen and promote democratic ideals and institutions. Following a pattern first started in the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States Congress

Reagan

approved the National Endowment for Democracy. This organization subsequently established institutes of labour, business and political parties dedicated to programmes of cooperation with democratic forces around the world. I hope other democracies will join in this effort and contribute their wisdom and talents to this cause.

Here in Western Europe, you have created a multi-national democratic Community in which there is a free flow of people, of information, of goods and of culture. West Europeans move frequently and freely in all directions, sharing and partaking of each other's ideas and culture. It is my hope that in the 21st century — which is only 15 years away — all Europeans from Moscow to Lisbon will be able to travel without a passport and a free flow of people and ideas will include the other half of Europe.

(Prolonged applause)

It is my fervent wish that in the next century there will be one, free Europe. I do not believe those who say that the people of Europe today are paralysed and pessimistic, and I would say to those who think this: Europe, beloved Europe, you are greater than you know. You are the treasury of centuries of Western thought and Western culture. You are the father of Western ideals and the mother of Western faith.

Europe, you have been the power and the glory of the West and you are a moral success. In the horrors after World War II you rejected totalitarianism, you rejected the lure of the new 'Superman' and a 'New Communist Man'. You proved that you were, and are, a moral triumph. You in the West are a Europe without illusions, a Europe firmly grounded in the ideals and traditions that made her greatness, a Europe unbound and unfettered by a bankrupt ideology. You are today a new Europe, on the brink of a new century, a democratic Community with much to be proud of.

We have much to do. The work ahead is not unlike the building of a great cathedral. The work is slow,

complicated and painstaking. It is passed on with pride from generation to generation. It is the work not only of leaders but of ordinary people. The cathedral evolves as it is created, with each generation adding its own vision — but the initial ideal remains constant and the faith that drives the vision persists. The results may be slow to see, but our children and their children will trace in the air the emerging arches and spires and know the faith and dedication and love that produced them. My friends, Europe is the cathedral and it is illuminated still.

And if you doubt your will, and your spirit, and your strength to stand for something, think of those people 40 years ago who wept in the rubble, who laughed in the streets, who paraded across Europe, who cheered Churchill with love and devotion, who sang the Marseillaise down the boulevards. Spirit like that does not disappear; it cannot perish; it will not go away. There is too much left unsung within it.

I would like just to conclude with one line and say: We have seen evidence here of your faith in democracy, in the ability of some to speak up freely as they prefer to speak. And yet I cannot help but remind all of us that some who take advantage of that right of democracy seem unaware that if the government that they would advocate became reality, no one would have that freedom to speak up again.

(Loud and prolonged applause)

Thank you all for your graciousness on this great day. Thank you, and God bless you all!

(Standing ovation)

Mr Pierre Pflimlin, President of the European Parliament. — *(FR)* On behalf of the overwhelming majority of this Parliament and of the peoples we represent, I thank you, Mr President.

(Parliament gave the President of the United States a long standing ovation, then resumed its applause for the President of Parliament)

(The formal sitting was closed at 3.15 p.m.)

ANNEX

I. *Questions to the Commission**Question No 3, by Mr Fanton (H-394/84)*

Subject: Bilateral contracts for the supply of gas

In view of the revision of certain bilateral contracts between Member States of the Community and non-member supplier countries — France and Algeria or the USSR, for example — and in view of the effects of the increase in the rates charged to the consumer as a result of the extra cost of these negotiated deliveries, does the Commission not feel that it is in the interests of the Community as a whole to adopt a joint comprehensive strategy for gas supplies and does it intend to raise the matter with the Council?

Answer

Natural gas continues to play an important role in Community energy supplies and at the moment covers just on 20% of its energy needs. The increase in this percentage, which was 12% in 1972, i.e. immediately before the first oil crisis, illustrates the important contribution natural gas makes to the diversification of Community energy supplies and to reducing its over dependence on oil.

At the end of the Seventies natural gas imports from non-member countries grew rapidly within the Community's gas supply framework. This proportion rose from 11% of total supplies in 1977 to 26% in 1980, at which time the Commission took the initiative to submit to the Council a series of Communications on the development of natural gas supply and demand and, in particular, on the Community's growing dependence on imports from non-member countries and concerning the consequences of this for supply security. The Commission was assisted in its work by experts from Member States.

During its meeting in November 1982, the Council, after examining the Commission's initial study on the security of future Community gas supplies, concluded that the Commission should continue to monitor the natural gas supply situation in consultation with the Member States.

Last year the Commission submitted two Communications to the Council concerning natural gas, and these were also submitted to the European Parliament. I would like to mention here the extremely useful work done by the European Parliament's Committee on Energy, Research and Technology in the form of its report, drawn up by Mr Rogers, on Community gas policy, a report which provided valuable support for the Commission's work by drawing attention to this sector. The first Communication (COM(84) 120), concerning Community natural gas supplies up to the year 2000, looked at supply sources, diversification of supplies and security measures. The second Communication (COM(84) 583) extended this analysis and looked at the future role of natural gas in the Community. In this latter Communication the Commission noted the potential competition between gas producers in supplying the Community market, and the possibility of Community importers taking advantage of this to increase in natural gas share of the market.

Present Community legislation does not regulate natural gas imports. Negotiation and renegotiation of commercial contracts concerning natural gas supplies is principally a matter for the gas companies involved. Nevertheless, all import contracts have to be approved by the government of the Member State concerned. The second Communication on natural gas submitted by the Commission to the Council in 1984 underlined that 'in order to maintain a watch on the Community's natural gas supply and its security, the Commission considers it desirable that certain key topics are regularly analysed and discussed between national gas experts and the Commission. Such topics would include the development of the natural gas supply situation as a whole, diversification of supply sources and security measures, and procedures to be adopted in the event of an emergency.' It is therefore natural that in future such discussions focus on the issue of natural gas supply contracts and renegotiations such as those now under way with the USSR and Algeria.

The Commission is able to follow Community developments in the natural gas field closely due to its regular bilateral discussions and its exchanges of views with the Member States, and also thanks to its close contacts with the Community gas industry and with producer-country governments such as Norway, Algeria, Nigeria and Canada. The Commission believes that this process of consultation and regular reporting to the Council should be continued and reinforced because it is an effective way of protecting and promoting Community interests in the natural gas sector.

*
* *

Question No 8, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (H-614/84)

Subject: Transport of horses

In its resolution of 10 June 1983 the European Parliament tackled the question of the transport of horses. What action has been taken in response to this resolution? What are the Commission's intentions, in particular, as regards reducing the distances over which horses are transported and what measures does the Commission intend to take when strikes or any other circumstances lead to animals in transit being held up at frontiers?

Answer

I am aware that public opinion is upset by the trade in live horses, and the Commission has been closely following this question.

On a proposal from the Commission, the Council has already adopted a number of directives on the protection of animals during international transport.¹ They are based on the Council of Europe's International Agreement on the subject, contain precise regulations for the protection of all types of animals, and apply to all forms of transport. One of the directives also provides for a special certificate which must accompany the animals during transport, as well as inspections to check compliance with the stipulated conditions.

With a view to establishing what further measures it can take, the Commission has carried out a thorough study of the transport of animals for slaughter last year. A detailed report is now available.

Precise information is required so that the legislation can be adapted. But even at this stage it will be possible to adopt a number of practical measures to improve the situation. We consider that this can be done by adjusting the Community code of conduct for this sector. An urgent investigation is currently being undertaken to provide a sound basis for such adjustments.

Furthermore there are Community health rules for intra-Community trade in fresh meat, including horsemeat.² These stipulate that horses must be inspected before being slaughtered, in particular to check whether they are suffering from fatigue, anxiety or injury. Animals may not be slaughtered unless they have been allowed to rest completely; tired or anxious animals must be allowed at least 24 hours' rest.

The Commission is taking further measures to insure that these Community rules are more strictly applied by the Member States.

*
* *

¹ OJ L 200 of 8. 8. 1977, p. 10.

OJ L 150 of 6. 6. 1981, p. 1.

² OJ 121 of 24. 7. 1964, p. 2012/64.

Question No 10, by Mrs Dupuy (H-621/84)

Subject: Consequences of the cold weather in the Community

Is the Commission aware of the serious consequences of the wave of exceptionally cold weather on certain products, particularly in the Mediterranean regions, which are having a substantial effect in terms of price rises, and does it plan to make emergency aid available to the most seriously affected regions of the Community?

Answer

Because of the nature of the bad weather to which the honourable Member refers, which is a seasonal climatic phenomenon affecting the Community as a whole and of indeterminate duration and exceptional magnitude, and also because of the scope of the aid sought, these resolutions imply measures which greatly exceed the nature, limits, possibilities and purpose of Article 690 of the Budget, which was intended to provide emergency aid to members of the public in the Community affected by disasters.

The very limited appropriation provided under this Article, reduced by the Budgetary Authorities to 2 750 000 ECU for 1985, and use of which is limited still further by the provisional twelfths system, only allows for intervention as a mark of Community solidarity in cases of localized and unforeseen natural disasters whose consequences can be contained.

*
* *

Question No 11, by Mr Juppe (H-640/84)

Subject: Plan by the United States to tax imports of oil and consumer goods

Is the Commission aware that Congress is currently studying a plan to introduce degressive taxes of 20, 15 and 7% per year on imports of oil and consumer goods over a period of three years, with a view to reducing the budgetary and trade deficits, and has it assessed the serious consequences of such measures, if they are adopted, for Community exports of the products concerned?

Answer

I would refer the honourable Member to the statement made by my colleague Mr Andriessen in the course of the debate on the Parliament's draft resolution on the possible introduction of an import surcharge by the United States which was held on 17 January.

I am of course aware that the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has been asked to examine the question. However, the CBO is not a branch of the executive in the US and exists to give Congress independent economic information and advice. It does not make policy recommendations. For the present, there is still no indication that the matter is being considered as a serious policy option within the Administration itself; however, the Commission continues to watch developments very closely. I can confirm that the Commission, within the spirit of Parliament's resolution, will remind the United States of their international obligations, and of the gravity of the situation which would result in the event of application of an import surcharge becoming official US Government policy. The Commission will not hesitate to make the necessary proposals to the Council, in conformity with our rights and obligations in GATT.

*
* *

Question No 17, by Mr Roelants du Vivier (H-43/85)¹

Subject: Commission's 18th general report

In its Eighteenth General Report on the Activities of the European Communities — point 389 — the Commission refers to ten communications received under the notification agreements of 5 May 1973. Would the Commission state the subject of these communications and the action taken thereon?

Answer

The Commission receives frequently information from Member States on legislation which is being prepared at national level. The ten communications mentioned in the 18th General Report under no 389 dealt with information sent to the Commission under the information agreements of 5 May 1973 on environment matters, but also under the general standstill agreements for industrial policy which were agreed at Community level in 1969 and 1972. The information on draft environment legislation which was sent to the Commission dealt with the following issues:

1. Information of 23 February 1984 from the Dutch Government, sending a 'Note on acidity and an assessment report of acidity through atmospheric disposal'. The Commission did not undertake specific action on reception of these documents, since air pollution and in particular acid rain was subject to a number of activities at EEC level.
2. Information of 15 March by the Danish Government on draft Danish legislation concerning liability of SO₂ pollution from energy-producing installations. No specific action was undertaken, as air-pollution by SO₂ is the subject-matter of several activities at Community level.
3. Communication of 30 March 1984 by the Danish Government concerning draft Danish legislation on the use of CFCs as solvents and in aerosols. In the meantime the draft was enacted in Denmark. The Commission has received a complaint on this legislation and is presently examining the compatibility of the Danish law with Community law.
4. Communication of 9 October 1984 by the Danish Government concerning State aids for the reutilization of paper and packages and on clean technologies. No specific action was undertaken on this subject.
5. Communication of 15 November 1984 by the British Government on the Food and Environment Protection Bill. Subsequent to this communication the Commission informed the United Kingdom Government of its intention to elaborate a Community proposal on waste deposits at sea, which is presently being elaborated.

*
* *

Question No 18, by Mr McCartin (H-744/84)

Subject: Specific Regional Development Measure contributing to the improvement of the economic and social situation of the border areas of Ireland and Northern Ireland

Can the Commission please say whether it intends to submit to the Council a further measure to assist the border areas of Ireland and Northern Ireland when the Specific Regional Development Measure, Regulation (EEC) 2619/80,² expires in December of this year?

¹ Former oral question without debate (O-137/84), converted into a question for Question Time.

² OJ No L 271, 15. 10. 1980, p. 28.

Answer

In December 1984, the Commission submitted to the Council four proposals supplementing the second set of specific measures adopted in January 1984. One of these proposals is specifically designed to consolidate existing activities to assist the Irish and Northern Irish border areas referred to by the honourable Member.

This would involve the provision of additional funding, enlargement of the scheme's geographical scope, new measures to develop small and medium-sized undertakings, and, in Ireland, improvements in the field of energy. Lastly, it is proposed to extend these activities for a further five years.

*
* *

Question No 19, by Mr Papoutsis (H-755/84)

Subject: The possibilities of concluding sponge-fishing agreements between the Community and third countries

The Community has already successfully negotiated fisheries agreements with many third countries. These agreements have produced considerable results in that they expand the scope for development of Community fishing (agreements on fishing in third countries' waters) and provide for the monitoring of the market in fishery products (agreements laying down import and export quotas). Could the Commission investigate the possibilities of concluding agreements in the sponge-fishing sector, in particular with the Mediterranean countries of North Africa?

Answer

The Commission is ready to study whether it is worthwhile negotiating sponge-fishing agreements with non-member countries as and when real interest and real possibilities arise in this regard.

*
* *

Question No 22, by Mrs Marinaro (H-801/84)

Subject: Compulsory fingerprinting of foreigners

At the express instruction of the Belgian Ministry of Justice, local authorities in Belgium have for years taken the step of fingerprinting foreigners.

Since there is no provision that requires the Ministry to obtain such fingerprints, since the Belgian Government does not apply this measure to its own citizens, and since the European Convention on Human Rights prohibits any discrimination on grounds of nationality, does the Commission not think the time has arrived to put an end to this practice which smacks of police-state tactics and is contrary to the spirit of the Treaty of Rome and the principle of non-discrimination between Community citizens?

Answer

According to the information available to the Commission, a finger-printing requirement is applied in Belgium both to nationals of Member States who are subject to proceedings for acts regarded by the national authorities as incompatible with public order, and to citizens of Member States who apply for registration at the 'Commune', including their children who reach the age of 17.

Finger-printing is part of an information-sheet (bulletin de renseignements) concerning all foreigners, which is completed by the administration when they register as foreigners.

The Commission does not believe that a finger-printing requirement can be *systematically* applied to EEC immigrant workers only, and not to nationals, in circumstances where their personal conduct does not justify that the national authorities invoke grounds of public policy or public security.

The Commission has already started an infringement procedure, and is taking all necessary steps to have this finger-printing requirement abolished.

*
* *

Question No 28, by Mr Ford (H-377/84)

Subject: Caribbean airline 'Leeward Islands Air Transport'

Can the Commission confirm recent press reports that the Caribbean airline 'Leeward Islands Air Transport', which has been seeking a 20 million EEC loan to purchase the British Aerospace Super-748 aeroplanes — is being pressurized by DG VIII to purchase alternative less satisfactory aircraft from other EEC based companies and does this not mean that DG VIII is breaching the principle of free and fair competition between aircraft manufacturing companies and Member States?

Answer

The Commission is astounded to learn of press reports according to which it has pressurized the Caribbean airline LIAT to accept reportedly less satisfactory aeroplanes. The Commission categorically rejects the content of these reports and expresses its consternation that such allegations are repeatedly put forward in the press without being substantiated by the slightest evidence.

The Commission administers the funds contributed by the European taxpayers in strict accordance with the rules laid down by the EEC and ACP states signatory to the Lomé Convention. Article 121(2) provides that in conjunction with his ACP counterpart, the Chief Authorizing-Officer — the Director-General for Development — ensures equality of competition in procurement procedures and that the tender selected is economically the most advantageous. In the case of LIAT the Commission has adhered strictly to the above rules.

The Commission consequently repudiates any affirmation that the principles of free and fair competition have not been respected in this case.

*
* *

Question No 29, by Mr von Wogau (H-546/84)

Subject: Tax disadvantages suffered by frontier-zone workers under the double taxation agreement between West Germany and the Netherlands

Under the double taxation agreement between West Germany and the Netherlands German frontier-zone workers who work in the Netherlands pay tax in the Netherlands. They are unable to obtain tax advantages available under West German tax law, for example on depreciation under paragraph 7(b) of the Income Tax Law, in either the Federal Republic of Germany or the Netherlands. Under a Commission proposal for a directive the income of frontier-zone workers is to be taxed in their country of residence. This would be a help in the case that has been brought to my attention. However, the German

tax authorities consider that this arrangement could be two-edged. Does the Commission agree with the relevant German authorities that taxation in the country of residence could be two-edged because tax relief for certain groups of workers would be accompanied by a heavier tax burden on others?

Answer

Where an individual is treated as a non-resident in the State of employment he can frequently claim only a restricted range of tax reliefs and allowances available to residents. The directive prepared by the Commission, which would entail taxation in the State of residence, would avoid this particular disadvantage. Whether there would be an overall advantage or a disadvantage in the individual case would however depend not simply on this factor, but also on the relative rates of taxation in the two countries.

*
* *

Question No 31, by Mr Van Miert (H-589/84)

Subject: Portugal

How many seats in the European Parliament are to be given to Portugal, with 14 million inhabitants, on its accession to the European Communities and how was the figure arrived at?

Answer

According to the latest figures published by Eurostat for 1982 (cf. Eurostat 1984 'Demographic Statistics'), Portugal has a population of 10 033 000 (this figure includes all the population residing on Portugal's territory, excluding Portuguese nationals living abroad).

Considering that this population is very similar and therefore comparable to those of Belgium and Greece (which, according to the same publication, and on the same basis, have 9 856 000 and 9 792 000 inhabitants respectively), the Community has proposed that the number of Portuguese seats in the European Parliament be identical to that of these two other Member States, i.e. 24. (N.B. the Netherlands has 25 seats, for a population residing on its national territory of 14 313 000.)

Portugal has accepted this proposal.

*
* *

Question No 33, by Mr Alavanos (H-655/84)

Subject: Possible proceedings against Greece before the European Court of Justice in respect of thirty agricultural cases

In statements to representatives of the EEC cereals trade, Mr Claude Villain, Director-General for Agriculture at the Commission, stressed in connection with the alignment of Greece with the Common Agricultural Policy that, after the period of instruction, the time for discipline had arrived. Mr Villain stated that the Commission was already examining 30 cases of 'violations' which would, if necessary, be referred to the European Court of Justice.

In view of the fact that the statements by Mr Villain have caused great concern among Greek farmers, who fear new blows from the EEC Commission, and since they follow a long list of cases already brought before the European Court of Justice, would the Com-

mission state what these cases involve and on what grounds the EEC intends referring them to the European Court of Justice?

Answer

The Commission is naturally concerned about the large number of infringements of Community law committed by Greece in the agricultural field.

It is significant that the former Director General of Agriculture made the comments referred to by the honourable Parliamentarian at a meeting of Representatives of the European Cereals Trade as it is in the cereals sector where the greatest number of problems have arisen.

Examples included:

- Failure of the Greek authorities to ensure that Community quality standards for durum wheat purchased by its intervention agency are properly observed;
- Use of 'currency licence' system to manage on a national basis imports and exports of cereals particularly feed grains;
- Use of the cooperative organization Kydep to pursue national policy aims by facilitating the operation of a national regime for feed grains under which it would appear that the public authorities systematically make up the losses sustained by the organization in connection with its sales of feed grains at less than cost price;
- Failure to observe Community procedures systematically for example the rules governing tendering arrangements for intervention stocks and extending the validity of export certificates without proper authority;
- Interfering in the machinery of price format of flour and semolina.

Outside the cereals area, the largest number of infringements and substantiated complaints concern direct and indirect restrictions on the import or export of agricultural commodities and export aids failure to implement Directives on time.

The legal basis of the infringements is either the breach of the rules of the common organization of the market in the relevant commodity sector or breach of Articles 30-34 of the EEC Treaty.

*
* *

Question No 34, by Mr Rogalla (H-718/84)

Subject: Relations between the Community and Canada

How does the Commission view relations between the Community and Canada during the last ten years in the light of political indicators and any trade conflicts, and what individual criteria justify one's speaking of 'sound development'?

Answer

In general, relations between the European Community and Canada have developed over the last ten years in a satisfactory, and in certain areas, successful way.

The most important event in the development of a closer relationship was the conclusion in 1976 of the Framework Agreement for commercial and economic cooperation. The Agreement has led to a number of positive results in the area of industrial cooperation as well as cooperation in the field of science and technology and environment policy. The Community and Canada have also been successful in concluding a Long Term Fisheries Agreement in 1981, complemented in 1984, and in the smooth implementation — except

for one period in the late 1970s — of the Euratom/Canada Agreement of 1959. In December 1984 an agreement was reached on a new duty-free import quota for Canadian newsprint. The semi-annual high-level consultations have allowed both sides to regularly discuss their bilateral commercial problems.

Notwithstanding the presence of such a privileged framework, EC/Canada trade relations have not escaped from getting into rough waters from time to time, an evolution which appears to be unavoidable between important trading partners. However, the present tension over Canada's restrictive import policy regarding footwear and beef and over the discriminatory practices of Canada's provincial liquor boards constitute a rather exceptional low. The Commission hopes that an early solution can be found to these contentious points in order to avoid protracted tensions affecting the traditionally good and friendly relationship with Canada.

*
* *

Question No 37, by Mr Collins (H-810/84)

Subject: Recording and rental of audio and videos copyright material

Is the Commission aware that the United Kingdom Government has published a Green Paper on 'The recording and rental of audio and video copyright material' in which a levy on all audio and video tapes is suggested? Does the Commission agree that such a levy merely assumes that all purchasers of tapes are intending to use them illegally and in the main penalizes consumers who tape their own records and videos for recording programmes so that they can watch them later?

Answer

The Commission is aware of the UK Government's consultative document: 'The recording and rental of audio and video copyright material'; The Commission proposes to publish this year a green paper on copyright which will deal *inter alia* with the suggestion that levies should be imposed on blank recording tape. Such information as is available suggests that while much recording tape is indeed used for viewing television programmes at convenient times, a substantial quantity is also used for the unauthorized reproduction of audio and video works subject to copyright. The general objective must clearly be to find a solution which is fair to all the interest involved.

*
* *

Question No 38, by Mr Moorhouse (H-830/84)

Subject: Laker Anti-Trust Case

Will the Commission check that the alleged conspiracy by British Airways, Pan Am, Sabena etc. to force Laker Airways off the transatlantic air route, and presently the subject of an American antitrust suit, is not in breach of EEC Competition Law? If there is a breach, will the Commission use all of its available powers to prosecute any breaches that might be discovered?

Answer

An Article 85/86 violation must have an appreciable effect on intra-Community trade. To justify launching an investigation of this size and complexity the effect on trade should be at least direct, appreciable and not just potential.

Furthermore to prove an infringement of the competition rules in this case the Commission would require substantial powers of investigation supported by sanctions which in the air transport sector it does not have because the necessary regulation proposed by the Commission in 1981 has still not been adopted by the Council.

The Commission considers that the air tariff approval system as a whole of which airline consultation forms an essential part, is in need of reform. Such reform has been proposed by the Commission in its Civil Aviation Memorandum II. Given the dimensions of the problem therefore the Commission thinks that it would be unwise to intervene in this particular case.

*
* *

Question No 39, by Mr Elles (H-144/85)¹

Subject: Practice of Medicine

Will the Commission please state what action it has taken concerning the intention of certain countries to introduce reforms of medical studies which will seriously contravene the Directive concerning the practice of medicine, and set back the possibility of harmonization of differing Member States' systems in the Community?

Answer

The provisions for the mutual recognition of diplomas and for freedom of movement of Community nationals holding medical qualifications awarded by Member States are set out in Directives 75/363/EEC and 75/363/EEC,² as modified by Directive 82/76/EEC.³ If arrangements made by a Member State in respect of medical training are in breach of the provisions of these directives, the Commission would initiate infraction proceedings under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty.

In the Commission's view, no Member State has recently introduced reforms in medical training — or has announced proposals for such reforms — which infringe these directives.

*
* *

Question No 41, by Mr Christodoulou (H-5/85)

Subject: Greek Government Development Programme

In reply to my previous question on the financing of the five-year Greek Government Development Programme, the Council stated (last December) that it was awaiting the Commission's proposals and the Commission replied that it was examining the matter and proposals and decisions would be forthcoming 'soon'. As some considerable time has already passed with no new developments, would the Commission state what the situation is regarding this matter and what stage of the decision-making procedure has been reached?

Answer

As the Commission already explained last December to Parliament, the dossiers concerning the projects envisaged under the five-year Greek Social and Economic Development

¹ Former oral question without debate (0-156/84), converted into a question for Question Time.

² OJEC No L 167 of 30. 6. 1985.

³ OJEC No L 43 of 15. 2. 1982.

Plan were submitted to the Commission at the end of May and of July 1984. These dossiers, quite large ones at that, have since been under study by the Commission's Departments. At its meeting of 19 December 1984 the Commission, briefed on the results of this examination, noted the need to study in greater detail certain of the projects proposed by the Greek government.

Moreover, I would draw the honourable Member's attention to the fact that the Commission — in relation to the Council's blocking of the previous proposal for the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes — has, since the beginning of the year, developed a new approach for these Integrated Mediterranean Programmes. This approach, which has just been approved by the Brussels European Council, attaches particular importance to the problems faced by Greece, and replies in particular to the Greek requests concerning the large-scale projects contained in the five-year plan.

Study of these projects has entered an intensive phase and we hope to conclude this work soon.

*
* *

Question No 42, by Mr Wurtz (H-8/85)

Subject: New standards for the manufacture of chocolate

Under the terms of a 1973 directive, in addition to sugar, milk and dried fruit, only products obtained from cocoa may be used in the manufacture of chocolate. According to my information, the Commission has been planning to authorize the use of vegetable fats for the manufacture of chocolate in proportions of up to 5% of the total weight of the products used. How can the Commission justify such a proposal, which is likely to have serious repercussions on the cocoa exporting ACP states, especially Cameroon and Nigeria?

Answer

The ingredients which are used in chocolate making are derived from cocoa bean and sugars, but the directive referred to by the honourable Member permits the addition of a variety of other materials up to a maximum of 40% by weight in order that a variety of chocolates may be manufactured to meet the demand of the market. In addition to cocoa butter or fat, dairy fats are allowed to be added. In addition, in Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom the possibility of adding 5% of edible vegetable fats other than those derived from cocoa was maintained by the Council when the directive was adopted. All chocolates legally manufactured in a Member State are allowed free circulation, provided that the labelling gives adequate information to consumers.

The Commission has sent to the Council a proposal for modification of the basic directive, which consolidates a number of previous modifications and also extends the possibility of using up to 5% edible vegetable fats to the Community industry as a whole. This proposal is currently before Parliament.

Consultations with ACP countries are now in progress concerning this question.

*
* *

Question No 43, by Mr Pearce (H-21/85)

Subject: German beer

While waiting for Germany to obey the rules of the 'Common Market' and admit foreign beer to its markets, will the Commission authorize the other Member States to keep German beer out of their territories?

Answer

Community law affords no basis for the line of action proposed by the honourable Member. The fact that one Member State may be in breach of its obligation under the Treaty cannot justify other Member States breaching their obligations.

As the honourable Member will be aware, the Commission is currently taking proceedings against the German Government in this particular case.

*
* *

Question No 45, by Mr O'Donnell (H-57/85)

Subject: ERDF Non-Quota Section to Irish cross-border projects

Could the Commission state the total amount of funds committed under the ERDF Non-Quota Section to Irish cross-border projects; the total payments made; whether the Commission is satisfied with the progress to date and if not whether it is proposed to formulate any new strategies for cross-border development such as integrated development programmes?

Answer

Community aid of 16 MECU was granted to Ireland for the implementation of its 5 year programme (1981-1985) under the specific Community Measure for the border areas of Ireland and Northern Ireland.¹ Payments made to date under this programme amount to some 8.5 MECU. These payments are made by means of advances on annual tranches in line with progress made on implementing the programme.

Whilst it is true that, in the initial stages, the implementation of the programme took off rather slowly, it has progressively gathered pace and, as the Member State concerned has now assured the Commission that the total aid granted under the special measure will be committed by the end of the programme, the Commission is satisfied that the programme will be fully implemented. The honourable Member will be aware that the Commission has, last year, submitted a proposal to the Council² to reinforce the existing measure which benefits the border areas of Ireland and Northern Ireland.

*
* *

Question No 46, by Mr Romeo (H-83/85)

Subject: The effect of provisional twelfths on the farming sector

The European Parliament has rejected the budget which was based on the principle of financial discipline and proposed, *inter alia*, to reduce EAGGF appropriations by 1 315 m ECU. On the basis of Article 204 of the Treaty of Rome, the Commission is using the provisional twelfths system to finance existing policies.

Has the Commission considered that the application of the provisional twelfths system leads in effect to a reduction in appropriations for the farming sector and in structural measures and, furthermore, will the new Commission take into account in drawing up the new budget the proposals of the European Parliament and the decision of the European

¹ Council Regulation (EEC) No 2619/80 of 7 October 1980, OJ L 271, 15. 10. 1980.

² Proposal for a Council Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2619/80, COM(84) 715 final of 14. 12. 1984.

Council in Fontainebleau regarding an increase in the Communities' own resources (an increase of the VAT ceiling to 1.4%)?

Answer

As the honourable Member has recalled, the Commission had to resort to the 'provisional twelfths' system following the European Parliament's rejection of the 1985 draft budget.

The Commission has applied this system in accordance with the provisions of Article 204 of the Treaty and Article 8 of the Financial Regulations applicable to the General Budget of the European Communities. Although this system decreases the appropriations available, the CAP beneficiaries have not yet suffered any adverse effects.

On 1 April 1985 the Commission submitted to the Budgetary Authority a letter of amendment concerning the 1985 preliminary draft budget, on the basis of which the Council adopted a new draft budget on 24 April 1985.

The Commission hopes that Parliament will approve the 1985 budget as soon as possible and that this budget will prove to be a most thorough response to the honourable Member's concerns.

*
* *

Question No 47, by Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken (H-90/85)

Subject: Proposal for a Council resolution on a second programme of action of the European Communities on safety and health at work (submitted to the Council by the Commission on 4 November 1982)

The abovementioned proposal for a resolution expresses the political will to take, in keeping with the urgency of the matter and bearing in mind what is feasible at national and Community level, the measures required so that by the end of 1988 priority actions can be undertaken in connection with protection against dangerous substances, protection against accidents and other hazards, organizational aspects, monitoring, training and information, statistics, research and cooperation.

Will the Commission state what actions are to be given priority and whether it will be possible to put the abovementioned programme of action into effect by 1988?

Answer

The resolution on a second programme of action of the European Communities on safety and health at work¹ was adopted by Council on 27 February 1984, at which time the Commission was requested to prepare annually, after consulting the Member States, a forward outline of the work it intends to carry out on the implementation of this resolution.

In addition to consulting the Member States, the Commission has sought the assistance of the Advisory Committee on Safety, Hygiene and Health Protection at Work, prior to drawing up the forward outline. The 1984 implementation plan has been transmitted to Parliament as an annex to the Eighth Progress Report of the Committee² and the 1985 plan which has already been prepared will be annexed to the Ninth Progress Report.

To ensure the progressive implementation of the second programme of action by 1988 the Commission will continue to establish annual forward outlines of work using the procedure.

*
* *

¹ OJ No C 67, 8. 3. 1984, p. 2.

² COM(84) 628 final.

Question No 48, by Mr C. Jackson (H-86/85)

Subject: Anti-Dumping and Anti-Subsidy Activities

The Second Annual Report of the Commission of the European Communities on the Community's Anti-Dumping and Anti-Subsidy Activities reveals an increase in the Commission's activities in this field, especially in relation to the number of cases concluded.

In the light also of United States experience, does the Commission foresee an increasing number of complaints being raised by EEC industries against third country imports and does the Commission therefore consider that the size and staff complement of its department is adequate to obtain and verify all the relevant detailed data from all interested parties within a reasonable time period?

Answer

The Second Annual Report of the Commission of the European Communities on the Community's Anti-Dumping and Anti-Subsidy Activities covered 1983, during which 38 investigations were opened.

The number of investigations opened rose to 49 in 1984, and proceedings were started in 24 cases during the first four months of 1985. Thus the workload in this field has already increased, and the number of complaints can be expected to rise after the accession of Spain and Portugal.

In view of this, the Commission will do its utmost to conduct the investigations as quickly and as effectively as possible.

Because of the limited number of Commission staff available, however, it is most unlikely that the average duration of investigations will be shortened. Indeed, under certain circumstances, investigations might take longer.

*
* *

Question No 49, by Mr Lomas (H-92/85)

Subject: Rules for qualifying for EEC funding

The Commission will be aware that grants from the Social Fund are conditional upon matching money being received by projects from public money in the individual country. In Britain, many projects are currently jointly funded with the Social Fund, by local authorities, including the GLC, which the British Government is proposing to abolish.

Is the Commission prepared to waive the rules in those areas where the British Government has abolished the democratically elected local councils, as otherwise such projects will not qualify for EEC funding?

Answer

It is a requirement of Social Fund aid that Fund assistance cannot exceed the amount of the financial contribution of the public authorities of the Member State concerned. The waiving of this rule would require an opinion of the Commission to the Council, requesting an amendment to Article 5 of the basic Council Decision on the tasks of the European Social Fund. The need for such an opinion derives from Article 10 of the basic Decision and ultimately from Article 126 of the Treaty of Rome, which together reveal that the Council may only amend Social Fund rules on the basis of a Commission opinion.

The Commission is not prepared to give such an opinion to the Council in order to amend the requirement for a financial contribution by the public authorities. The rule of joint

financing has a dual purpose, in that it both stimulates vocational training effort in the Member State and constitutes an indispensable element of the guarantee given by Member States for the successful completion of each operation (Article 2 of the basic Council Decision).

*
* *

Question No 50, by Mr De Gucht (H-93/85)¹

Subject: Integrated measures on behalf of Limburg (Belgium)

- A. Recognizing the need for specific measures on behalf of certain backward regions and problem areas as defined in Council Regulation (EEC) No 216/84 of 18 January 1984,
- B. whereas Belgian Limburg is in every respect eligible for such assistance,
- C. whereas during the Flemish Council sitting of 13 December 1984 the President of the Flemish Executive was called upon to request the European Commission for integrated measures,
 1. Can the Commission state whether such an application for integrated measures for Limburg has already been made?
 2. If so, what initiatives have already been taken and what progress has been made on any studies?
 3. In general: what is the European Commission's position with regard to Limburg and the machinery for integrated measures?

Answer

The Commission points out that Council Regulation (EEC) No 216/84 of 18 January 1984,² to which the honourable Member refers, concerns regions affected by restructuring of the steel industry. The criteria used to define its territorial field of application would not allow application of this regulation in Limburg province.

At the end of January 1985 the Belgian authorities asked the Commission to co-finance a study preparatory to integrated measures for Limburg province.

Taking into consideration the socio-economic problems currently experienced by this province, the Commission decided on 16 April 1985 to co-finance this study. The Commission contribution amounts to 1.5 million Bfrs, i.e. 75% of the cost of the study.

*
* *

Question No 51, by Mrs Crawley (H-95/85)

Subject: EEC funds for British Telecom

Given the recent disclosures of extensive phone tapping by MI5 in the UK, is the Commission aware of whether or not the latest tranche of EEC funds for British Telecom has assisted the development of System X, which, it is maintained, makes telephone surveillance even more difficult to detect?

¹ Former oral question without debate (O-121/84), converted into a question for Question Time.

² OJ L 27 of 31. 1. 1984.

Answer

Aid from the European Regional Development Fund to British Telecom has been granted in respect of physical investments in telephone exchanges, telecommunications lines and communications networks throughout the United Kingdom: no such assistance has been given towards the development cost of System X.

*
* *

Question No 53, by Mr McMahon (H-101/85)

Subject: European Poverty Programme

Can the Commission give an indication of how many applications have been received from Member States for the above programme and what are likely to be the allocations and number of projects under the scheme?

Answer

The date limit for applications from Member States for funding under the Poverty Programme is 31 May 1985. None has been received so far and the Commission is not at present in a position to forecast either the number of projects or the likely allocations under the scheme.

*
* *

Question No 54, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-102/85)

Subject: Suspension of duties for certain products intended for use in the construction, maintenance and repair of aircraft¹

Does the Commission feel that the Community's aircraft industry would benefit further if these measures were applied for the exemption of customs duties for certain important products destined for the construction, repair, maintenance, rebuilding, modification or transformation of all types of aircraft, and not only civil aircraft?

Answer

The Commission takes the view that the Community's civil aircraft industry benefits, in general, from the suspension of tariffs on aircraft and aircraft components in the Community's export markets. This is why the Community is a party to the GATT agreement on trade in civil aircraft negotiated during the Tokyo Round of multilateral trade negotiations in 1979.

As far as military aircraft are concerned however, these are not covered by the GATT agreement and are subject to normal tariff treatment in the Community as in other countries.

From a legal point of view the Commission holds that the common commercial tariff applies to the import of defence equipment, including aircraft, into the Community by virtue of Articles 9 and 28 of the Treaty of Rome. This is disputed by a number of Member States, against which the Commission is currently contemplating proceedings under Article 169 of the Treaty.

¹ OJ L 317 of 6. 12. 1984.

As the honourable Member will be aware, defence procurement as such falls outwith the competence of the Community; the Commission is not therefore in a position to comment on whether or not the suspension of duties for military aircraft would benefit the Community military aircraft industry.

*
* *

Question No 55, by Mrs Squarzialupi (H-104/85)

Subject: Slaughter of birds of prey in Calabria and Sicily

Every year in April and May, in the area around the Straits of Messina, hundreds of unlicensed hunters, many from abroad, kill hundreds of birds of prey: honey buzzards, harriers, black kites and others, to be subsequently stuffed and mounted. At the same time, ecologists try to prevent this slaughter by setting up base camps for surveillance purposes. But the area to be kept under surveillance is vast and the numbers of unlicensed hunters considerable. Furthermore, neither local nor national authorities take any action to prevent the slaughter. Indeed, a small majority in the Calabrian regional parliament, opposed by the Italian Communist Party, has called for a derogation from the law on hunting which prohibits any hunting after 10 March.

Can the Commission state what approaches it intends to make to the Italian Government to induce it actively to prevent this type of illicit hunting and not to grant any derogation from the current law on hunting, in the hope, also, that Italian legislation will be promptly adapted to take account of the Community directive on the protection of birds?

Answer

The Commission considers that the application of the Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds is an important matter and has already initiated infringement procedures against all Member States including Italy for the incorrect application of this directive.

The Commission is aware of the situation described by the honourable Member and on the 9 April 1985 invited the Italian authorities to furnish detailed information concerning this annual slaughter.

*
* *

Question No 56, by Mr Didò (H-113/85)

Subject: The threatend strike by Italian road hauliers and the risk of a blockade of customs offices at frontiers

In view of the fact that, at their meeting of 17 March 1985, the Italian road haulage undertakings, which are members of the International Federation of Road Hauliers, gave 30 days' notice of a complete stoppage of transport operations, what steps will the Commission take to prevent the disastrous consequences of the kind seen recently at frontier passes, when similar action was taken?

Answer

The action referred to by the honourable Member had almost no impact on traffic crossing the international border. Only at the Vintimiglia frontier post the passage of lorries was blocked from Sunday 21 April until noon on Monday 22 and the Italian and French authorities took at this time the necessary measures to limit the impact of this action.

The Commission's Services were kept informed of the evolution of the situation but there was no reason for the Commission itself to take any particular action at this stage.

*
* *

Question No 57, by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (H-128/85)

Subject: Implementation of the conclusions of the European Council

When and how does the Commission intend taking the necessary measures to implement the proposals of the Adonnino Committee report as provided for in the conclusions of the European Council in Brussels?

Answer

1. As regards the short-term measures contained in the Adonnino Committee report, all the necessary proposals for their implementation are on the Council table. These basically include raising the duty-free allowances (for travellers, small postal parcels and bus fuel) as well as the introduction of a simplified procedure for increasing allowances, simplifying border checks on people and the right of residence. It is in particular during the three Council sessions — 'Internal Market', 'Economy/Finance' and 'General Affairs' — scheduled for May that the Council should reach decisions. As for mutual recognition of professional qualifications, a policy agreement based on the Commission's proposal should be possible at the 'Social Affairs' Council in June. The Commission attaches great importance to satisfying — thoroughly and in good time — the European Council requests, and will address a letter to this end to the Council President.

2. As for longer-term measures, the Commission is currently drawing up a proposal for a general system of diploma recognition. Moreover, the Commission is working to have the Council re-examine its proposals concerning the tax arrangements applicable to frontier-zone workers. As for a Europe without frontiers, as proposed by President Delors, the Commission is now preparing a 'White Paper' which will be presented prior to the Milan European Council.

*
* *

Question No 58, by Mr Wedekind (H-130/85)

Subject: Bureaucratic obstacles to the free movement of goods by the Italian authorities in respect of imports of second-hand motor vehicles

On 1 March 1985 a ministerial decree entered into force in Italy whereby any person importing a motor vehicle from a Member State of the Community is now required to produce not only the motor vehicle registration book, an authenticated registration certificate, the certificate registering departure issued by the competent authorities of the country of origin and a list of the technical data of the vehicle by the inspection services but also a certificate of origin from the manufacturer of the vehicle. This new discriminatory obstacle to the movement of goods within the Community means that anyone purchasing an imported vehicle has to wait for up to five months before receiving a road licence in Italy.

Does the Commission agree that this measure on the part of the Italian Government is incompatible with the spirit and letter of the Treaties, is discriminatory and distorts competition and in particular prevents the establishment of a 'People's Europe' and what measures does it intend taking?

Answer

The difficulties experienced in registering in Italy both new and used motor vehicles imported from other Community countries are well-known to the Commission, not least because of the many complaints — more than a hundred — which it has received on this problem in the last months.

The Commission has drawn the attention of the Italian Government on several occasions to the need for Italian procedures for the registration of imported cars to be compatible with Community law. Discussions with the Italian authorities did not lead to satisfactory conclusions and in December 1984 the Commission initiated proceedings under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty.

*
* *

Question No 59, by Mrs Jackson (H-133/85)

Subject: Pig industry — private storage aids

In view of the EEC Council of Ministers' statement in the last two EEC farm price review settlements that due account must be taken of regional difficulties in managing the pig-meat market, and the recurring economic problems in some Member States over the level of pig prices and returns to producers, will the Commission now implement an automatic price trigger to activate private storage aids in the Community based on regional prices?

Answer

The Commission does not intend to implement an automatic price trigger to activate private storage aids in the Community based on regional prices for the following reasons:

The common organization of the market in pigmeat does not provide for any automatic price trigger.

The evolution of the market price in absolute figures is not necessarily relevant for the economy in pig production, since fluctuations in feedstuff prices and other market elements are relevant as well and need to be taken into account.

The implementation of private storage aids at a regional level is limited to extraordinary situations, i.e. mainly in case of outbreaks of animal disease and trade limitations because of such disease. Implementation of market support measures at a regional level might lead to market disintegration and is not within the meaning of the common market organization for pigmeat.

*
* *

Question No 62, by Mr Filinis (H-120/85)

Subject: Elections and migrant workers

Does the Commission propose to submit a proposal to the Council for the enactment of a regulation according four working days' special leave with full pay to migrant workers who, being nationals of the Member States of the Community, wish to travel to their country of origin in order to exercise their right to vote.

Answer

The Commission is aware of the fact that nationals of Member States resident in another Member State find it very difficult in practice to exercise fully their political rights in their

own country, with some exceptions, these being Member States which provide in their own legislation the right of their citizens to vote in national elections, either on the premises of the consulate, by proxy or by letter, without the physical presence of these citizens in their own country.

At the present stage of development of Community law, the Commission does not have a direct legal competence to help migrant workers in the exercise of the right to vote in their home country. Nevertheless, in the light of Article 7 of Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 and the decisions of the Court of Justice of the European Communities, in particular the judgment of 15 October 1969 (*Wurtembergische, Milchverwertung v Ugliola*, Case 15-69), the Commission is of the opinion that special leave without loss of acquired advantages should be granted to migrant workers from Community countries wishing to carry out their civic duties in their country of origin so far as nationals of the country of employment enjoy a similar right under corresponding circumstances.

But, leaving aside this particular case, the Commission would suggest that the best solution to this problem is the introduction, by all Member States, of the possibility of their own citizens being allowed to vote in national elections by letter, by proxy or on the consulate's premises, when they are resident abroad, as is already laid down by law in some Member States. This solution is less time and money-consuming; no special leave is needed; and it will be easier for all migrants to vote, without travelling expenses.

The Commission might even consider a Recommendation to Member States. If we take into consideration the spirit of Articles 48 and 49 of the Treaty, Regulation 1612/68, where it is said that the right of freedom of movement has to be exercised with freedom and dignity, and Council Resolution of 9 February 1976 '... continue and enhance the humanization of freedom of movement for workers', we could deduce that migrants should be given facilities to enjoy their right to vote at national level in their own countries, (being unable to do so in the country of residence), without facing too many obstacles such as long distance travel, expenses and waste of working time.

This is particularly relevant for Greece, Italy and Ireland, which have several thousand migrants resident and working in other Member States.

*
* *

Question No 63, by Mr Evrigenis (H-122/85)

Subject: Unemployment among new graduates

As reported in the Greek press last week, the Greek Organization for the Employment of Labour recently published a report on youth unemployment in Greece. The findings concerning the unemployed among young persons who have graduated from establishments of higher education are truly dramatic. According to the report, the number of young unemployed graduates has risen since 1981 from 13 100 to more than 25 000 in 1984. Furthermore, the proportion of college graduates among young unemployed persons between the ages of 22 and 29 now stands at 50%.

Is the Commission aware of this report and, if so, to what extent can it confirm its findings regarding unemployment among young graduates? Does the Commission believe that unemployment among young graduates in the Community merits a special study and special measures within the framework of efforts to combat unemployment, in particular youth unemployment? Does it believe that the extreme gravity of the problem of unemployment among young graduates in Greece warrants an immediate special study and socio-economic measures of a conjunctural and structural nature to meet the country's special needs?

Answer

The Commission is not yet in possession of the report referred to. It has contacted the Greek Labour Administration to obtain the necessary information. The Commission,

therefore, would ask you to appreciate that it can only comment on the problem broached by Mr Evrigenis when it has this information.

*
* *

Question No 64, by Mrs Hammerich (H-124/85)

Subject: Community research appropriations

Was the proposal to increase the Community's research appropriations, with a view to participating in the US Strategic Defence Initiative (Star Wars project), devised solely by the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, or did it reflect the wishes of the Commission as a whole?

Answer

The Commission would remind the honourable Member that it submitted to the European Council of March 1985 a Communication on strengthening the technological base and competitiveness of Community industry.

This document pointed out how Community industry as a whole had fallen behind in most high-tech industries, especially in information technology, telecommunications, biotechnology and new materials.

Our loss of ground in these advanced technologies is likely to delay their use in traditional industries, with the risk of losing markets and destroying jobs. Also, if the European economies fall back on the widespread use of imported equipment they are likely to handicap their own new-technology industries.

The Commission also pointed out that no Member State can face up to the challenge of the new technologies on its own: the cost of developing them is too high. What is more, through the effect of standards, technical regulations, aid to industry and public procurement, national policies in support of technology tend to perpetuate the national character of industrial structures and the fragmentation of the common market. Within the narrow confines of national markets it is impossible for large companies to achieve economies of scale or for innovative SMEs to specialize in specific market slots. In its Communication the Commission also clearly expressed the desire to match the funds available to the scope of the objectives aimed for.

In its analysis the Commission noted that the Community's scientific base, although comparable to that of the USA and Japan, is less effective and developing more slowly. The tremendous expansion of Pentagon research and development programmes will boost American superiority. This shows how important large-scale research programmes are in shaping and considerably stimulating large countries' technological development. Seen from this angle, the Commission believes that, if they are to have any impact, such programmes cannot be undertaken in a random fashion by the Member States.

*
* *

Question No 67, by Mrs Boserup (H-142/85)

Subject: Commission's publicity campaign to increase consumption of olive oil

As the Community produces a surplus of olive oil, the Commission proposes to increase consumption during 1985/86 by means of a campaign costing a total of 4 m ECU (more than Dkr 32 m), 3 m ECU of which are to be spent on advertising and other forms of publicity. These activities will promote olive oil as a health product and stress its gastron-

omic qualities. The Commission is considering the possibilities of funding a book on the subject of olive oil and making educational programmes for use in schools. According to Agence Europe of 5 April 1985, the Commission is even considering arranging a visit to olive groves for journalists.

Community farmers are slaughtering their cows to reduce milk and butter production, yet butter stocks continue to swell. Under the section on milk and milk products in Doc. A2-10/85/D on the decision granting a discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Communities for the 1983 financial year, it is stated that 'In six years almost 200 m ECU (over Dkr 1 600 m) have been spent on sales promotion, advertising and market research . . . under the special measures to open up new markets and improve quality.'

In the light of the above, would the Commission state how much butter consumption has risen per head during the last five years and whether it really believes that, by spending more than Dkr 32 m, it can increase the consumption of olive oil? Does not the Commission take the view that this consumption will replace butter consumption and does the Commission believe that consumers can consume more butter and more olive oil at the same time? Would the Commission also provide details of its plans for the publicity campaign intended to promote the consumption of olive oil?

Answer

In reply to the honourable Member's request for information the Commission is able to supply the following details.

Internal consumption of butter in the Community of Ten decreased by 3% between 1979 and 1982, the last year for which statistics covering all the Member States are available. This figure is an average of the decreases in each Member State, apart from the Netherlands (+ 8.5%) and Ireland (+ 20%). It should be recalled that butter consumption promotion measures financed from the co-responsibility funds — and thus by the very people producing the surpluses — started in 1979.

The third campaign to promote olive oil consumption in the Community, recently the subject of an open invitation to tender, is financed from the funds for consumption aid granted to firms which prepare this oil for the market. This use of the funds as well as the sum made available are based on the Council Decisions concerning common organization of the market in question (Article 11, Paragraph 6 of Regulation No 136/EEC and Regulation (EEC) No 1970/80).

The Commission is firmly convinced, as is the Council, that measures of the kind already used in the two previous campaigns provide valuable support and draw consumers' attention to olive oil. These measures will prove even more useful given the forthcoming enlargement of the Community.

Market studies indicate that there is only a low level of mutual substitution of butter and olive oil among consumers, and that the two are not rivals in overall consumption of cooking fats. On the other hand, the two products have to face competition from other fats of vegetable origin.

The details required by the honourable Member regarding the third publicity campaign measures can be found in the detailed programme annexed to the invitation to tender cited earlier, and published in the Official Journal of the EEC, No C 82 of 30 March 1985, p. 10.

Question No 68, by Mrs Cinciari Rodano (H-143/85)

Subject: Humanitarian aid to Vietnam

In view of its answer to Oral Question No H-736/84¹ on such aid, on what grounds does the Commission consider it humanitarian to protect the Vietnamese from hunger, but not humanitarian to prevent them from dying of thirst, dysentery or tuberculosis?

Answer

It is clear that every well-planned development operation has a humanitarian aim in the broad sense. Therefore, in cases of the type mentioned by the honourable Member, the Community distinguishes between direct humanitarian aid to populations directly affected, and structural development aid. It is on this basis that the Commission took a negative decision regarding the Nha Trang water distribution network project, which is basically an infrastructural project.

*
* *

Question No 70, by Mrs Oppenheim (H-147/85)

Subject: The Community's small and medium-sized undertakings

The European Parliament has adopted a number of resolutions designed to ease the burden on the Community's small and medium-sized undertakings, with a view to enabling them to create more jobs for the benefit of us all. Among other things, the European Parliament was responsible for designating 1983 the 'European Year of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises and Craft Firms'. Can the Commission provide more specific information on the initiatives taken by it and other Community institutions in order to implement Parliament's resolutions in this field?

Answer

The Commission is well aware that Parliament has an intensive interest in the overall conditions pertaining to SMEs and the craft sector in the Community, and has taken corresponding initiatives.

Following the work of the Community bodies and the committees in the individual Member States during 1983, the Commission published in 1984 a Communication to the Council (COM(84) 263 final of 22 May 1984) entitled 'Follow-up to 1983: European Year of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises and Craft Industry'. This Communication described the activities undertaken during the year and — on the basis of the Action Programme adopted at the Strasbourg conference winding up the 1983 SME European Year — set out guidelines for priority action, as part of a Community plan, to deal with problems faced by the SMEs.

However, I would like to point out that in 1984 and 1985 the Commission vigorously pursued its work in conjunction with the Parliament and the other Community bodies in order, *inter alia*, to improve the situation of the European SMEs by using the following instruments:

1) ERDF:

The new Regulation governing the European Regional Development Fund provides for aid to be given to the SMEs and the craft sector.

¹ Verbatim report of proceedings for the sitting of 17. 4. 1985, provisional edition.

2) VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The priority guidelines for the European Social Fund, recently adopted by the Commission on 30 April 1985, also include vocational training schemes in SMEs with a view to introducing new technologies and schemes for training staff to be employed in SMEs in specific sectors.

3) FUNDS FOR SMEs:

The overall total of loans from the EIB, ECSC and the New Community Instruments for Financing Productive Investment in SMEs increased from 1 263.3 million ECU in 1983 to 1 860.3 million ECU in 1984, i.e. by 47%.

4) INTERNAL MARKET:

This is the basis for sound SME development. We are also continuing our attempts — via publicity campaigns — to have this aspect incorporated into SMEs' decision-making processes.

The leaflet 'Scope for intervention by the European Communities to aid small and medium-sized enterprises and the craft industry' (revised edition of 20 July 1984), provides a more comprehensive overview of our policy, and this will be sent to the honourable Member.

*
* *

II. *Questions to the Council**Question No 73, by Mrs Chouraqui (H-804/84)*

Subject: Meeting of Ministers responsible for family affairs

During talks held with members of the Greek, French, Irish and Italian governments, COFACE (Committee of Family Organizations in the European Community) requested that a Council of Ministers responsible for policy on family affairs should meet as soon as possible. Can the Council say what its position is with regard to this request?

Answer

The Council is aware of the very important implications family affairs policy has for the future of the Community Member States.

Although family affairs policy as such is not directly a Community responsibility, several aspects of it have already been dealt with indirectly in the context of freedom of movement and provisions of a social nature provided for by the Treaties. For example, during the 'Social Affairs' Council, scheduled for 13 June next, the Presidency will see to it that there is extensive discussion of the proposed Directive concerning parental leave and leave for family reasons.

However, it is not intended to hold a Council meeting specifically devoted to family affairs policy.

*
* *

Question No 74, by Mr Fitzsimons (H-809/84)

Subject: Radioactive leaks at nuclear stations

Is the Council aware that twice in January of this year a nuclear plant in West Germany had to be temporarily closed, once because of a radioactive steam leak and on a second

occasion because of machinery damage and furthermore is it aware that only a few weeks ago the industry proclaimed one of the Gundremmingen reactors as being among the most reliable in the world in 1984 and will it comment on the safety of such installations?

Answer

The Council attaches very great importance to nuclear power stations in the Community operating under the best possible safety conditions.

In accordance with Chapter III of the Euratom Treaty, the Council establishes standards for the protection of the health of the population and of workers against the dangers resulting from ionizing radiation in the Community. The standards are revised regularly and were most recently updated on 3 September 1984.

On the other hand, it is not for the Council to express an opinion on specific instances such as those mentioned by the honourable Member.

*
* *

Question No 79, by Mrs Lizin (H-65/85)

Subject: Council meeting on pollution from cars (20 March)

Can the President of the Council summarize the position adopted by the Belgian Minister, Mr Aerts, and the arguments he used with a view to defending the interests of the Flemish assembly lines?

Answer

I should like to remind the honourable Member of Parliament that, in accordance with Article 18 of its Rules of Procedure, the Council's deliberations are confidential.

*
* *

Question No 80, by Mr Van Miert (H-535/84)

Subject: The San José Conference

In the joint final communiqué of this conference between the European Community and Latin America, both parties expressed their willingness to open negotiations as soon as possible with a view to concluding a cooperation agreement. In the Council's opinion, what areas would fall within the scope of such an agreement and what steps have they taken so far to reach an agreement?

Answer

Recognizing the importance of strengthening and giving institutional form to relations between the European Community and Central America, the Ministers on the two sides declared themselves ready at the San José Conference to start discussions as soon as possible with a view to negotiating an inter-regional framework cooperation agreement.

As a concrete follow-up to this declaration of intent, the Commission held exploratory talks with the countries concerned at the end of 1984. It is for the Commission to propose to the Council the directives on the basis of which it wishes to be authorized to negotiate the above-mentioned cooperation agreement.

The relevant European Parliament Committees will be receiving all the necessary information under the Westerterp procedure.

As to the content of such an agreement, I can add that at the San José Conference Ministers had in mind a framework agreement of the type already concluded with ASEAN, although of course adapted to the special situation of the Central American region.

*
* *

Question No 81, by Mr Hutton (H-539/84)

Subject: Improvement of relations between Council and European Parliament

In view of the statement in the Solemn Declaration on European Union, adopted at Stuttgart in June 1983, that the European Parliament 'has an essential role to play in the development of European Union',¹ what specific proposals is the Council preparing, based on Parliament's resolutions on relations with the other institutions adopted in July 1981² and in addition to the Declaration, to enable Parliament to satisfy the demands of European citizens that it should play a more effective role in this regard?

Answer

The Council has examined in detail the resolutions referred to by the honourable Member. It stated the outcome of this examination in three letters dated 6 April 1982 and 13 and 14 March 1984. In so doing, the Council adopted positions on the aspects of these resolutions concerning:

- the statement of the programme of the Presidency-in-Office;
- written and oral questions;
- participation by the President of the Council in its various compositions in meetings of Parliamentary Committees;
- optional consultation of the European Parliament;
- further consultation of the European Parliament;
- Rules 32 and 36 of the European Parliament's Rules of Procedure;
- examination by the Council of European Parliament resolutions;
- informing the European Parliament of the action taken on its opinions;
- the role of the European Parliament in the drawing up and conclusion of international agreements and treaties of accession.

Furthermore, at the meeting between the Enlarged Bureau of the European Parliament and the ten Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States on 20 November 1984, Mr Barry outlined the Council's position on the question of the revision of the conciliation procedure.

*
* *

Question No 85, by Mr Andrews (H-772/84)

Subject: The horticultural industry

In view of the importance to the Community of achieving self-sufficiency in horticultural produce, and since the oil price explosion of the seventies made the entire oil-fired sector

¹ Bulletin of the European Communities, No 6-1983, point 2.3.1.

² OJ C 234, 14. 9. 1981, pp. 52-57, 64-66.

uneconomic for horticulturalists in the North County Dublin growing area, will the Council state what its plans are for the future of this vital industry?

Answer

The horticultural sector is covered by the common organization of the markets in the fruit and vegetable sector which is provided in the 1972 basic regulation.

The system set up by that Regulation has been improved on several occasions to ensure a reasonable level of income for the agricultural community concerned and to protect undertakings in that particular sector against imports from non-member countries.

In regard to any special measures to assist the horticultural industry in Ireland, the Commission has not submitted to the Council any proposals relating to this sector.

*
* *

Question No 86, by Mr Vandemeulebroucke (H-797/84)

Subject: Programme of action on toxicology for health protection

In May 1984 the Commission submitted to the Council a draft resolution on a programme of action of the European Communities on toxicology for health protection. Will the Council indicate what stage it has reached in the consideration of this draft resolution?

Answer

As regards the programme of action of the European Communities on toxicology for health protection, during their meeting of 3/4 May in Venice the Health Ministers reached a large degree of agreement and instructed the 'Health' Group to continue its work in this regard.

*
* *

Question No 87, by Mr Fitzgerald (H-10/85)

Subject: Employment and Italian Presidency

During his speech to the European Parliament on 16 January 1984 Mr Andreotti, President of the Council of Ministers, stated that the Italian Presidency intended to ensure that the central importance of the issue of employment was the main criterion guiding the determination and development of Community instruments and of initiatives that are not confined to the social sector but are also — and primarily — of importance to the economic and the industrial cooperation fields. Will the Council now indicate what action it has taken to meet these objectives?

Answer

As promised, the Italian Presidency has devoted much attention to the problem of unemployment.

The Council, to begin with, and subsequently the European Council have worked out economic policy guidelines designed to ensure more job-generating and sustained economic growth. These guidelines involve

— the creation of a large single market between now and 1992;

- the creation and development of small and medium-sized undertakings;
- the adaptation and adjustment of working conditions;
- the expansion of employment by means of specific measures.

Carrying out these measures should reduce the administrative burden on industry both at national and Community level.

The President-in-Office of the Social Affairs Council also gave a detailed account of the activities and intentions of the Italian Presidency when replying to a series of Oral Questions during the previous part-session of the Parliament.

In addition, the Italian Government organized a major international conference in Venice at the beginning of April to discuss one of the most acute problems of our age — the consequences of the introduction of new technology for employment.

The Italian Presidency hopes that these initiatives will provide a better insight into the problem of unemployment and consequently make it easier to implement job-creating policies.

*
* *

Question No 88, by Mr Pearce (H-25/85/rev.)

Subject: Paperwork formalities at intra-Community frontiers

Does the Council believe that the Commission's new approach to technical harmonization will bring about a major relaxation of paperwork formalities at intra-Community frontiers and posts?

Answer

The Commission's new approach to technical harmonization is aimed at speeding up the harmonization at Community level of the myriad technical rules and standards existing in the various Member States to ensure or establish that products do not endanger the safety of persons, domestic animals or property.

This approach — like that followed hitherto in adopting the 180 Directives already in force — is designed to remove barriers to intra-Community trade, thereby contributing to the free movement of goods.

*
* *

Question No 89, by Mr Ephremidis (H-45/85)

Subject: Greek steel industry

The trade deficit in steel products between Greece and the other nine EEC countries is constantly growing (1979: 3 900 m drachmas; 1980: 10 100 m drachmas; 1981: 11 300 m drachmas; 1982: 11 700 m drachmas; first ten months of 1983: 17 600 m drachmas). Imports from the EEC went up from 565 700 tonnes in 1981 to 1 178 000 tonnes in 1983, while Greek production of steel products went up from 1 320 000 tonnes to only 1 454 000 tonnes in the period from 1981 to 1983. At the same time, the Community prohibits state aid for investment in the Greek steel industry, while generous aid for the steel industry in France and West Germany is approved.

What specific measures does the Council propose to take to revive the Greek steel industry, having regard to the desperate situation in which it now finds itself, particularly since

Greece joined the EEC, and bearing in mind that, at the end of 1985, the present Community system governing aid to the steel industry and the distribution of steel exports expires?

Answer

At the present time the Council has not received any request from the Commission for an Opinion regarding possible measures to revive the Greek steel industry. Of course, if the Commission submits such a request, the Council will certainly study it with all the necessary attention.

It should be recalled that the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community confers upon the Commission the powers for implementing the Treaty aims. The Treaty stipulates that the Commission must consult the Council or obtain its Opinion only when certain well-defined measures are involved.

*
* *

Question No 90, by Mr Mac Sharry (H-71/85)

Subject: Beef exports

Bearing in mind that Ireland is the EEC's biggest exporter of beef, is the Council aware that the decision to reduce export refunds on shipments to third countries and the first ever suspension of intervention in Ireland will seriously undermine the stability of the Irish cattle and beef industry and does not the Council agree that the Community should in fact pursue a policy of increasing exports to third countries to offset increased supplies of cow beef?

Answer

The measures to which the honourable Member refers relate to management of the beef and veal market and are therefore a matter for the Commission, whose task it is to take, in the present budgetary context, the measures which it considers appropriate for Community management of the market.

*
* *

Question No 92, by Mr von Wogau (H-85/85)

Subject: Compulsory delays of trains at intra-Community borders

According to the travel trade journal 'Der Fremdenverkehr', long-distance trains still have to stop for long periods at intra-Community frontiers so that border police and customs officials can carry out checks on the passengers while the train is stationary. The time allowed for the border police and customs formalities may be as long as 56 minutes, the time that a train on the Kehl/Paris line was held up at Strasbourg station. Trains almost always stop for 20 minutes at the Brenner Pass, where most passengers have been unable to report any activity by the border police.

Does the Council not share my view that the easing of border formalities for motorists should be paralleled in intra-Community rail traffic by spot checks by police and customs officials on individual trains, carried out during the journey so as to avoid unnecessary delays at the Community's internal frontiers in future?

Answer

The Commission has submitted to the Council a proposal for a Directive on the easing of controls and formalities applicable to nationals of the Member States when crossing intra-Community borders.

The problem raised by the honourable Member is one of the kind discussed during examination of this proposal, which is being carried out in the light of the Opinion delivered by the European Parliament on 18 April 1985.

*
* *

Question No 98, by Mr Rogalla (H-114/85)

Subject: Threatened strike by Italian road hauliers and the danger of a jam at border customs posts

What steps does the Council intend to take following the declaration on 17 March 1985 by a meeting of Italian road hauliers affiliated to the International Road Hauliers' Federation that 'all road haulage services are to be closed down within 30 days' in order to avert the disastrous effects at border crossing points which similar action has already produced in the not too distant past?

Answer

I can confirm, as the Council has already done in reply to Oral Question No 632/83 put by Mr von Hassel with regard to a similar case, the Council's general position that waiting times at internal border crossings in the Community should be reduced to the minimum necessary for the proper performance of essential checks and formalities.

The Council has every confidence that the Member States will comply with the provisions for the Directive on the facilitation of physical inspections and administrative formalities in respect of the carriage of goods between Member States adopted by the Council on 1 December 1983, in particular with a view to giving effect to the policy I have just mentioned.

*
* *

Question No 99, by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (H-129/85)

Subject: Implementation of the conclusions of the European Council

When does the Council intend adopting the necessary decisions to implement as rapidly as possible the proposals of the Adonnino Committee report as provided for in the conclusions of the European Council in Brussels?

Answer

The European Council asked the Council of Ministers to adopt without delay the decisions to which the Report on a People's Europe refers which fall within its purview. In several cases, the Report gave deadlines for the adoption of decisions in those fields. It also invited the commission to take the initiatives to enable the proposals contained in the report to be put into practice. It finally invited the Member States to take decisive action where this was within their sphere of competence.

Several of the topics dealt with in the report of the *ad hoc* Committee on a People's Europe have already formed the subject of Commission proposals. The Council is contin-

uing to examine these matters and, as requested by the European Council, will report to it at the European Council meeting on 29 and 30 June 1985.

*
* *

Question No 101, by Mrs Hammerich (H-126/85)

Subject: Militarization of the European Community

During Parliament's debate of 16 April 1985 on the March summit, the President-in-Office, Mr Craxi, stated that the summit in Milan in June would not be discussing militarization of the European Community. How does this square with the following phrase in the Dooge report, which is, after all, the basis for the summit's debate on European Union:

'A commitment by Member States to design, develop and produce such systems and equipment jointly' (i.e. 'high-technology equipment which can strengthen Europe's defensive capabilities')?

Answer

The European Council in Dublin agreed that the report of the *ad hoc* Committee for Institutional Affairs would be the principal subject on the agenda for the European Council meeting in June 1985.

The Council was not represented on the *ad hoc* Committee for Institutional Affairs (Dooge Committee) and is not therefore in a position to interpret the phrase referred to by the honourable Member.

I would furthermore draw the honourable Member's attention to the fact that questions relating to the Member States' defence policies are outside the European Communities' field of competence.

*
* *

Question No 102, by Mr Ferruccio Pisoni (H-127/85)

Subject: Amended proposal for a directive of 2 March 1979 on (self-employed) commercial agents

Will the Council explain why, six years after the abovementioned proposal was submitted, one of the Member States is still, as the questioner has himself ascertained, taking such a determined stand against it, and to which points in the proposal its objections refer? What is the Council doing to resolve this deadlock?

Answer

Technical work on finalizing the Directive on commercial agents has, as the honourable Member says, made only very slow progress, particularly in view of the fact that a fundamental reservation has been tabled on its actual desirability.

The Presidency of the Council has taken the matter up with the Commission in order to maintain the necessary contacts to enable any progress to be made which would satisfy all the delegations and the Council resumed its discussions only yesterday at its meeting on the Internal Market.

*
* *

Question No 103, by Mrs Boserup (H-131/85)

Subject: Community participation in the Star Wars project

Agence Europe of 18 April 1985 reports that Mr Karl-Heinz Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission, concurs with the favourable attitude expressed by Mr Delors, President of the Commission, at the Brussels Summit of 29 and 30 March 1985 towards support for the US plans to develop Star Wars weaponry.

Does the Council share the Commission's belief that the Community ought to participate in the Star Wars project? If so, which articles of the Treaty of Rome provide for such collaboration, and under which headings will the Council enter such activities?

Answer

The Council of the European Communities does not feel obliged to comment on press reports of the statement by Vice-President Narjes.

With regard to discussions which took place during the European Council meeting in Brussels on 29 and 30 March 1985, a report has already been made to the European Parliament in accordance with the usual procedures.

*
* *

Question No 105, by Mr Filinis (H-137/85)

Subject: European Union and a system of financial equalization

The Draft Treaty of the European parliament establishing the European Union provides, in Article 73, for the introduction of a system of financial equalization in order to alleviate excessive economic imbalances between the regions. However, the report of the Committee on Institutional Affairs makes no reference to this system.

Would the Council state the reasons for this omission and what measures it could take to ensure that the system of financial equalization forms an integral part of any endeavour to establish European Union?

Answer

The Council was not represented on the *ad hoc* Committee on Institutional Affairs and therefore is not in a position to indicate the reasons why this Committee did not include the subject mentioned by the honourable Member in its report.

*
* *

Question No 104, by Mr Raftery (H-135/85)

Subject: New Technology

Will the President-in-Office confirm that the Council will fully consider at the earliest possible opportunity the important Commission proposals on the reinforcement of the technological basis and the competitiveness of Community industry? Will he provide a timetable for their implementation?

Question No 106, by Mr Pininfarina (H-141/85)

Subject: European industry

The final communiqué of the Brussels European Council endorsed the Commission communication on a six-point programme to consolidate the technological base and competitiveness of European industry.

The communiqué also requested the Council of Ministers to give careful consideration to the proposal contained in this communication. What action does the Council of Ministers intend to take, and when, on the Commission's programme?

Joint answer

The Council currently attaches and will continue to attach the highest priority to measures to strengthen the technological base and competitiveness of Community industry. Some of the concrete proposals made in response to one of the six principal objectives singled out by the Commission in its recent communication to the European Council are already being examined with all due dispatch, while others are scheduled for immediate discussion as soon as the Parliament has delivered its Opinion.

Thus, for example, the new approach presented by the Commission on standardization has given rise to intense discussions which are about to come to fruition. As soon as the Parliament has delivered its Opinion, the Council will commence its examination of the RACE programme, which, in the Commission's view, constitutes the first stage in the implementation of the industrial policy concerning telecommunications. This also applies, in particular, to the proposals in the field of biotechnology relating to medicinal products, on which the Parliament has also been requested to deliver its Opinion.

This Commission communication must be followed up by practical proposals and I can only stress in this respect that the Council will examine them with all due speed and with the highest priority, taking account of any Opinions which the European Parliament may express on these matters.

*
* *

*III. Questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation**Question No 108, by Mr Boutos (H-808/84)*

Subject: Murders of representatives of the press within the Community

Recently, in a Member State of the Community, two newspaper publishers have been assassinated within a short space of time. These crimes are still unsolved. Within the general climate recently created by a whole series of terrorist acts committed in the democratic countries of Europe, to which our Parliament rightly gave its attention in the February part-session, there is — with due cause — a growing suspicion that this campaign is taking on new dimensions that make it particularly dangerous for our institutions. It is now clear that, in liquidating important figures in the press world, the aim is to undermine the desire and capacity for freely expressing ideas in this crucial area of our public life, in the hope that others will thereby be intimidated and our democracies will as a result be further destabilized. Do the ministers share the view that this new development is particularly alarming and that every effort should be made to give special protection to all those active in the press world and to accelerate the coordination of measures by the governments in all Member States aimed at combating terrorism?

Answer

The Ten share the honourable Member's concern at the recent new outbreaks of terrorism in Europe and agree on the need for closer coordination between the Member States in tackling it.

This matter was recently dealt with at the Ministerial Meeting in Rome on 12 February last, during which the Ministers stressed the need to continue and strengthen the already active cooperation between the Ten in order to tackle this problem.

*
* *

Question No 111, by Mr Selva (H-834/84)

Subject: Khadafi and terrorism in Europe

How do the Foreign Ministers think they ought to respond to statements by Khadafi (extracts of whose speech appeared in the European press on 4 March 1985) that he regards the Baader-Meinhof, Red Brigades and Action Directe terrorist groups as 'revolutionary opposition' and promises to support them, and does any EEC government believe that such organizations have received aid from Khadafi in the past?

Answer

The statements by Colonel Khadafi to which the honourable Member refers have not been discussed in European Political Cooperation. Hence the implications of these statements and any possible reaction to them have not been discussed by the Ten. However, this does not exclude the possibility that the partner countries have taken or plan to take bilateral political and diplomatic initiatives.

*
* *

Question No 116, by Mr Van Miert (H-710/84)

Subject: United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

On 9 December 1984 when the deadline for signature expired, 159 countries had signed the Convention, including most of the Member states, except for the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom, as well as the European Community. On the other hand, however, not one single Member State has so far ratified the Convention. The preparatory committee of the Seabed Authority has now evidently decided to commence registration of firms engaged in deep-sea mining in March 1985. What steps have the Ministers already taken to ensure that the Member States ratify the Convention and that the Community does not miss the boat in such an essential sector as the law of the sea?

Answer

When the United Nations signed the Convention on the Law of the Sea, some signatory Member States and the European Community itself made statements on the omissions and shortcomings of Section 11 of the Convention, which deals with the seabed, and expressed the hope that the preparatory committee for setting up the International Seabed Authority would manage in the course of its work to draw up implementing rules which would make the system applying to the seabed acceptable. In addition, some Member States did not sign the Convention.

In view of this, it does not look as if the process of ratification or accession by the Member States of the Community will be concluded soon. Consultations between the Member States of the Community are still being conducted on the matter.

Furthermore, in accordance with Resolution No 2 on the protection of prior investments, the French Government lodged an application on 3 August 1984 for registration with the

Preparatory Committee as a pioneer investor with a view to obtaining rights to a prospecting site for metal-bearing nodules.

This registration cannot take place until all the conditions set with regard to Resolution No 2 have been met.

*
* *

Question No 117, by Mrs Hammerich (H-732/84)

Subject: Participation by countries other than Community Member States in European Political Cooperation

If it is seriously to be believed that European political cooperation functions independently of the Community, the current practice must cease as soon as countries other than Community Member States participate in European political cooperation. If European political cooperation is to expand to become proper West European cooperation involving countries other than Community Member States, will the Foreign Ministers draw the appropriate conclusions and stop linking European political cooperation with the activities of the European Parliament? Will the President of the Foreign Ministers then stop attending Parliament's part-sessions each month for inspiration and guidance and to answer questions?

Answer

As was stated in the reply to Oral Question No H-730/84 tabled by the honourable Member herself, participation in political cooperation is restricted to the Member States of the European Community.

The honourable Member's attention should also be drawn to the fact that, by recognizing that 'the Assembly of the European Community has an essential role to play in the development of European Union' and, consequently, that 'the European Parliament debates all matters relating to European Union, including European Political Cooperation', the Solemn Declaration on European Union, signed by the Heads of State and Government of the Ten at the end of the European Council held in Stuttgart on 17-19 June 1983, laid down the consultation procedure currently in force between the Presidency of the Ten and the European Parliament.

*
* *

Question No 119, by Mrs Dury (H-15/85)

Subject: The dictatorship in Chile

On 22 February 1985, Carlos Gabriel Godoy Echegoyen, a young man of 23, died as a result of torture inflicted the day after he had been arrested with 12 others. He is the second person in less than a month to have been tortured to death in the Chilean dictatorship's secret prisons.

Do the Foreign Ministers envisage bringing other forms of pressure to bear on the Chilean dictatorship, since it remains unmoved by the written and verbal protests which have been made?

Answer

The Ten have on many occasions expressed their deep concern at the repeated violations of human rights in Chile and its shock at the tragic events, of which the death of Carlos

Gabriel Godoy Echegoyen, referred to by the honourable Member, is a recent serious example.

In their statement of 12 November 1984, which received wide public attention, the Ten strongly condemned the breaking off of dialogue with the opposition and the declaration of martial law, by which the Chilean Government is attempting to justify legally the constant violations of human rights and basic freedoms. It should be pointed out that, in this regard, the Ten have not only publicly condemned these acts but have also made repeated representations, including recently, to the authorities in Santiago on behalf of Chilean citizens.

*
* *

Question No 120, by Mr Ephremidis (H-46/85)

Subject: Non-involvement by Member States in Star Wars plans

At the last two-day conference in Rome of the European Space Agency, Italy, a Member State of the Community, and a member of the Agency, asked ministers to agree to a proposal by President Reagan that the Agency should become involved in the Star Wars programme. Britain announced that it was prepared to take part in the programme, while France, through its Foreign Minister on his last visit to the USA, said in this connection that the USA and its allies 'must have further discussions on this idea of a protective curtain leading to the disappearance of the offensive system'.

What steps do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation propose to take to prevent involvement by Community Member States in the Star Wars plans, and are such attitudes of Member States' governments not at variance with repeated declarations made in the context of political cooperation concerning peace, arms reductions and the need to step up the Geneva talks?

Answer

Disarmament issues are obviously dealt with in the context of European Political Cooperation. The Ten have always done, and continue to do, everything in their power to promote bilateral or multilateral negotiations with a view to the reduction of armaments of any kind, both nuclear and conventional, by means of balanced measures under effective international supervision.

The question raised by the honourable Member, however, concerns a matter which is not covered by European Political Cooperation and has thus not been discussed in that context. The governments of the Member States of the Community will thus have to adopt a position on this matter at national level or on the basis of direct consultations between the countries concerned. However, the honourable Member's description of the attitude of certain Member States towards this question does not correspond with the actual positions of the countries in question as expressed in numerous public statements.

*
* *

Question No 121, by Mr Tzounis (H-54/85)

Subject: Violation by the Soviet Union of a series of arms reduction treaties

Have the Foreign Ministers given any consideration to the reports that the Soviet Union has violated the 1972 ABM treaty by constructing a prohibited type of radar in Siberia, the 1979 SALT II treaty by going on to test a second type of intercontinental missile, and the

1963 nuclear test treaty by carrying out tests from which there were leaks of radioactive waste?

Answer

The Ten are closely following the Geneva negotiations on space and nuclear weapons and, as in the past, will not fail to encourage any possibility of positive developments in the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The question raised by the honourable Member is a fundamental aspect of the current negotiations. The Ten attach the greatest importance to compliance with the obligations resulting from the present treaties, in particular the ABM Treaty, and will not fail to take due account of these concerns in their action to promote positive results in Geneva.

*
* *

Question No 122, by Mr Fellermaier (H-77/85)

Subject: Change of names of Turkish citizens in Bulgaria

Can the chairman of the Foreign Ministers confirm reports that as part of a nationwide campaign since the end of 1984, the Turks living in Bulgaria have been forced to give up their Turkish names and adopt Bulgarian names and does the conference of Foreign Ministers see any possibility of influencing Bulgaria, given that it is one of the signatories of the Final Act of Helsinki, to respect the human rights of its Turkish minority?

Answer

The Ten are closely following the situation of the Muslim minority in Bulgaria. This question was recently dealt with in the context of European Political Cooperation. In order to gain a full and objective insight into the problem and all its implications, the Ten are currently engaged in obtaining further facts.

*
* *

Question No 123, by Mr Pearce (H-80/85)

Subject: Export of cocaine

Will the Foreign Ministers make representations to the governments of those South American countries from which cocaine is exported with a view to impeding supplies from reaching Europe?

Answer

The illegal export of cocaine from South America is not at present receiving specific attention in the context of European Political Cooperation. However, at the meeting of 12 February 1985 in Rome the Foreign Ministers of the Ten recognized the importance of the problem of drug trafficking and agreed that it should be discussed at the next meeting of the Ministers responsible for action to combat terrorism and organized crime.

*
* *

Question No 124, by Mr McMahon (H-100/85)

Subject: Shootings in South Africa

Can the President of the Council of Ministers inform Parliament as to what actions the Ministers propose taking to put pressure on the South African Government to end their policy of apartheid and what representations were made by the Commission to the South African Government about the killing of innocent citizens in the month of March in the Eastern Cape?

Answer

The Ten have of course on numerous occasions expressed their condemnation of apartheid in South Africa and called on the Pretoria Government to move quickly to introduce the reforms necessary for bringing racial segregation to an end, notably in the Foreign Ministers' declarations of 11 September 1984 and, more recently, 29 April 1985. The recent events in South Africa, as was indicated in the answer to oral question H-59/85, were the subject of a press statement made by the Presidency on behalf of the Ten on 25 March 1985.

This stated that the ten Member States of the European Community expressed their deep concern at the tension created in South Africa as a result of indiscriminate repressive action against the black population. In particular, they strongly condemned the behaviour of the police in the events of 21 March in Uitenhage, which led to the deaths of a number of blacks. The Ten recalled the Foreign Ministers' declaration of 11 September 1984 and repeated their call for an end to apartheid and for a process of dialogue leading to substantive reforms that met the legitimate aspirations of the black population.

*
* *

Question No 127, by Mr Iversen (H-138/85)

Subject: Measures against South Africa

In recent months, the Scandinavian countries have taken a tougher line with the barbaric regime in South Africa. Among other things, measures have been taken with a view to a boycott of coal imports from, and oil exports to, South Africa. In their answer to my question H-59/85,¹ the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation stressed that they would welcome thorough-going reforms with a view to satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the black population. However, the Foreign Ministers are evidently unwilling to take more stringent measures against South Africa than those of the UN. Is this because the Foreign Ministers do not consider that an oil boycott and other economic sanctions would actually be an effective instrument against the illegal regime in South Africa?

Answer

The situation in South Africa and the policy to be adopted towards that country are regularly discussed in European Political Cooperation.

In this context, as pointed out in the reply to Oral Question No H-59/85 tabled by the honourable Member himself, the position adopted by the Danish Parliament has been brought to the attention of the other partners. However, the possibility of imposing an oil boycott or other economic sanctions on South Africa, in addition to the mandatory sanctions adopted by the United Nations and strictly applied by the Ten, has not been discussed in European Political Cooperation.

The Ten will continue to use their collective weight to induce the South African Government to end the inhuman system of apartheid.

¹ Verbatim report of proceedings for the sitting of 17. 4. 1985, provisional edition.

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 9 MAY 1985

Contents

Mr Le Pen; Mrs Hoff; Mr Provan; Mr Cassidy; Mr Ford; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Härlin; Mr Elliott; Mr von der Vring; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Balfe; Sir Fred Catherwood

1. Budget 1985 — Votes:

Mr Pearce; Mr Pitt; Mr Dankert; Mr Cot; Mr Staes; Mr von der Vring; Mr Fich; Mr Curry; Mr Fich; Mr Curry; Mr Fich; Mrs Barbarella; Mr Curry; Mr Fich; Mr Pitt; Mr Fich; Mr Pitt; Mr Fich; Mr Alavanos; Mr Muntingh; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Fich; Mr von der Vring; Mr Curry; Mr Fich; Mr Arndt; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Barbarella; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Guerneur; Mr Staes; Mrs Castle; Mr Pasty; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Curry; Mr Fich; Mr Croux; Mr Herman; Mr Balfe; Mr Cassidy 197

2. Topical and urgent debate:

- *Farm prices — Motions for resolution (Doc. B 2-260/85/rev.) by Mrs S. Martin and others and (Doc. B 2-300/85) by Mr Mouchel and others:*

Mrs S. Martin; Mr Mouchel; Mr Wolter; Mr Bocket; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Pranchère; Mr Maher; Mr Mac Sharry; Mrs Jepsen; Mr Gatti; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Christophersen (Commission) 206

- *Nicaragua — Motions for resolution (Doc. B 2-265/85) by Mr Arndt and others and (Doc. B 2-316/85) by Mr Cervetti and others:*

Mr Arndt; Mr Cervetti; Mrs Lenz; Mr Prag; Mr Filinis; Mr Verbeek; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Zaborka; Mr Alavanos; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Marck; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mr Arndt; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Dankert; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Klepsch; Mr Arndt; Mr Cervetti; Mr de la Malène; Mr Van der Lek; Mrs Veil; Mr De Gucht; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Guerneur; Mr B. Friedrich; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mrs Piermont 212

- *Terrorism — Motions for resolution (Doc. B 2-281/85) by Mr Beyer de Ryke and others; (Doc. B 2-305/85) by Mr Glinne and others; (Doc. B 2-310/85) by Mr Herman and others and (Doc. B 2-315/85) by Mr Cervetti:*

Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Glinne; Mr Herman; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Barzanti; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr de Camaret; Mrs Dury 222

- *Libya — Motions for resolution (Doc. B 2-261/85) by Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mrs Veil; (Doc. b 2-278/85) by Mr de la Malène and Mr Coste-Floret; (Doc. B 2-295/85) by Mr Stirbois and others; (Doc. B 2-312/85) by Mr Mallet and others:*

Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Coste-Floret; Mr Stirbois; Mr Bernard-Reymond; Mr Bombard; Mr Habsburg; Mr Segre; Mr Nordmann; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission) 225

- *Ethiopia — Motions for resolution (Doc. B 2-280/85) by Mr Chinaud and Mrs Flesch; (Doc. B 2-285/85) by Mr Le Chevallier and Mr Antony; (Doc. B 2-301/85) by Mr de la Malène and others and (Doc. B 2-311/85) by Mr Herman and others:*

Mrs Flesch; Mr Tripodi; Mr Guerneur; Mr Raftery; Mr Fellermaier; Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Wurtz; Mr Ciccimessere; Mr Natali (Commission); Mr Fellermaier; Mr Guerneur; Mr Patterson; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mr d'Ormesson 229

3. Budgetary policy 1986 (Doc. A 2-25/85) (continuation):

Mr Ulburghs; Mr Bardong; Mr Christophersen (Commission) 235

4. Votes:

Mr Christodoulou; Mr Dankert; Mr Alavanos; Mr Dankert; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Le Chevallier; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Chanterie; Mrs

- Weber; Mr de la Malène; Mrs Dury; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Bonaccini; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mr Elliott; Mr Stirbois; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Pearce; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Cervetti; Mr Le Chevallier; Mr Mallet; Mr Welsh; Mrs De March; Mr Galland; Mrs Lehideux; Mr Wurtz 237
5. *Mediterranean countries (Docs. A 2-24/85 and A 2-27/85) (continuation):*
Mr Papoutsis; Mr Verbeek; Mr Filinis 244
6. *World Conference in Nairobi — Oral question with debate by Mrs Lenz (Doc. B 2-182/85), to the Commission and (Doc. B 2-183/85) to the Council:*
Mrs Lenz; Mr Mosar (Commission); Mrs Lenz; Mrs Gadioux; Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken; Mrs Daly; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mrs Lemass; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mrs Lenz; Mrs Dury; Mrs Lenz 246
7. *Social Fund — Oral question with debate (Doc. B 2-287/85) by Mr Arndt to the Commission:*
Mrs Salisch; Mr Mosar (Commission); Mrs Dury; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Welsh; Mr von der Vring; Mr Huckfield; Mr Mosar; Mr Muntingh; Mr Welsh; Mrs Salisch; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Dury; Mr Welsh; Mr Pearce; Mr Muntingh; Mr Welsh 252
8. *Environment — Report (Doc. A 2-19/85) by Mrs Dupuy:*
Mrs Dupuy; Mr Bombard; Mr Lambrias; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission) 258
9. *Animal feedingstuffs — Report (Doc. A 2-23/85) by Mr Mertens:*
Mr Elliott; Mrs Daly; Mr Mertens; Mrs Weber; Mr Mertens; Mr Sherlock; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Clinton; Mrs Daly; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz 263

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)

Mr Le Pen (DR). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, yesterday, at a solemn sitting, this Assembly received President Reagan, who is the Head of the American Executive — in other words, the leader of the most powerful ally nation. I have to say that many Members were deeply shocked, not only by the discourteous behaviour of certain of our colleagues, but also by what seemed to us to be the complacency on the part of the authorities in our Assembly, and a number of administrative departments.

I know that it is a kind of disinformation that allows the cameras to be pointed only at minority activities or activism. But, whether it is a question of President Reagan or any other Head of State, since we are also talking about the dignity of an Assembly which will perhaps be called on one day to legislate, Members ought indeed to be convinced of the need to set an example of respect for order and dignity. The fact that no violence occurred appears to be due to negotiations between the Presidency and some of those responsible for the disturbances.

This blackmail is absolutely intolerable, and it is obvious that — in the matter, also, of attire — the

Assembly owes it to itself to present a dignified, respectable image of the peoples that it represents.

(Applause from the right)

President. — Mr Le Pen, I have to contradict you; there were no negotiations of any sort.

Mrs Hoff (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, as it is impossible, in the context of a debate on a point of order, to express remarks with regard to the content, although I could certainly say something about that, I should like to inform Mr Le Pen that he is the last person entitled to pass judgment on the conduct of our colleagues. I should therefore like to repudiate utterly what he has said.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Provan (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. In the light of changed circumstances consequent on decisions taken in Nigeria, which moved yesterday to take legal proceedings against Kenneth Clark and Angus Patterson, I wish to withdraw the urgent resolution in my name. These two men have been held for just short of a year, and the Nigerian authorities now say that the trial is to commence next Monday. I, therefore, believe it would be inappropriate for Parliament to discuss this matter today, as it could be viewed as *sub judice*.

Provan

However, I must ask Parliament to support the resolution next month, as a matter of urgency, if proper procedures and conditions are not in place. The two Aberdonians, who are aircraft technicians, have not had proper consular representation or access to legal advice. The court proceedings must take place within a reasonable time, as they have been postponed several times in the past and the families of the two men concerned cannot be allowed to stay in the conditions that they are having to live with at the present time.

Mr President, I am sure you will accept that basic human rights have to be respected. If the Nigerian authorities do not proceed with this trial at the present time, in an acceptable manner, we as a Parliament will have to return to the basic human rights issue in the future. Mr President, I hope you will allow me to withdraw this resolution for the present.

President. — Your comments have been noted.

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Mr President, I raise a point of order under Rule 68 — order in the Chamber — and Rule 70 — disturbances. It is not the first time that banners have been displayed in this Chamber by certain Members, whom I will not name but whose identity is well known to you. I see that in the case of continued offences the Chair has the right under Rule 69 to exclude Members who continually transgress.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

May I therefore suggest that under Rules 68 and 70 — order in the Chamber, and disturbances — a note be made of those who caused the disturbances yesterday with a view to their possible exclusion from this Chamber under Rule 69 at some future date.

In the case of the chairman of the British Labour group, she is old enough to know better. In the case of the German Greens, of course, they are the spiritual heirs of Adolf Hitler and cannot be expected to know any better.

President. — Your statement has been noted.

Mr Ford (S). — On a point of order Mr President. I am tempted to engage in a debate with Mr Cassidy over the comments he has just made. However, I actually have a serious point of order to make, as opposed to trying to make a political point.

This morning, in my pigeonhole, I received an answer from the Commission to an oral question I tabled on Leeward Island Air Transport and the purchase of aircraft. The answer was identical to that supplied to Mr Newman some four months ago. In fact, it was the same answer with his name tippexed out and mine put

on instead. Since that has happened, the British Government has asked for an inquiry into how the decision came to be made. If the Commission is going to treat this House seriously — and we are being urged to treat it seriously — I presume it can at least update its answers over a period of four months! I hope you will take this up with them. Clearly we are all wasting our time if all the Commission is going to do is to photocopy previous answers four months later, when circumstances have changed.

President. — Mr Ford, that was not a point of order. If you care to submit to me in writing the question you have just raised, I shall see what action I can take.

Mr Fellermaier (S). — *(DE)* In contrast to my colleagues of the Conservative Group, I should like to thank you expressly for the dignity with which you conducted yesterday's sitting, as well as for the fact that you allowed Members the liberty to express their views by personal badges or banners and did not comply with the request of a British Conservative to institute disciplinary measures against freely-elected Members. They were only expressing the attitude of their electors to a country's President whom we certainly respect but with whose policy we are not bound to agree in full. That only shows the spirit of the British Conservatives. They remain true to themselves as being forever yesterday's people.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Härlin (ARC). — *(DE)* Mr President, may I ask you to call upon Mr Cassidy to apologize immediately for what he has just said about the German Greens.

(Applause from the left)

Quite apart from the Rules of Procedure and varying forms of expression there are limits of which all of us in this House ought to take account and Mr Cassidy has overstepped these limits. I should be grateful if you would tell him that and I call upon Mr Cassidy to withdraw what he said, since that was going too far!

Mr Elliott (S). — I wanted to rise in opposition to what Mr Cassidy has said, but this has already been taken up. In complaining about other people he, like a number of his colleagues, has been extremely offensive to those of us who are simply exercising our right to put forward the views that we espouse and the views of those people we represent. I hope that there will be an evenhandedness in regard to this whole matter of expressing one's views, because it is totally unreasonable for the Conservatives to think that they are the only people who have any right to express their point of view.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (*DE*) Mr President, there is a certain inheritance which one must accept even if one has not solicited it and in this sense we are all heirs of Adolf Hitler and of the inheritance he has left us. I should like to invite Mr Cassidy to come to the Federal Republic of Germany and to see for himself where Adolf Hitler's spirit still lives. Then he will understand that it is not pacifists — whether one agrees with them or not — who threaten the world.

(*Applause from the left*)

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — (*NL*) Mr President, I should like to associate myself with what Mr Fellermaier has said as regards your handling of yesterday's sitting. Because of my respect for you I cannot believe that you were listening carefully when Mr Cassidy insulted a number of our colleagues. You stated that you noted his statement. I assume that at that moment you were not listening carefully and that you will now tell Mr Cassidy most emphatically that that sort of insult cannot be addressed to our colleagues here.

(*Applause*)

President. — Mrs Van de Heuvel, I was listening very carefully. I reserve the right to take, during subsequent sittings, whatever decisions I consider to be in line with both the Rules of Procedure and the dignity of this House without, of course, having to make any commitments regarding hypothetical situations which we cannot at the moment foresee.

(*Applause*)

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, any chamber obviously has to have certain standards as to what can or cannot be said in it. I recognize that, as far as I know, Mr Cassidy's only previous experience of elected office was in the chamber of the Greater London Council where such language may be permissible. I would invite Mr Cassidy to withdraw his remark. I hope that no person on the left or on the right of this Chamber would make a similar remark. In the event of him refusing to withdraw his remarks, I would invite you to use Rule 69 to exclude him from the Chamber for a period of time, because I really do think that we do have to set down some standards for conduct within this House.

(*Applause*)

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, Mr Cassidy told me, as acting leader of the group, that he was going to raise a point of order on the behaviour in the Chamber yesterday. He did not say what he was going to say and I am sure our group would not associate ourselves with the words that he used.

(*Applause*)

President. — I consider the matter closed.¹

1. Budget 1985 — Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on:

- the draft amendments to Sections I, II, III — Annex IV and V of the draft general budget of the European Communities for 1985,
- the draft amendments and proposed modifications to Section III of the draft general budget of the European Communities for 1985,
- the report (Doc. A 2-30/85) by Mr Fich, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the new draft general budget of the European Communities for 1985.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, I simply wish to make a correction to one of the budget items. It concerns Articles 600 and 601 and Amendment No 384. There is reference in the document on those budget lines to Community funds given to Greenland. I believe this to be an error and that money for Greenland has, I believe, ceased or will shortly cease. I think that once that correction is made, it will be opportune, as the authors of the amendment propose, to add Merseyside to that list of particularly disadvantaged areas.

President. — The question will be considered when the texts have been submitted; we shall hear the rapporteur's opinion then.

Mr Pitt (S). — Mr President, I rise on a point of order relating to the item on research in the budget. Either yourself or I have been misled, and I wonder if you would clear up the matter.

In the new budget there is a heading on research which in the conciliation process you yourself raised. When I asked you on Monday what authority you had to raise it, you said that there had been an adjournment, that Parliament's delegation had held a meeting at which all of the political groups had been represented and you had then used that as your authority to insert this item in the budget.

I am told subsequently, Sir, that there was no Socialist Group representative at that informal consultation. I wonder if you would correct me or confirm that you were wrong in what you said to me on Monday and would then take my point that you had no authority to

¹ *Approval of minutes — Documents received: see Minutes.*

Pitt

introduce the item on research as you did during the conciliation process.

President. — Mr Pitt, allow me to point out that, first, the European Parliament's delegation did in fact include members of the different groups, although none of them was present as representative of his group.

Secondly, at this conciliation meeting the Council of Ministers agreed to change its own proposals. These new proposals will, of course, be submitted to the House. If you do not like them, Mr Pitt, you can vote against them. Clearly a conciliation meeting of this kind in no way ties the hands of Parliament which retains its full freedom of decision. You will therefore have an opportunity to express whatever views you have on this matter.

We now come to the vote on the budget. I would remind the House — and I would ask you to listen very carefully to this — that for adoption draft amendments require the votes of a majority of the current Members of Parliament, i.e. at least 218 votes in favour. Proposed modifications require an absolute majority of the votes cast. The Committee on Budgets is in favour of all the amendments which it adopted and of Amendments Nos 1 to 4, 309, 318, 320 and 348. I shall remind the House of these favourable opinions when the amendments are being put to the vote. The Committee on Budgets is against all the other amendments.

In view of the fact that a large number of amendments have already been adopted by Parliament in October 1984, I propose, in agreement with the Committee on Budgets, that a simplified voting procedure be adopted: when a series of amendments already adopted in October and marked with an asterisk on your voting list is presented unopposed, I shall put to the vote the first amendment of the series under the normal procedure. If this amendment is adopted I shall ask the House if its position on each subsequent amendment in this series is the same. If one or more Members oppose this procedure I shall immediately apply the normal voting procedure.

Are there any objections?

Mr Dankert (S). — (FR) Mr President, I am afraid that you are creating a dangerous precedent by not voting on the amendments in turn, one after the other, as laid down by the Treaty. I very much regret that it takes more time, but, in view of the budgetary difficulties already experienced in applying the Treaty, I almost beg you to accept the rule as laid down by the Treaty, and vote on each amendment in turn.

President. — Very well, Mr Dankert, I note your position.

As I pointed out a moment ago this simplified procedure which has been proposed by the Committee on Budgets, or at least by a majority of its members, can, I feel, only be applied when there is unanimous agreement. However, as it is apparent from your statement that this unanimous consensus is not present, we shall follow the normal procedure.

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Mr President, obviously, if there is an objection, the customary procedure must be followed.

I simply wanted to point out to Mr Dankert that the procedure that you are suggesting, and that I had proposed to you, Mr President, in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Budgets, is a procedure that allows our Assembly to vote on each amendment in succession.

The only thing that is changed is the way in which the votes are taken. There is no question whatever of a global vote on the amendments, under the pretext that they would have been adopted in November.

It appears to me therefore that your proposal in no way offends against the dispositions of the Treaty and the Rules of Procedure.

(Applause)

Mr Staes (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, I naturally fully agree that we must save time and that waste of time must be avoided. On the other hand, I must tell you that my group is asking for separate voting on Title VII, part (b), concerning nos 131, 132, 162 and 163 on the one hand and nos 165 and 174 on the other. The reason is that, if these matters are taken together, the vote must be taken on two options which are thus conflicting, on the one hand for nuclear energy but on the other hand also for alternative energy. We cannot do that. I therefore ask for separate votes on these points.

President. — We shall not waste any more time. I already said that we would follow the normal procedure. That is decided.

(Applause)

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, my Honourable Friend, Mr Dankert, put forward objections, but he did not express his opposition and I ask you to proceed as you were proposing to do. I respect your authority in the interpretation of the Treaties in the sphere of the financial system and with every individual point you can give Mr Dankert the opportunity to express his opposition formally if he thinks things are not in order. Otherwise we can proceed as you proposed.

President. — Mr Dankert is opposed to this procedure on the grounds that its use would create a dangerous precedent. I have to respect and take account of his opinion. We shall therefore follow the normal procedure.

SECTION V — COURT OF AUDITORS

Statement of revenue

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Mr President, I should like first of all to say in general as regards the Commission's budget, as you also already mentioned in the introduction, that the Committee on Budgets naturally recommends all its own draft amendments. That does not mean that the Committee on Budgets has thus rejected all amendments by specialist committees, since it is a simple fact that the Committee on Budgets has taken over those amendments tabled by specialist committees on which we voted on 14 November 1984. Apart from that, the Committee on Budgets is in favour of only seven further amendments and I shall point these out as we come to them.

With special regard to the revenue side of the budget, on which there are six draft amendments, I should like to say that it is essential to vote for the amendments which increase own resources, otherwise there will not be the funds to finance expenditure, and that will thus mean that when we have advanced a little further with the process we shall no longer be able to vote on increased expenditure.

Finally I should just like to draw attention to draft amendment No 289 recommended by the Committee on Budgets. It concerns the question of the refund to the United Kingdom.

SECTION III — COMMISSION

Title III

Item 3841 to Article 387 — Draft Amendments 52 and 312

Mr Curry (ED). — Mr President, Mr Provan has asked me to defend his amendment. This is an amendment which follows a resolution carried, I think unanimously, in the House following the discussion about frauds and it would give practical financial consequence to the House's desires for the control of frauds, particularly in relation to the Mafia.

President. — Thank you, Mr Curry. As you are aware, the amendment has just been adopted.

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Mr President, I should like to say that the Committee on Budgets expressed its agreement with you that this amendment lapsed when draft amendment No 52 was adopted. I do not think that we can vote on this draft amendment.

President. — In fact Mr Provan is satisfied, is he not? And Mr Curry too.

Title V — Articles 560, 583, 649 and 707

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Mr President, I assume that we have now reached draft amendments No 293 and No 291. The latter also concerns the question of the refund to the United Kingdom. It concerns the revenue side, whether to introduce a proposed modification in connection with urban renewal together with some comments on the matter. I should just like to say that there are two draft amendments — one tabled by Mrs Barbarella and one which bears my name and which the Committee on Budgets supports. The Committee on Budgets did not vote on Mrs Barbarella's amendment, since at that time mine had already been adopted by the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Curry (ED). — Mr President, I do not appear to have the revised version of Mrs Barbarella's amendment in my folder. I would be grateful if the rapporteur could read it out to me. I am particularly interested to know what the commentary says and when I have heard it, I may ask for a split vote between the token entry and the commentary.

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) I think there is a mistake on the list since it says 293/rev.; but in fact it is simply draft amendment No 293 which is concerned. I also have only one version — like Mr Curry. There was a mistake, Mr Curry, in the first batch since the commentary was omitted, but now it is included in draft amendment No 293. That is what we are concerned with: draft amendment No 293. There has been no alteration to the text itself.

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — (IT) Mr President, by mistake, obviously, the text was initially distributed with part of it missing. However, the complete text is now available in all languages. With your permission, Mr President, I should like to read the complete text, for Mr Curry's information also.

Mr Curry (ED). — Mr President, it is no longer necessary, now that I know there is but one amendment. But I would request you to vote on the line and on the commentary separately, please.

Before the vote on Draft Amendment No 291/rev.

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) I think that we can now vote on the draft amendment approved by the Committee on Budgets — that is, No 291. It is identical as regards the proposed modification but has a different commentary which I, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, can recommend.

Title VI

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) The first vote of all on Chapter 6 concerns the Social Fund. Here there are two draft amendments on a general amount: one from the Socialist Group for 72 million in appropriations for payment — but I think I heard that it was withdrawn. Then one from the Committee on Budgets for 67 million in appropriations for payment, as an exceptional measure. Naturally I wish to recommend the one from the Committee on Budgets. But I must make it clear here that behind this figure lies a political agreement in the Committee on Budgets which involves both supporting this amount and then also an amount of 5 million ECU for the development of agriculture in Poland. I should like to say that these two matters were joined together in the Committee on Budgets not so much for technical as for political reasons.

President. — Thank you, Mr Fich.

Item 6482 — Draft Amendments No 358 and No 414

Mr Pitt (S). — It is a point of order, Mr President. Forgive me, but could you explain something to me? I understand fully why amendments fall when a different figure has been adopted, but in the last two we adopted a figure for the payments column. You then said that two amendments seeking to insert amounts in the appropriations column fell.

Because they make proposals for the appropriations column and not for the payments column, surely they could be taken too.

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) In this column they are not differentiated allocations and we naturally cannot therefore enter a figure for appropriations for commitment differing from that for appropriations for payment, and so Mr Pitt is *not* correct. We cannot subsequently vote on higher amounts for appropriations for commitment than for payments because these are non-differentiated appropriations.

Item 6610 — Draft Amendments No 110 and No 332

Mr Pitt (S). — Mr President, I understood Mr Fich's explanation to my last point of order, which clearly you couldn't answer yourself, to mean that you cannot

take together the two amendments which I mentioned, because then you would end up with different figures in the columns.

He is now himself, proposing different figures — 250 000 in the first and 325 000 in the second. I will not accept the implication that the difference to which he is referring is a difference between no figure and a figure. That is not a valid reason for an amendment to fall.

President. — I repeat that in the preceeding case the Chair had a prepared explanation before it, but I felt it would be useful to allow the rapporteur to explain it to the House, as he did very clearly.

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Mr Pitt, the budget contains differentiated and non-differentiated appropriations and for differentiated appropriations there may be a difference between appropriations for commitment and appropriations for payment. No such difference is possible in the case of differentiated appropriations. Previously we were dealing with non-differentiated appropriations. Therefore we could not vote; but we are now dealing with differentiated appropriations. Therefore this time we may have different amounts.

Item 6706 — Draft Amendment No 344

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) I would just like to draw colleagues' attention to the fact that this amendment only refers to a change of title, and not of the amounts involved. In other words, a change of title from 'Figures for the restoration and maintenance of the Parthenon' to 'Figures for the restoration and maintenance of the Acropolis'. Because as the item stands at present, it cannot be made good.

(On leaving the Chair, Mr Pflimlin was loudly applauded by the House)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

Vice-President

Title VII

Item 7317 — After the vote on Draft Amendment No 275

Mr Muntingh (S). — (NL) I think there has been a mistake, since we have just voted on Amendment No 275 and we were now engaged in voting on

Muntingh

Amendment No 183, but the board showed clearly No 275. So there must have been a mistake.

President. — Mr Muntingh, I am following the order set out in the file given to me. I repeat that the order in which we have just voted was: Amendment No 273, then No 182, then No 274 and that we were in the process of voting on No 275. This is the order on the paper before me. I cannot see any grounds for contention.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) Madam President, I accept at once that everything was in order according to your file, but with Amendment 182 we had 275 on the screen as well and with Amendment 275 we had 275 again. So there were a number of people who thought we were at Amendment 183. Perhaps you have not got it wrong, but the board did have it wrong. That is what I go by. When it says 275 I vote on Amendment 275 and that cannot be taken twice, but it did appear twice on the board.

President. — Mrs Viehoff, having checked the record I repeat that Amendment No 273 was adopted and No 182 rejected; that No 274 was also rejected and that we have just voted on No 275 which was adopted by 218 votes.

Title IX

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Madam President, I should like to make a brief remark by way of introduction to Chapter 9 which, as we all know, is a very important chapter. The Committee on Budgets has naturally decided to support its own draft amendment together also with five draft amendments in Mr Saby's name — Nos 1, 2, 3, 4 and 348. Moreover, we decided to support draft amendment No 320 by Mr Chambeiron and finally the very last vote under this chapter is the question of support for agricultural development in Poland, on which there are three draft amendments: one from Mr Klepsch, one from Mr Battersby and one in my name. I would ask Mr Klepsch and Mr Battersby to withdraw their amendments in favour of mine, which is an attempt to combine these two draft amendments. That is all I need to say on Chapter 9 for the time being.

President. — I thank the rapporteur for giving an overall opinion on these amendments.

After the vote on all the amendments to Annex II

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Unfortunately it appears that a mistake was made in one of the very last votes on the budget. That was partly due to an over-

sight on my part. Madam President, you said that one of the draft amendments of the Committee on Budgets was withdrawn. That was not the case and it is a great pity that we did not vote on it. It concerns Article 991 and this is a very important field, namely cooperation with Latin America in the industrial sphere, in which there was a request for 5 million in payment appropriations and 15 million in commitment appropriations. It will be a tremendous mistake not to manage to adopt this draft amendment since it is indeed Parliament's policy and I therefore request that draft amendment No 265 to Article 991 be put to the vote.

President. — Mr Fich, I shall check whether there is a mistake in the amendment number. I have just been informed that Amendment No 265 has in fact been put to the vote and I seem to remember that it was by roll-call vote. I shall check that in the record.

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) I am tired of insisting and taking up Parliament's time, but this is an important draft amendment and a technical error has occurred. I repeat: Draft Amendment No 265 which concerns 5 million in payment appropriations and 15 million in commitment appropriations, was tabled to Article 991 which is concerned with industrial co-operation with Latin America. It is a proposal of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee did not withdraw it. Since it is politically a very important proposal I request that we vote on it, although I admit it is rather late.

President. — The situation is now clear.

The amendment in question is No 265. The President's papers indicated that it had been withdrawn which is why it was not put to the vote. I therefore propose to put it to the vote now.

*Motion for a resolution**Paragraph 6 — Amendments Nos 5 and 12*

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) In the light of the decision we took on the United Kingdom, I recommend these two amendments which are intended to delete point 6. I think we are compelled to do so following the decision mentioned. I therefore recommend Amendments No 5 and No 12.

After the vote on paragraph 6

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Madam President, I think insufficient attention was paid to Mr Fich about this. It was made clear here what we were voting about

von der Vring

and after this vote about the revenue side we can no longer decide that paragraph 6 stands.

President. — Mr von der Vring, I do not know whether that follows. However the vote was clear and I cannot go back on it.

Mr Curry (ED). — Madam President, it may help if you put our amendment to the vote, but paragraph 6 says: '... has therefore deleted those entries'. But we have not deleted those entries. It is an incorrect statement. We have always achieved a harmony between the votes which are in the body of a budget and the resolution which reflects those votes. It would be incoherent if that paragraph were to stand. It just does not make sense.

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Madam President, I am pleased to receive support from the last two speakers. That was what I was trying to say myself. There must be consistency between the draft amendments and the resolution. I must of course defer to democracy but in the amendment one thing was approved and now we are asked to approve something different in the motion for a resolution. It must simply be pointed out, Madam President, that it is the draft amendments which have legal validity.

Explanations of vote

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) I should just like to make one thing clear and distinct: There has been a majority in this House for a long time past for the view that the Treaties must be observed and that value added tax was European money. If now there is a correction — and a correction was needed, because there was no fair compensation as against the United Kingdom — then that must be done via the expenditure side.

That was the firm conviction of this House with the exception — that must be expressly declared — of the British Labour group and the Conservatives. But all others have maintained that for years until today. Now, today, the Group of the European Peoples Party has done again what it always does in such cases: It has gone back on itself.

(Mixed reactions)

Simply by abstaining it has ensured that the necessary majority has not been secured. I said expressly that in this House the Labour and the Conservatives Members took another view from the beginning. We knew that.

But this was typical again: reject the budget, put on a big show, declare themselves for Europe — but when it comes to the point, go back on themselves!

(Applause from the left)

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) I listened to the speech of the minority leader of the Socialist Group. It was for that reason that we asked for a roll-call vote.

(Interruption by Mr Arndt: 'It hadn't come to the vote'.)

That was what my group asked for. Certainly we rejected the budget in December 1984 because it was not an annual budget. In the meantime the governments paid a further 2 000 million ECU and thus satisfied our basic demand. We now have an annual budget before us. It is true too that there is a legally regrettable element in this draft budget. That is what the present voting position looks like.

The Council has done something that we regard as legally unacceptable. The ratification procedure following Fontainebleau is not yet concluded. So in our view it is legally unacceptable to settle the British question, which we all want to get out of the way, on the revenue side. My group therefore abstained so as to make it clear that we certainly want to solve the British problem but are not ready to agree to this legally unacceptable solution. That is a matter for the Council!

When the ratification of the increase in value added tax to 1.4% has created the legal basis for this and for Fontainebleau this problem will become irrelevant in any case. A political solution must therefore be found and in my group's view this lies in a new financial regulation.

But, I repeat, we do not support this legally unacceptable behaviour and therefore we abstained from voting. It was only because of this extraordinary situation that we were prepared to act in that way. We refer to the decisions which will have to be taken at the summit in Milan and beyond. We were confronted with the problem whether the Community needs a budget or not. We decided for the budget and we decided that we did not wish to push the Community into a fresh crisis before the next summit in Milan. And I think the majority of the Socialist Group voted in the same way.

I should like to emphasize once more that our group voted for the Barbarella commentary so as to make our position quite clear. Certainly it was rejected, Mr Arndt, but we asked for a roll-call vote and we shall still settle everything.

My group, in the interests of the European Community and in the interests of this House, took the decision to get this budget through, and that is what we have done.

(Applause from the right)

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — (IT) Leaving aside the words and recriminations that I have just heard from the member who has just spoken before me, I should

Barbarella

like to point out to Members that, by the vote of the majority of this Chamber, we have in fact accepted the position of the Council on a central question, the question of the British refund. And therefore, having accepted it, I think that we have in fact clearly failed to show that consistency and firmness that we had hitherto shown in regard to that question.

I should like to point out two things, ladies and gentlemen. I do not understand how you can explain the elimination, from the revenue side, of a manner of distributing VAT that does not yet exist — how that can be said to have a 'legal basis'. The new treaty does not yet exist, and until it does exist, it cannot be used as any sort of legal basis. That is one point.

I should like, however, to add — interpreting also the views of other colleagues, that I do not think the firm, unyielding approach is the correct one either — standing firm, that is, on the old positions of last November. I think that as far as the other question is concerned, the corresponding action on the expenditure side, we ought to have found a compromise solution. Not that I set any particular store by my own proposal, but, what was important was to find a solution that would enable us to make some progress; to stand firm by our principles and, at the proper time, reopen the question of the basic issue, which is the new financial regulation.

As things are we find ourselves with nothing more in the budget, without any consistency of principle, and having for the most part accepted, as I have already said, the positions of the Council.

I think that, at the second reading, it will be very difficult for my Group to accept such a badly distorted budget.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group I have to say that we shall not vote for the resolution. And we shall not vote for it because, yet again, Parliament, in the first paragraph, has not been consistent. Let us refresh our memories: when we rejected the budget, it was because it was not a twelve-months' budget. We have that now, and have expressed our satisfaction. With our amendment, we have quite simply returned to the rapporteur's first text, to which an amendment was tabled by the British Labour Members in the Committee on Budgets. We now find ourselves once again with a sort of condemnation of the agricultural policy. This is quite scandalous, and is not at all what we wanted to do. For that reason we shall vote against this resolution.

As far as the budget is concerned, the amendments that have been adopted seem to us more or less satisfactory. I think that, at this first reading, Parliament has adopted a more or less satisfactory position on the very difficult amendments to do with the British con-

tribution. For that reason we are quite happy with what has happened. We are sorry that only the first part of Mrs Barbarella's amendment has been adopted. It would have seemed a good thing to us if the second part also — the commentary — had been adopted, but that has not happened. But the important thing is that the remainder was not adopted.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — *(FR)* On behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, I have to state that our group, as well, will not vote for this resolution.

By rejecting a budget that said nothing and was completely unambitious the Assembly made it clear to the Member States that it intended to ensure that the undertakings given with regard to the people of Europe would be honoured. And we were right, since there has now been submitted to us a twelve-months' budget, and one that guarantees the financing of the common policies. Of course, we are still sadly out in our reckoning, and we have still not got a real budget: the refund to the British aren't acknowledge itself for what it is, and we are asked to camouflage it under revenue; the Council has not the courage to enter the bonus to the German farmers as expenditure; the necessary food aid cannot be guaranteed; fixing the farm prices, the delay in which is improper, as well as being harmful to the farmers, threatens to unbalance the budget; nor does the budget for the IMP honour the commitments that have been entered into.

Finally, apart from the budget itself, we condemn the petty political drift which, little by little, is separating Europe more and more from its ambitions as a Community. Instead of voluntary, decisive policies backed by the corresponding budget, we have to put up with petty haggling over the contributions of Member States, whilst all hope is abandoned of the great common policies that could counter the challenge of the United States. The Council soothes us with lullabies on European progress and European union, and refuses increasingly as each year passes to provide the resources for their achievement. European policy is being reduced, in fact, to a succession of pious vows.

Nevertheless, Madam President, in spite of these serious deficiencies, and because necessity demands it, we would have voted for the resolution that closes this debate.

But the adoption of the shameful amendment put forward by the Labourites prevents us from doing this. There is a limit to how far the spirit of the Treaty can be subjected to attack, and this limit has now been exceeded by a chance majority that objectively supports the Labourite subversion within this Parliament. We shall not be in any way associated with this low blow struck at the future of European agriculture.

And, with great regret, the Group of the European Democratic Alliance will not vote for the resolution.

Mr Staes (ARC). — (NL) As members of the GRAEL in the Rainbow Group we have a positive outlook to the extent to which we are certainly not always against everybody and everything but are expressly supporters of a viable, non-violent and just world. That fundamentally positive outlook compels us to reject this draft resolution, because in general it is the expression of a policy which increases violence in the world, further pollutes the environment and strengthens the large-scale agricultural structure, with all the resultant consequences.

Agreement between our political conviction and the tendency which we find in the text now before us is once again difficult to discern. The lion's share of the funds still goes to a system of agriculture which puts paid both to our own farmers who live on small- or medium-sized holdings and to the peoples of the third world — a system which strengthens the agro-industry under the cloak of provision of foodstuffs and maintenance of low prices for the European consumer.

Funds for the energy, research and technology sector are simply invested in the ever increasing militarization of our scientific and technical creativity, apparently the only sector which flourishes in times of economic crisis. Nuclear energy takes the principal place in this increase even though it is doomed to expire in the medium term simply on traditional economic and financial grounds and nuclear fusion with its laser techniques is ensconced direct in the Star Wars or Eureka folly.

Social and regional projects directed towards independent, local development are crushed under the weight of large-scale automated agriculture. Projects for the third and fourth world are then reduced to a caricature of the crumbs falling from our rich table and the third world is humiliated in the spirit of paternalism and charity as long as the dependence of those countries is maintained and we in the North continue to rule the roost and hand out the food. As long as the interests of the economic great powers are at issue we are left with our employment policy and an unimaginable number of younger pensioners at the age of 21.

Madame President, we do not wish to bear any responsibility for such a procedure. We do not understand how the majority of those politically responsible in the EC can support such conduct. In order to see that it is nonsense you do not need to be an alternative, a normal measure of common sense is enough and I have increasingly the impression that the genuine alternative mentality should not be sought with us but with the conservative-minded majority in this Parliament. Many examples could be given. But this draft budget is an impressive example, a poignant example of an expertly packed piece of folly for which the future will call us to account quicker than we suppose.

Mrs Castle (S). — The British Labour Group will vote for this report because I and my Labour colleagues

have succeeded in altering it out of all recognition. Alright, so we have not managed to get paragraph 5 withdrawn. However, paragraph 5 is now a nonsense in view of the vote on the budget earlier; and everybody in this room knows that the attempt to make Britain take her rebate on the expenditure side instead of the revenue side is now dead.

The Fontainebleau agreement will, in fact, go through.

We, of course, are delighted that our Amendment No 2 has been adopted. It nails the colours to the mast in the matter of accepting the Commission's proposals for farm price increases and farm price reductions and price freezes as well. This transforms the situation. In fact, this Parliament should be grateful to us because we prevented it from making a nonsense of itself in calling for a rectifying budget to cover all expenditure before it knew what that expenditure was going to be. The farm price increases — if they come along — will make a nonsense of the amount of extra money that has been provided for.

So we believe that this motion ought not to have been necessary. We should not have been discussing the supplementary budget before the Agriculture ministers had made up their minds. However, we have improved the motion and therefore we shall support it.

Mr Pasty (RDE). — (FR) What has happened this morning, towards the end of the morning, is lamentable and brings Parliament into disrepute.

We have had a situation in which there were only 250 members present whilst important votes were being taken, and we have seen agreements, entered into between political groups on a subject as important as the British budgetary contribution, broken into smithereens. Under these circumstances, the text adopted for the resolution no longer really represented the majority point of view of this Assembly.

For that reason I shall personally vote, like my group, against this resolution as it stands.

(Applause from the Right)

Mr Tomlinson (S). — I am amazed when people tell this Assembly that it is regrettable that deals done behind closed doors do not stick and that that is their reason for voting against the democratic decision of this House. If people were concerned about the issues, then they should not have required a commitment behind closed doors. They should have done what they are paid by the citizens of Europe to do, i.e. to come into this Chamber and exercise their vote.

In democratic votes in this Chamber today, the motion for a resolution has been dramatically improved. Paragraphs 1 and 2 now clearly reflect the sensible view

Tomlinson

that this Parliament is going to take towards agricultural expenditure. We have regretted the error of our past ways and accepted that we ought to be supporting the Commission's price proposals as a minimum first step towards the reduction of agricultural surpluses. We have also stated the imperative need for the agricultural regulations to be amended so that the laws of supply . . .

(Cries of 'Time, time!')

. . . and demand, so much worshipped by the right wing of this House in other areas of political activity, are given some credence in the area of agriculture. As for those who are bellowing 'Time', I wish they could read a clock as well.

In conclusion, Madam President, let me say that paragraph 5 of this report is still unsatisfactory. However, we take the view that the vote of this House on the lines in the budget is a much more important reflection of the opinion of this House. Despite the nonsense of paragraph 5 of the report, therefore, we will urge our colleagues to vote for the report.

Mr Curry (ED). — My group will vote for this resolution. This has been a difficult day and a difficult issue, and I wish first of all to pay tribute to the comprehension of our friends on this side of the House who have had to take difficult decisions in circumstances which are difficult for them. However, the reason they have done so and the reason we sought that help was that we believe it is about time the Community set its face to the future and started to create a new basis for this Europe in which we all believe.

(Applause)

We believe we have to exorcise the ghost of the British rebate. We cannot go back to our people and argue the case for Europe while we have this issue hanging over us. That is why we have always taken a position which you may seem . . .

(Interruptions from Mr de la Malène)

Mr de la Malène, I listened courteously to you because I so admire your French. My English is as good as your French and I recommend that you listen to it.

We believe in cooperating with you in moving forward towards Europe and we have to take our people with us. We have to fight this issue because it is important to us.

I pay tribute to Mrs Castle's lonely fight in the Socialist Group. They perform magnificently, that little minority. I do recommend that they try to seek broader agreement with their own group, as we have

with our friends on this side of the House, to form a more genuine basis for moving forward.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — *(DA)* First of all I should like to say that everyone here knows that we had to deal with the budget under extremely difficult conditions as regards the time available to us. I should therefore like to begin by saying that I find it very positive that the Parliamentary committee and the political groups have behaved with such strict discipline that we are able in any case to give the question an initial examination here in May. But it must also be said that Parliament's staff have worked very hard to enable us to make this examination in May, and I think that that should be acknowledged.

But I rise to draw the conclusions from what we have adopted today. As I understand it the difference between what Parliament has adopted and what the Council stands for has in the end turned out to be very small. I should therefore like to put the following question directly to the Presidency of the Council: Is it possible to give us an answer on whether the Council can accept the proposal on the budget now under consideration? If it is not possible to give such an answer today, then when will it be?

President. — The question will be put to the Council, Mr Fich.

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — *(DA)* Madam President, I should be grateful if you would ask the Presidency of the Council whether I can have an answer to my question.

President. — The President-in-Office of the Council has just indicated to me discreetly that he will give us an answer a little later.

Mr Croux (PPE), in writing. — *(NL)* In the name of the CVP, PSC and CDA Members, I wish to state that we are of the opinion that there must be no indexation of expense allowances. We affirm also that these expenses must be dealt with in the framework of special identical rules for the Members of the European Parliament.

In those rules parliamentary emoluments as a whole, including the actual salary, must be linked to the requirement of regular attendance for the activities of Parliament and its committees.

Mr Herman (PPE), in writing. — *(FR)* Although I voted for the budget, I shall not vote for the resolution.

Herman

I should like to express my disappointment following the rejection of the commentary that accompanied Mrs Barbarella's Amendment No 293.

This commentary expressed the wish of Parliament to set a time limit to the unacceptable and budgetarily indefensible mechanism that was imposed upon us at Fontainebleau.

It was the almost unanimous wish of the Parliament of the time. I am astonished to see the Socialist Group contributing so massively to the diminution of the budgetary prerogatives of our institution. As for the Tory Members, they are paying us back very badly for the understanding that we showed when they were temporarily in an awkward situation.

(Parliament rejected the motion for a resolution)¹

*
* *

President. — I wish to draw the attention of my French colleagues to a mistake in the French version of the agenda. The vote this evening will be taken at 7 and not 7.30 p.m.

(The sitting was adjourned at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

President. — Mr Balfe has asked to speak on a point of order.

If it is your intention, Mr Balfe, to refer to Mr Cassidy and to the incident which occurred this morning and to call on the Chair to take up the matter, then we are in agreement. However, I do not want a further procedural debate on this matter, particularly as one may not speak twice on the same topic. Do you accept that, Mr Balfe?

Mr Balfe (S). — All I was going to add, Mr President, was that following a similar incident on 15 March the matter was actually referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions by Mrs Pery, who was in the chair on that occasion. I was going to suggest that this is part of a wider problem and should be referred to the same source, namely, the Committee

on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. If you are willing to accept that, I am willing to let the matter die.

Mr Cassidy (ED). — I am afraid that I am not prepared to let the matter die. I am astonished to hear that the Bureau is taking up my entirely justified remarks, which have since been endorsed as accurate by many other Members of this House. I am astonished that the Bureau should be taking up that remark of mine when it is not examining the behaviour — of which I originally complained — of the British Socialists and others on the extreme left yesterday during the visit of President Reagan.

President. — We will not continue this debate now as we shall be dealing with these incidents in a different context.

2. Topical and urgent debate

Farm prices

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution, by Mrs Martin and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group on the fixing of agricultural prices (Doc. B 2-260/85/rev.)
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Mouchel and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the urgent need to fix the farm prices and adopt the related measures for the 1985-86 marketing year (Doc. B 2-260/85/rev.)

Mrs S. Martin (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is certainly not the first time that the Council has not fixed farm prices by the set date. It must also be acknowledged that this has often been due to the domestic policies of Member States, or electoral reasons.

There are some years when the approach of elections speeds up debates. There are others — such as this year — when the opposite is the case.

The farmers — or to be more precise, the stock breeders, since it is in fact only they that are concerned — are very much affected by these politicking fluctuations, the cost of which they have to bear, and which prevent us from getting on with the building of Europe.

Last year, because it was necessary to control milk production and keep down surpluses, milk quota systems were introduced, alongside an increase in the

¹ On the motion for a resolution, the rapporteur spoke:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 5, 7 and 12
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 4, 6, 8, to 11, 13 to 16.

S. Martin

co-responsibility levy and a virtual price freeze. This came after a difficult year, since in 1983 the net income of the farmers had already decreased on average by 13.5%.

These measures — despite some overall improvement in farmers' incomes, due mainly to an exceptional grain harvest — still further affected the milk producers' incomes, and in addition there was the disturbance of the beef market due to the slaughtering of milk cows, the effects of which will continue to be felt during this year.

In this context it is therefore essential for the Council to fix farm prices before the next Council of Agricultural Ministers on 13 May — and I imagine that part of the electoral obstacle will have disappeared by then, which will undoubtedly facilitate its task on the basis of the Parliament's proposals, which are in our view the only acceptable ones capable of meeting the producers' needs. The Council must also recognise the budgetary implications of its proposals.

Furthermore, I cannot refrain from remarking that those very same members of the Council who were calling for budgetary discipline are today in the process of realizing that the consequences are sometimes heavy to bear. That is ample proof, as my group has on numerous occasions pointed out, that the budget can only reflect and, in fact, must only reflect, lines of policy and decisions.

It is moreover essential, as far as the stock breeders and, above all, the milk producers are concerned, for the Council to make compensation for the consequences of the delay, for which it is responsible. An undertaking along these lines was moreover given — if I am to believe certain of the media in my country — by President Pandolfi to the farmers' meeting in Luxembourg last week. It is also the only way to show the producers that they are not being taken lightly, and that, in this uncertain period, account is being taken of their concern.

For this reason, and in this spirit, I very much hope that our Assembly will adopt, by a large majority, the compromise amendment that I have put forward in conjunction with a number of colleagues from virtually all the political Groups, and that the Council will heed our words of wisdom and reason.

(Applause)

Mr Mouchel (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, after the last speech by Mrs Martin, I could simply have added that I approve entirely of what she has just said, and then sat down again. But, since I have a few minutes available, I should like to add a few words and remind us all that, every year, the fixing of farm prices gives the Council of Ministers an opportunity to provide real guidelines for the Common Agricultural Policy. It

is the time when, each year, priorities are established as between one policy and another, or one type of agricultural produce and another. Yet the new campaign opened on 1 April last, and farm prices have still not been fixed.

This is unfortunately a situation that tends to become normal, yet is entirely abnormal. It is contrary to the proper operation of our institutions, and it is contrary to the execution of a good agricultural policy. It is regrettable that, for reasons that are sometimes related to the domestic policy of one Member State or another, or that simply reflect the desire to delay as long as possible the increase of farm prices, a method is in this way adopted that becomes automatic.

The harm which the farmers suffer varies very much according to what they produce, but it also varies from one country to another. The delay in fixing farm prices does not in fact harm those producers for whose products no price increase is envisaged. On the other hand, in those sectors of farm production that are worth encouraging but which present problems, if there ought to be a price increase then each day's additional delay increases the harm done to the farmers engaged in this production.

I would also say that, when a country is already suffering from the application of positive monetary compensatory amounts, every day's additional delay prolongs this harm and this handicap, for an increasing period of time. We are now in effect going to reach 15 May with farm prices still not having been fixed. This is a practice that stems from a bad policy, and that penalizes too many farmers. I hope that this motion for a compromise resolution, that we have presented jointly with a number of Members from different Groups — as Mrs Martin pointed out — will receive an entirely favourable vote showing a very large majority. I hope also that it will take into account the harm done to farmers by the delay in fixing the prices.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Woltjer (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, it is not an everyday happening that my name occurs together with those of Mrs Martin and Mr Mouchel, the presenters and originators of this resolution. But that is the fact this time and I should like to congratulate the presenters on their initiative, which I fully support, in so far as I too, together with my group, think that agricultural prices ought indeed to be fixed in time and that horsetrading cannot be carried on ceaselessly until well on in May so as finally to come out much too late with some compromise or other which is scarcely more credible. So on that point there is no difference of opinion.

Nor is there any as regards paragraph 2 of the motion for a resolution, although I should like to say something in passing. Mr President, at the time of the prices

Woltjer

debate we expressly stated what our point of view was and when the budget was dealt with this week we heard that that standpoint was still supported by Commissioner Andriessen. I should like to mention that expressly. It is therefore not our intention to say now that with the acceptance of this resolution we have immediately brought forward again the old demand that prices must go right up, but rather that we feel that a decision must be taken and that we maintain that price increases for surplus production are fundamentally wrong, at least if no other instruments are available.

Then I come to the commercial factor, Mr President, that is, the cereals prices. On the basis of an agreement in the Council the Commission has proposed to reduce those prices by 3.6%. That is a very essential matter. Actually I am a little surprised that the Commission has been trying to play Old Maid too much this week whilst in fact a very alarming matter is at issue, namely the principle that when the threshold of production is crossed prices are actually reduced — is that principle maintained or not? Is there or is there not swindling on this point? That is the first and principal question.

In dealing with prices I have already observed that when in market management the price instrument is employed, another instrument is then needed to deal with the social aspects of agriculture, in this case the income aspect. It surprises me that on this point the Commissioner has still made scarcely any move. He sticks to his 3.6% but on the other hand on the question of those social problems which have been put forward strongly by one of the Member States in particular he has made hardly any advance. I think it is the wrong way to go negotiating as to whether that 3.6% might become 2 or 2.2% or whether it might be 1.8%, or whether, as one Member State wishes, it should not sink below zero — because all that is bargaining with margins without actually achieving anything. I continue to think that the Commission must make some positive progress on this point. I sincerely hope too that in order to forestall blunders the Commission on Monday next week will in fact show rather more imagination than it has done up to now. If it wishes to stick to its line of policy as regards management of the market in cereals it will have to make some advance as regards the social problems. I think that must be said once more, Mr President.

With regard to paragraph 2 of this resolution I therefore want to say that we too support it. We think then in particular of the point about the surcharge, with regard to which the Council — or actually the Commission on the basis of a Council regulation — has already decided that the quota must be reduced by one million tonnes. In that case I find it justified too that the co-responsibility levy, which now still stands at 3% should be reduced with retro-active effect as from 1 April, when the quotas too went down. These two factors were linked one to another and on that point too we thus fully support this resolution.

Mr President, I will leave it at that. Once again, I think it is a good thing that Parliament should again give its point of view on this matter, that we should send an urgent call to the Council to find a solution at last for this problem and that we should again wish the Commission the imagination to solve this problem without bargaining with its principles.

Mr Bocklet (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the decision about agricultural prices is already six weeks overdue and at the moment it is impossible to say when it will be adopted. For agriculture this means uncertainty, loss of income where . . .

(Interruption by Mr Fellermaier: 'Mr Kiechle blocked things again'.)

where prices should have been increased — Mr Fellermaier, you used to be more imaginative than with that interjection of yours. Most of all, however, the farmers' confidence in the ability of the Community to take decisions has suffered as a result.

There is no point in assigning blame in this situation. I should only like to remind the Commission that on 14 March Parliament produced a wide-ranging proposal for agricultural prices. Unfortunately the Commission has so far refused to adopt this moderate proposal.

There are grounds for thinking that we should have had a decision on agricultural prices long ago if the Commission had followed Parliament's line. Much too little attention has so far been paid to that. What is actually to be made of the promise of the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, at the time of his taking up office, to the effect that the Commission would respect the wishes of Parliament more than its predecessor did? Just when it comes to keeping its promise it refuses to do so.

But not only the Commission. We call expressly upon the Council: Act quickly and be guided by the principle that no Member State can be expected to accept what it must necessarily regard as intolerable. The application of the majority decision in the Council will therefore only have a chance in future if the Council in its decisions allows itself to be guided by this principle.

But Mrs Martin spoke also of budgetary discipline. In this Parliament we have always arranged that in the application of Article 39 of the EEC Treaty we have first determined what is necessary from the point of view of agricultural policy and subsequently have arranged the finance.

I should not like now to start a fresh debate on agricultural prices in order to answer my Honourable Friend Mr Woltjer. The Parliament's view is available, it was adopted on 14 March. The important thing for

Bocklet

us is that on the basis of that view the Council should arrive at a decision as soon as possible and we therefore ask that the compromise proposal, tabled by all political groups, should be supported.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — Mr President, agricultural prices should be, and must be, decided by a majority vote in the Council of Ministers. My group leader, Sir Henry Plumb, said exactly that one month ago in this very Chamber.

There are two motions before us which we have to vote on. The Liberal motion includes a call for majority voting, and I welcome it. The European Democratic Alliance motion unfortunately does not. Hence I have had to table Amendment No 1 calling for the inclusion of majority voting as a possibility.

There is also a compromise amendment. I greatly regret that that has no reference to the Liberal call for majority voting. It is unfortunate that our Rules of Procedure do not allow us to amend an amendment.

Three years ago, the Agriculture Ministers in the Council were similarly deadlocked. Our Parliament took a lead when we voted to ask the Ministers to take a vote. The Ministers followed us, and a decision on agricultural prices was quickly and satisfactorily taken. They should do the same again this year.

Why is voting in the Council of Ministers so important? Because, without voting the Community's decision-making is deadlocked. We in this Chamber know that well, but the public does not know that and does not understand. They don't understand why there was no reform of the dairy surplus for years. That was because the Council of Ministers, meeting in total secrecy, ran away from the decision year after year, preferring to spend money building an ever bigger butter mountain. I wish the public knew and understood that.

The Council of Ministers, meeting undemocratically in total secrecy must be forced into the habit of taking decisions by majority voting. It is our duty to push them in that direction. Otherwise, they are wasting our taxpayers' money, they are leaving our citizens in a state of unjustified uncertainty and they are abusing the democratic traditions of Europe.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Pranchère (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, two months ago, when adopting the report that I had presented on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, our Assembly addressed an urgent appeal to the Commission and the Council. To date, Ministers have refused to heed that appeal, and have got bogged down in interminable negotiations. This six weeks' delay, as has been said, is prejudicial to the interests of the breeders. It is only right that they should receive compensation.

Apart from differences of category between Member States, which are anyway minimal, the negotiators refuse to shake off the yoke of budgetary discipline which is proving to be a veritable war machine against agriculture, as we said it would be, right from the start. I pointed this out during the debate on farm prices. Budgetary constraints are simply false pretexts.

It is in fact possible, here and now, to finance a proper increase in farm prices by penalizing those that are responsible for surpluses — that is to say, by ensuring greater respect for Community preference. The taxation of fats alone, which was moreover proposed by the Commission in 1983, would provide a revenue of 600 million ECU, not to mention the thousand million ECU which will once again be refunded to Great Britain, and the very considerable expenditure envisaged for enlargement.

So it is not the financial resources that are lacking, but the political will to defend the Community farming industry, and to resist the Americans.

Refusing to fix correct farm prices and accepting the renegotiation of GATT agreements is all part of the same approach. The farmers have today lost all patience with the delay in fixing prices, and demand quick decisions. I share their anxiety and their demands.

I therefore call on the Council to conclude its negotiations on 13 May, taking into account the proposals adopted on 14 March by the European Parliament, as called for by the compromise amendment of which I am a signatory.

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, I think it is unfortunate that we are conducting this debate in the absence of the Council. I know, of course, that there are some civil servants from the Council present, but we don't have any political representation; and after all, we are aiming our guns at the Council not at the Commission. However much I might disagree with the Commission in what they have proposed on farm prices, they are not responsible for the delay. In fact, I would like to give them credit, and the Agriculture Commissioner particularly, for all the efforts he has made to get the Council to reach a conclusion. I hope that will be conveyed to him.

I think there is a simple way out of this dilemma. There is a formula which is quite well known in industrial relations. I have often seen it occur in my own country and I have seen it occur in others. When there is a delay in the fixing, for instance, of wages, often there is retrospection. Agreement is reached that if there is a delay of a month, two months or three months, then the wages will be made applicable so as to provide compensation to those who are in receipt of these incomes for the time lost. I think that ought to be acceptable. A lot of our worries would disappear, because we would know, at least, that we were being

Maher

compensated for the failure of the Council to reach decisions in time.

Of course, we are not here talking about the income of farmers, only about the fixing of agricultural commodity prices. That is important to understand. The farmers only get whatever is left after everybody else takes what they need down the line as far as the farmer. It is important to draw attention to the fact that little and all as that is that goes to the farmers, it is exceedingly important for him at this time, particularly those farmers who happen to be operating under a quota system. That is true of a high proportion of the farmers in my country, who produce milk. They produce milk on a seasonal basis. They do not produce mainly throughout the winter, but only during the season, from cheap Irish grass: they don't import large quantities of meal from other countries, they use home-grown fodder. Therefore, they produce the milk in a short period. They are now in their peak period, so if the prices are not fixed the Irish dairy farmers stand to lose tremendous sums of money every day, even though the price increase for milk is meagre. Nevertheless, they are losing and they will never get it back unless there is retrospection.

I completely reject the idea that when there are quotas there ought also to be co-responsibility. If you have a quota, then you cannot produce any more. You are bound to it; you can get no further income in any other way unless you get a price increase. It is quite wrong to penalize farmers through co-responsibility if, at the same time, you tell them they can produce only a certain amount and no more. Therefore, I think dairy farmers particularly are severely hit by what is going on at the moment.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — Mr President, this urgent debate here today is about people, the millions of farmers throughout our Community who earn their livelihood from the land and who have a right to a decent standard of living as provided for in the EEC Treaties. It is a debate about the serious plight of farmers being worsened by a substantial loss of income because of the considerable delay in the fixing of farm prices for this marketing year. Need I remind this Parliament that the start of the marketing year is 1 April!

I agree with the point made by Mr Maher about retrospection whenever agreement is reached. The delay to date is almost six weeks. I ask you: what other sector of our economies would put up with that type of treatment? The answer is none, because their trade unions would ensure, through strike action if necessary, that their interests would be protected and defended. Need I remind this Parliament that farmers are also workers in their own right, that they, unlike other workers, cannot take trade-union action to defend their incomes and their family livelihoods. When will these men and women stop being used as a political football?

I strongly condemn the Council of Agriculture Ministers for their inertia, for their total lack of political will to decide. They have no one but themselves to blame for this masquerade. They have shamefully allowed themselves to be hedged in on all sides by their finance colleagues. They are pussy-footing around with technocratic budgetary solutions which I strongly reject. Wake up, Agriculture Ministers, before it is too late! You are playing around with the lives of millions of men and women, not with balance-sheets. Why does the Council not seriously examine measures designed both to apply the Treaty of Rome and to ensure that crisis situations such as we face today do not recur?

First of all, and with a view to ensuring that Community preference is respected, I would like to see a global policy on fats, an equitable taxation of vegetable oils, soya and manioc. I call for an end to the other infringements of Community preference, in particular, the possibility enjoyed by certain Member States to import agricultural produce already in surplus from third countries exempt from Community levies. I call, in accordance with the principles on which the Common Market was founded, for the incomes of small, traditional and family farms not to be affected by any measures which may have to be taken to reduce the cost of supporting the dairy market. I call for an immediate end to monetary compensatory amounts, notably on dairy products. I call for the maintenance and revaluation of incentives to fatstock reconversion and non-commercialization of milk. I call for the establishment of an incentive for breeding-herds.

Mr President, the farming community, the very pillar of Europe, needs acceptable farm-price increases and related measures now. By adopting the compromise amendment signed by members of nearly every group in this Parliament, we are saying to the Council that our Community is being weakened, our Community institutions are losing their credibility. This is no way to build a Europe of tomorrow that we all so readily subscribe to. We have fulfilled our obligations. We want action from the Council, and we want it now!

(Applause from the right)

Mrs Jepsen (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, I already expressed my regret in the debate on Tuesday that the Ministers for Agriculture had not reached agreement on the new agricultural prices. Parliament however bears its share of responsibility for this lack of unity. By proposing unrealistic price increases and by failing to demonstrate sufficient willingness to collaborate in the necessary adjustments in the Community's agricultural policy, Parliament as long ago as March excluded itself from exercising any real influence. I hope that the majority in Parliament, which adopted the proposal in March, will reflect seriously about this fact.

In the two amendments under discussion consideration is not given to long-term perspectives in the Com-

Jepsen

mon Agricultural Policy. I should like to stress again that agricultural production must be reorganized in the light of free market forces. In this way it is left to the efficiency of the individual farmer as regards both production and production development, marketing and selling to adapt themselves to consumers' wishes and requirements. The quality factor and price fixing make a better regulator than quotas and other artificial limits on production.

We four Danish Conservatives cannot therefore support the actual content of the two amendments but we would call upon the Council of Agriculture Ministers — and here we are in full agreement with our British colleagues in the group — to apply now the rules of the Treaty on voting so that the decision which should have been taken by 1 April can now be taken on 13 May.

Mr Gatti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the resolution that we are about to adopt is perhaps superfluous, from next Sunday there are elections in Germany and Italy, and you will see that, next week, agreement will be reached by the Council of Ministers. We also, of the Italian Communist Party, wish to denounce the delay and those responsible for the failure — for electoral reasons — to adhere to the procedures laid down — a delay that is particularly harmful to the weakest farming sectors.

With regard to the resolution, we confirm our 'No' to para. B on the resolution on farm prices already adopted by this Parliament: we do this for reasons of consistency. We hope that the Commission will consider the resolution as a whole, but not the part referring to the increase in prices, because we do not agree with the increase that it proposes.

For the sake of consistency, and having regard to our positions on these questions, we vote in favour of the resolution, whilst nonetheless confirming our doubts about para. B.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. I wish to correct a misunderstanding which may have arisen. Some of my honourable friends may have given the impression that this group believes in majority voting on agriculture. I wish to make it quite clear that there are many of my honourable friends who do not agree with majority voting in the agricultural field and will proceed according to that particular view.

President. — That was a rather broad interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DA)* Mr President, I did not actually intend to take the floor, for I shall reluctantly be competing

with the Council of Ministers to which the draft amendments are in fact addressed. But perhaps it is in any case appropriate for me to say a few words on behalf of the Commission, since the Council of Ministers has not wished to reply at the moment.

The reason for which I asked to speak was that my good friend Mr Maher gave me the idea, since he was good enough to highlight the Commission's contribution in a positive way by saying — quite rightly — that it was not the Commission's fault that no result had been achieved. I am very glad to confirm that on behalf of the Commission. We have been quick to produce a proposal — even though we took up office only at the beginning of the year. Vice-President Andriessen stated in Parliament as recently as last Tuesday that we were quite clear that a rapid decision was essential, and that is also the reason for which the Commission has undertaken to try soon to produce a proposal on how a solution may be reached. That of course pre-supposes a willingness on the part of the Council of Ministers to cooperate — but I should therefore like to stress what Mr Maher said — namely that the Commission is in complete agreement with the Parliament on this matter.

A couple of individual points have been mentioned which I think require rather more detailed comments, without launching into a full-scale debate on agricultural policy, since this is not the appropriate time.

First of all I should like to say, as regards the Commission's position on the price determination which is to be effected, that it is naturally characterized by an assessment of how we can most reasonably safeguard the interests of both agriculture and the Community, now and in the slightly longer term. I must therefore say to Mr Woltjer that the Commission does not need to show more imagination. The Commission's imagination is in fact well developed. The Commission has actually a good enough imagination to envisage the consequences of an ill-considered short-sighted position. The Commission also has enough imagination to envisage how in the long run we can ensure, by means of a rational, cautious pricing policy, that it is productive farming which to a large extent has the chance to survive. Moreover that is also an answer to Mr Bocklet, who attached great importance to our following Parliament's recommendation. We did not consider ourselves in a position to do so both from the point of view of long-term considerations and because we have a practical budgetary problem.

I should like to say a few words on the latter point, since both Mr Newton Dunn and Mrs Jepsen touched upon it, as they both mentioned the possibility of introducing majority voting. It seems to me that I should say on this that the Commission has nothing against it, although it is the Council which will have to decide how the voting will take place. But the problem this year is different from the usual one. By means of majority voting it might well be possible to provide

Christophersen

greater expenditure, but not to provide greater revenue. We can in fact finance additional expenditure in the current year only if all Member States agree to an increase in the amount mentioned in the inter-governmental agreement and it is clear that the Commission's pre-condition for working on the idea of spending large sums must be that the money is forthcoming. I speak now on behalf of Mr Andriessen but also on behalf of the Commission and of myself. It is clear that 'two-way traffic' must be taken into account. If the Member States are of the opinion that the Commission's proposal should be improved they must show how it is to be financed. We do not in fact have a printing press for bank-notes in the cellars under the Berlaymont Building; nor are we likely to get one in the near future — no one is going to show such confidence in us.

I should therefore just like to say that it is all very well to talk about majority voting but we should not hide the fact that in the whole discussion here is a real budgetary problem which cannot be concealed and I should therefore finally like to call for a considerable measure of realism. The Commission is aware of its responsibility. We would ask the Council to take as soon as possible a responsible, conscientious decision on the basis of the Commission's proposal.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 replacing both motions for resolutions)¹

Nicaragua

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Arndt and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the United States' embargo on Nicaragua. (Doc. B 2-265/85),
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Cervetti and others, on behalf of the Communists and Allies Group, on the US trade embargo against Nicaragua (Doc. B 2-316/85).

¹ Amendment No 1 by Mr Martin, Mr Ducarme, Mr Nielsen, Mr Maher, Mr Nordmann; Mr Poniatowski, Mr Rossi and Mr Wolff; Mr Mouchel, Mr MacSharry, Mr Fanton, Mr Musso, Mr Barrett, Mr Pasty, Mr Guermeur and Mrs Ewing on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance; Mr Debatisse, Mr Clinton, Mr Dalsass, Mr Tolman, Mr Mühlen; Mr Borgo, Mr Bocklet, Mr Früh; Mr Stavrou; Mr McCartin; Mr Costanzo, Mr Pfenning; Mr F. Pisoni; Mr Mizzau; Mr Herman; Mr Mallet, Mr Bardong; Mr Stauffenberg; Mr Mertens; Mr Ebel; Mr Poetschki, Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken; Mr Ryan; Mr Späth, Mr Raftery and Mr Ligios on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party; Mr Thureau, Mr Eyraud and Mr Woltjer on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Provan and Mr Simmonds; Mr Pranchère and Mr Maffre-Baugè.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, this is an extraordinarily important debate and I should be really grateful if the Members of this House would not all start the debate with pre-conceived opinions.

I hope that after six years of our collaboration I personally inspire enough confidence amongst the other political groups in this House in my democratic convictions for them to credit me with the same confidence if now in this question I call for recruits in the battle for democracy.

I have been to Nicaragua and spoke to everybody there a fortnight ago today. Above all, I spoke to the opposition in Parliament and to the opposition which is united in the Democratic Co-ordination. I spoke too to the representative of the Conference of Bishops of the Catholic Church, Bishop Vega, and in particular also to both the Christian-Democratic parties: the Christian-Democratic party which is represented in Parliament and the Christian-Democratic party which is not represented in Parliament.

I also had talks with the ambassadors, both with those from the Contadora Group countries and with the ambassadors from the European Community. In all these talks I was assured by everybody — including the opposition, both that in Parliament and that outside the Parliament, that it is not possible to say that a Communist clique is in control there. I repeat: We were expressly assured by all — by both — the Christian-Democratic parties and the representative of the Catholic church, Bishop Vega: It is not possible to speak of a Communist clique here.

We were told by this opposition, that there are no concentration camps in Nicaragua. We heard that there from both sides. The government in Nicaragua has declared itself for national dialogue — it is true without the Contras. We have not heard from any opposition party or from the representative of the Catholic church: The Contras ought to be included in this national dialogue. People should know: The Contras are not supported by any of the political or social forces of Nicaragua. That was the result of our talks with everybody — and we really did speak to everybody.

I repeat: None of the parties, even the two Christian-Democratic parties, supports the Contras, but they reject what is happening there. Nobody of all the people we spoke to, including the editor-in-chief of 'La Prensa', thought that financial support should be given to the Contras.

For example we also discussed the question of press censorship. But you must recognize that those who attempted to defend the press censorship to us say: That is a result of the state of war.

(Interruptions from the centre)

Arndt

I suppose it is impossible to deny that there is a state of war there. May I repeat word for word what a leading representative of the government said about it — because we recommended that the press censorship should be dropped —: ‘Censorship’, he stated, ‘can be operated only by intelligent people’. And then he added: ‘But no intelligent person is ready to practise censorship’.

(Interruptions from the centre)

You can see, then: Even in those circles there it is understood that the censorship must be abolished. In our talks it appeared that there is a clear majority in the Sandinista Front for pluralism, for multiplicity of parties, they are against an electoral system of the ‘People’s Democracy’ type.

There is no doubt that some convinced Marxists also belong to the Novos Comandatos.

(Interruptions from the centre)

But the majority of the Comandatos have decided for pluralism because there are many parties, and they have declared themselves ready to send a delegation here to us in the European Parliament this summer so as to be able to discuss with us the possibilities as to what their constitution should be like.

We ought to support this way, that would be well advised of us. The trade embargo will drive Nicaragua into the hands of the Eastern Bloc. Everybody to whom I spoke in Nicaragua — everyone, the opposition and the others — rejects the possibility of being part of the Eastern Bloc. They wish to belong to the non-aligned nations. The government has expressly declared its loyalty to the Contadora cause; the opposition too assured us of this. But the trade embargo contradicts the Contadora development.

(Applause from the left)

I tell you one thing from my own experience — consider this: 20 years ago I supported people like Dubček, Ota Čik or Jiri Pelikan and then too I was attacked by people of your persuasion. If you had helped us then, things in Prague would perhaps have gone differently!

(Interruption by Mr Brok: ‘That’s an invention’.)

My Honourable friend Mr Brok, that is not an invention. I can prove to you from documents that it was so! I can prove to you that German-Czecho-Slovakian society in those days was composed of these circles and at that time was wrongly attacked by your groups.

I urge you to help those in Nicaragua to go the right, democratic way! By the trade embargo they will be

driven into the hands of the Eastern Bloc and then you would bear a share of the responsibility.

(Loud applause from the left)

Mr Cervetti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I, too, went, with Messrs Arndt and Glinne to Managua, as a guest of the Nicaraguan National Assembly. During our visit we had the opportunity of meeting the highest government officials, the leaders of the opposition parties, both within and outside Parliament, the managers of the opposition press and the Chairman of the Conference of Bishops of the Catholic Church, and we also had detailed talks and discussions with all the ambassadors of the countries in the European Community who were present in Managua, and with ambassadors from the Contadora Group.

These various meetings enabled us to take stock of important facts. We noted firstly that, with differences of emphasis, there is wide support for three fundamental principles of the present Nicaraguan political system — political pluralism, the mixed economy, and non-alignment. These principles, ladies and gentlemen, emerge from the concrete realities of the country. That marks the Nicaraguan political system as an original, autonomous one: it is all the more important because it is taking place in a situation that is difficult objectively, as we can all appreciate. It is a country riddled with poverty and the under-development that thrives on poverty. It is a country subjected to attempted economic strangulation and armed attack.

We have also seen determined efforts towards peace, evidenced by the preliminary agreement with the Miskito Indians and the resumption of a dialogue with the Church. We have seen that Nicaragua not only accepts all the terms of the Contadora Group’s peace proposal, but also accepts the proposals to set up a monitoring committee that will also include the representatives of the European countries.

On the basis of these facts, ladies and gentlemen, we find ourselves obliged to put forward the compromise resolution that we have submitted.

Europe cannot stand aloof. The international Community has the clear duty to match the principle of domestic political pluralism with a plurality of relations. We are the assertors of the safety of sovereignty and independence at any point on earth.

Europe cannot disregard that reality. Moreover, the European Council has taken up a stance that is in the main positive; the Commission is on the point of doing as much, with an economic agreement that is to be implemented rapidly. The solemn, united voice of our Parliament cannot be withheld. We are encouraged in this work by the need to oppose the American embargo, the attempt to strangle an original, auto-

Cervetti

mous political system. And we are also encouraged, ladies and gentlemen, by the stance taken by the majority of the American Chamber of Representatives.

I hope that wide support will be forthcoming for our resolution in this Assembly: that would be an act of solidarity, and also of great dignity.

(Applause from the Left)

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I hope Mr Arndt will accept my statement that the Group of the European People's Party too is concerned about freedom of democracy in that region. I should like therefore to raise some objections in the name of my group to the resolution tabled by the Communists, the Rainbow Group and the Socialists.

It seems that this economic boycott warrants some observations. Point one: The European Parliament has never yet voted for a boycott, for the very reasons you have already mentioned, that is, because it is always borne only on the shoulders of the poorest of the poor and not on the shoulders of the governments which are most responsible for these things, which are not themselves affected by the boycott and have mostly also been responsible in these countries for the economic state of emergency, exactly as now in Nicaragua.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Point two: Why has that little country mentioned by you in several resolutions, which is the biggest in the region, though not by a long way the most heavily-populated, actually built up disproportionately large armed forces from the very beginning and undertaken military rearmament which actually caused the threat in the region before the United States took any action?

(Interruptions from the left)

I was the rapporteur for this region and can prove what I say by statistics.

The neighbouring countries in this region are concerned about Nicaragua's support for people in this region who according to the quotation from a serious German newspaper have said that subsequently they intend to use mines to bathe every road in El Salvador in a river of blood, then I really have to ask myself seriously what Nicaragua is doing in this region.

Third point: If you describe the election as a genuine one, even though not as a democratically free election in our sense, why do you not mention that many groups in that country wish for a dialogue with the government? But this word dialogue, as far as I am aware, does not occur in the resolutions. Why do you not ask for dialogue in *this* country, whilst you demand it in another country with the friends of whom I was just speaking?

A further point: Why are the opposition politicians, living in that country, Mr Arndt, why are you, the church and the independent press asking precisely for the abolition of the censorship, for freedom and dialogue? Do not tell me that that is a pluralistic party system. We have that kind relatively near to the German frontier too.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Moreover, if the government thinks itself strong enough — and it has done all these things — although it was warned in these matters — why has it subsequently turned directly towards the country, to the power, which is most feared in the region, namely the Soviet Union? We support Contadora, but we support it in agreement with the neighbouring States and with the democratically elected governments there, which are gravely anxious. We cannot therefore subscribe to the wording of these proposals and we shall table some draft amendments.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Prag (ED). — Mr President, I must say that I am amazed at the boldness and, indeed, the arrogance with which my colleagues opposite have made statements about a situation which implies a danger to another country.

For instance, what grounds has the Socialist Group for stating so categorically that the Reagan Administration's assessment of the situation is incorrect?

(Interruptions from the left)

If anyone imagines that going to a country for three days, or even a week, allows them to see anything of what goes on, they are greatly mistaken. I can tell the people opposite that, as a journalist, I have seen many 'visiting firemen' who have not had the faintest idea of what was going on, but it did not stop them from going back home and talking about it as if they did.

(Mixed reactions)

What means do our friends opposite have? Do they, for instance, have intelligence sources, do they have air reconnaissance photographs? What do they really know about the situation in Nicaragua? Now, our noisy friends on the opposite benches say in their resolution that Nicaragua is a small country, it only has a population of 2.5 million. It is perfectly big enough to allow the installation of missiles if the Soviet Union were to decide that the moment had come to do that.

(Protests from the left)

And it is perfectly big enough to take fighter and bomber aircraft. It is an absolute nonsense, and anybody who has the faintest knowledge of military mat-

Prag

ters knows that it is nonsense, to make such judgements.

Then there is the political side of the matter. The situation in Nicaragua, as Mrs Lenz said, is not satisfactory. The conditions are ripe and they could become riper for the establishment of a dictatorship. The number of political prisoners is still large. The activities of many political parties have been severely curtailed, and all of them have been curtailed to some extent. The press remains heavily controlled. The election was neither free nor fair, although it was half pluralist. And the Sandinistas made perfectly clear that they were not going to relinquish power, whatever the result. Even more, they made it perfectly clear that they intended the result to be in their favour. Do our colleagues opposite really want us to undertake a policy in direct and open conflict with that of our major ally, the United States, on whom we are largely dependent for our own freedom, for our own defence and for the maintenance of the NATO shield?

(Cries of 'Yes!' from the left)

Mr President, the measures proposed by the Socialist and Communist resolutions are at best foolish and at worst fatuous, and I trust the House will vote for the amendments put forward by the European People's Party and by my own group.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Filinis (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it should be a matter of principle for the European Community to oppose decisively any interventions against the independence of peoples and countries, no matter where they come from and no matter what justification is offered for them. Only then will there exist a broad front for peace and for the freedom of all the world's peoples.

In this spirit we call upon the European Parliament to respond to the general concern of public opinion in Europe, and to stand decisively alongside a small but noble and heroic people, like the people of Nicaragua, who have fought an exemplary and successful battle for their freedom and who, at this time, are facing an unheard-of assault upon their independence because of the illegitimate and provocative activities of the Reagan administration.

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — *(NL)* Ladies and gentlemen, the latest news about Nicaragua arrived this morning from Washington. The House of Representatives is changing front. Now they want what the Senate wanted previously: the 14 million dollars for the Contras, so-called civil aid for the Contras, not provided by the CIA but by the State Department. President Reagan showed himself delighted in Madrid and said: 'The House of Representatives was misled and misin-

formed'. So he regards himself as having been right. The reason why the House of Representatives is now likely to support the Contras is that President Daniel Ortega went to Moscow, Warsaw, Belgrade and Prague. But that is exactly what Washington itself is causing with its boycott. That is also precisely what Reagan apparently wants to achieve. The House of Representatives in Washington has indeed been misled; only now they are being misled by their own President. In addition President Ortega is coming to Madrid as well. Directly after Mr Reagan's State visit, President Gonzales will receive his friend Ortega on behalf of the friendly nation of Nicaragua. Then Mr Ortega is going to Paris, to President Mitterrand. What would be better than for the European Commission now to telegraph to President Ortega to invite him to Brussels to accept special aid against, and for the duration of, the American boycott?

(Applause from the left)

This boycott is meant to starve the people of Nicaragua out and so to bring about the fall of the Sandinista government. Starving them out is war by other means. No boycott by the United States against racist South Africa, but against the people of Nicaragua who have freed themselves from the genocide of Somoza, the friend of Washington. The position cannot be more revealing as regards the President who yesterday was acclaimed here so loudly from the right. History will not forget that. The GRAEL Rainbow Group has withdrawn the resolution in my name. We do not wish to give any chance to amendments to our resolution put forward by the Christian-Democrat Von Habsburg and others; we support the compromise text by Socialists and Communists.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, I too was in Nicaragua some months ago. I am convinced that Nicaragua is a historical challenge both for this Parliament and for each one of us. None of us can remain neutral, including myself.

For those reasons I presented a motion for a resolution but after mature consideration I withdrew it in favour of the compromise motion. Why? I fear that if these motions for resolutions are rejected and if the amendments by Mr Habsburg, Mr Croux and others are approved, it will spell disaster not only for the people of Nicaragua but also for the peoples of the third world. In fact if these amendments were adopted, it would signify approval for Reagan's policy, which is rejected by a large part of American and indeed world public opinion. I have heard that yesterday even the Netherlands and Belgian governments declared themselves against an economic boycott against Nicaragua.

(Applause from the left)

Ulburghs

I hope, Mr President, that these initiatives from Mr Habsburg, Mr Croux and others will not meet with the approval of the Christian-Democrats in this chamber. That would be a historical error which would be recognized as such by a large part of their own supporters. I can testify to that as regards Flanders. In fact for a growing proportion of those supporters in Flanders, Nicaragua is a sign of hope, because Nicaragua may be an experiment for a new development. It lies at a point of intersection between East and West, North and South. This historical development in Nicaragua may show faults, but in any case will stand or fall with the support of Europe. That is why this decision today is of such great importance, not only for Nicaragua but for justice both in the third world and for us.

Therefore I should like to appeal to this Assembly to promote a diversification of the Nicaraguan economy and by means of exchange of trainees and advisers, twinning of municipalities and the like, to help the peoples on both sides to make the proper progress.

Finally, Mr President, I am entirely at one with the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States who unanimously condemned the Reagan administration's policy on Nicaragua as well as regards the escalation of nuclear armament.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Zahorka (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we should not be biased in our attitude to Nicaragua. Today Social-Democratic trade unionists are in prison, farmers are being compulsorily resettled and genocide has been committed against Indians. The Sandinista regime in Central America is clearly a disruptive factor both inside and outside the country and as regards the principles of democracy.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

A country which exports armed subversion to defenceless democratic neighbouring States must not expect unrestricted exports from other countries in the future. That is a clear principle where political economy is concerned and indeed one which we ourselves continually practise, for example in the case of South Africa. We all know that the long-term value of an economic embargo is contested. Although embargos are not part of our repertoire, we can appreciate to some extent the political value the US government puts on them as a warning.

(Interruption by Mr Fellermaier: 'Who is 'we'?)

I would emphasize Mr Fellermaier that when I say 'we' you are not necessarily included. Goods for the organized democratic resistance, including food, clothing and medicines for humanitarian purposes are exempt from the sanctions... And now perhaps the Socialist Members will allow me to finish, as is cus-

tomary in a democratic chamber! Connected with that is the appeal of the US President to the Government of Nicaragua to take account of the anxieties of its neighbours, and to take seriously its obligations where neutrality — not in the sense of a Cuba — and respect for democracy and peace are concerned. We are pleased about the fall of the Somoza dictatorship, but we do not want a Marxist dictatorship either. The US government intends the measures it has adopted to make its opposition to the Sandinista policy absolutely clear. Why have 90 000 citizens of Nicaragua taken refuge in Costa Rica? It is false in terms of political economy to say that Nicaragua is being driven into the arms of Moscow! It has been there since Ortega's recent visit to Moscow.

(Protests from the left)

The motions against the measure adopted by the USA, which even the Reverend Jesse Jackson would not approve, are not so much intended for Nicaragua as directed against the USA. After your ridiculous display of banners which accompanied President Reagan's successful speech yesterday you are betting on the wrong horse with these motions. You would do better to welcome the amendments put forward by the other two groups. That, I believe would be a balanced rather than politically one-sided attitude to take.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, I too would like to address colleagues on the opposite side of the House and tell them that we are not asking them for anything unreasonable. We do not ask them to rise up too far against Reagan's dangerous policy. We do not ask them to bless Daniel Ortega. We only ask them to adopt the same stance as the American Congress itself. Not to be more royalist than the king, more American than the Americans themselves.

(Applause from the left)

We ask them to take note of Congress's action, and adopt an honourable and proper position here, confirming that they are not the puppets of Reagan's dangerous policies. I ask myself how Members of the New Democracy, Greek Members, can possibly bring themselves to vote against condemnation of the economic embargo of Nicaragua just one month before the elections in Greece, when their party talks about an independent policy. I ask how Irish Members, who have known so many pressures against their country, can identify with the views of the Christian-Democrats or the British Conservatives? Any who are dreaming of a new Grenada should bear in mind that if an attempt is made to repeat this in Nicaragua, we will have a new Vietnam.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I too have been in Nicaragua. We must, even after the elections, be allowed to put a number of facts together.

The Sandinistas were ready to extend an amnesty to the Contras. Managua has negotiated with Miskito leaders who were operating from Costa Rica. There was the proposal which accompanied the proposals in Mazanilia. There were discussions. In addition 100 Cuban military advisers have been sent home; and what were the answers from the American side each time? Further military manoeuvres, support given to the Contras, proclamations of national emergency, trade embargo, non-recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

Ladies and gentlemen, yesterday we heard here a lot of hot air about freedom, but does not freedom imply in the first place the right of every people to self-determination? Does not that right imply the fundamental right to choose one's own social and economic model for development? What is the meaning of international agreements, human rights and people's rights, the UN Charter, the Treaty of the Organization of American States, if a single great power can infringe all these agreements as it chooses? So we must emphatically reject the trade embargo and I shall support the compromise proposal of the Socialists and Communists.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Marck (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, when the delegation from the European Parliament which, unlike the one of which Mr Arndt was a member, was made up of a number of parties, questioned the Sandinista leaders about their views on internal pacification and reconciliation after the elections, we were informed amongst other things of certain lines of policy by the present President of the Nicaraguan Parliament.

In the first place he stated that the national dialogue which had been initiated between government, opposition, social-economic and church circles would continue undiminished. Secondly the Sandinista government would draw its inspiration for its policy from political pluralism, non-alignment, mixed economy with guarantees for private property.

What is now left of these good intentions after the elections? First, the national dialogue was broken off by the government without sufficient reason. Secondly, the freedom of movement of the leaders of the political opposition and even church leaders were restricted amongst other things by the refusal of exit visas. Thirdly, press censorship was stepped up. Fourthly, President Ortega toured the Eastern Bloc countries in search of financial and above all military support. Fifthly, private undertakings, which had dedicated themselves after the revolution to the recovery

of the national economy, were discouraged by the non-delivery of raw materials and by other forms of harassment.

This systematic disregard of promises and of conciliatory gestures by the Sandinistas aroused exaggerated, and I stress the word exaggerated, reactions from the American government, such as the trade embargo. Mrs Lenz has emphasized that we were not in agreement with it. In this spiral the efforts of all who wish for pacification in Central America, including Contadora, are made difficult if not impossible. The European Community must continue to support Contadora, must make good its San José declaration and give a chance to all who in Nicaragua and elsewhere in Central America are striving for genuine reconciliation. They are present in both camps. The exacerbation of contrary attitudes as expressed in some resolutions is of no avail. I shall therefore reject them.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I rise to answer this debate on behalf of my colleague, Mr Claude Cheysson, who, as honourable Members will know, is the Commissioner responsible for the issues under discussion. Unfortunately, he has a longstanding engagement overseas and is unable to be here, but has asked me to convey his apologies to the House.

Mr President, the Commission can but note with grave concern the United States authorities' decision to impose a trade embargo against Nicaragua.

(Applause from the left — Cries of 'It's because you are a socialist!' from the right.)

I am told that I am a socialist. I acknowledge that. I am representing the point of view of the Commission!

(Applause)

In the Commission's view, such measures will make it even more difficult to restore badly-needed stability to the whole Central American region. It is to be particularly regretted, since they could seriously jeopardize the steps towards peace being taken in the context of the Contadora process — to which a number of honourable Members have properly referred — and we must not pay simply lip-service to that important process.

I would remind the House that since the overthrow of the Somoza dictatorship, the Community's attitude to Nicaragua has been one of practical support for the work of reconstruction and development undertaken by the Nicaraguan Government. That is the view of successive Commissions.

Between 1979 and 1983, Nicaragua received a total of 71.15 million ECU in aid, and 15 million ECU of that figure were provided in 1983 alone. Over this period,

Clinton Davis

Nicaragua has thus received a third of all the Community's aid to Central America. Nicaragua, moreover, runs a significant balance-of-trade surplus with the Community. As honourable Members will know, it is broadly the view of the Community that the source of the problems troubling the region is to be found in its social and economic imbalances. Given this analysis, economic measures of the kind taken by the United States can, in the view of the Commission, only aggravate a situation which has brought misery to hundreds of thousands of people.

(Applause from the left)

In this connection, the Commission would recall the Community's political commitment to the development of structured relations between Europe and the countries of Central America. This development will give the Community a greater role in putting an end to instability and violence in the region and in promoting social justice, economic development, respect for human rights and respect for democratic liberties in the spirit of the conclusions of the ministerial meeting held in San José, Costa Rica, on 28 and 29 September last year — and let that not be forgotten!

Following that meeting, the Commission is preparing an agreement designed to strengthen its ties with Central America by providing for an institutionalization of the existing political dialogue and for extensive cooperation on economic matters. The agreement would be with the countries grouped under the General Treaty on Central American Economic Integration and Panama. That this measure has the full backing of the countries of the region is confirmed by contacts which have been made between Mr Cheysson and senior government officials of both Contadora countries and the countries of Central America who regard the Community's support as vital to the success of the Contadora peace initiative.

The resolutions which you have been debating raise two clear issues warranting a response from the Commission: the United States' trade embargo on Nicaragua and future economic cooperation between Europe and Central America. I hope I have made clear the Commission's viewpoint on both these matters.

Mr President, may I end with a personal reminiscence about a visit which I made as the leader of a British parliamentary all-party group to Central America in December 1982 — one of those visits much denigrated by Mr Prag. It was an event which I found both sad and uplifting. It was an event which did not take place in Nicaragua but in El Salvador, but was connected with Nicaragua. It stands out vividly in my mind, as vividly and emotionally as any experience I have ever endured. We visited a disused church in San Salvador, a church which was home for some 320 people who had escaped from the fighting in villages, mostly refugees who were innocent women and children and they had left their menfolk behind or their menfolk had

been killed. They had been entombed there for 2 years, entombed because they dared not risk leaving that church for fear of arrest or even worse.

(Interruption by Mr d'Ormesson: 'Because of the Communists!')

I spoke to an elderly male peasant and I asked him what hope he had for the future. He pointed to a picture . . .

(Protests from the right)

I seem to have upset some of the Fascist right.

(Mixed reactions)

President. — Commissioner, I should like to ask you to speak on behalf of the Commission and to refrain from recounting your personal experiences.

(Loud applause from the right — Protests from the left)

Ladies and gentlemen every request to speak on a point of order gives rise to ten further requests; this would put an end to the topical and urgent debate.

I do not know what the Commissioner said. It is an open question.

(Interruptions)

Commissioner, if that is what you said then it goes beyond your terms of reference as a Commissioner. I would ask you to bear that in mind.

I have a total of nine requests to speak on a point of order. As President, it is for me to call Members to speak on points of order. I shall not call anyone. Please terminate this discussion now. Commissioner, please conclude your speech, after which we shall vote.

The Commissioner and not Mr Clinton Davis will speak on behalf of the Commission.

(Mixed reactions)

If you wish to protest against the way I am conducting the proceedings, you may do so. I am not calling Mr Clinton Davis but the Commissioner who speaks on behalf of the Commission.

(Uproar)

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, may I make it clear in response to the point that has been made: There is only one Fascist right group in this House, and I was adverting to that.

(Further uproar)

President. — Commissioner, I have no right to insist that you conclude now. I would however draw your attention to the Rules of this House. You are not a Member of this House but a Commissioner and it is as a Commissioner that you should speak.

(Loud applause from the middle and from the right — Loud protests from the left)

Mr Clinton Davis. — Mr President, I have long been a Parliamentarian and I absolutely respect the rights of every democratic right-wing party, and nothing I have said today invalidates that. Every Conservative party, every Liberal party, every party of the right save one falls within that category.

(Standing ovation on the left — Loud protests from the right)

I just want to conclude on this note, Mr President. That elderly peasant pointed to the picture of one man with tears streaming down his face, and it was the picture of the murdered Archbishop Romero. He said: 'There in the spirit of the Father lies our hope for the future.' I believe that it is remarkable that innocent people, deprived people, dispossessed people can still entertain that hope, free of ideology, free of ideology whether it is Communist or of the Right. They want to enjoy the right to free speech that some, apparently, seek to deny. That, I believe, is the lesson of the present tragedy that even the most obtuse could understand.

(Prolonged applause from the left)

President. — The debate is closed.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY MR ARNDT AND OTHERS (DOC. B 2-265/85)

After the vote on paragraph 5

(A large number of Members from the left left the Chamber)

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, my group has asked me to request a count at the next vote to determine whether the necessary quorum is still present in the House.

(After a check had been made the President stated that a quorum was present — in successive votes Parliament adopted both resolutions)

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — (FR) Mr President, allow me to address Commissioner Clinton Davis and tell

him that he has very unjustly insulted my Group. Amongst the ten French members of the Group of the European Right we have a comrade from the liberation, Mr de Camaret. I myself am the oldest elected mayor in the whole of the Ile de France region — I was elected in 1945 — which leaves no doubt as to my attitude during the war.

I will tell you, Mr Commissioner Clinton Davis, that I, too, have been to Nicaragua. There is one thing that I know, and which I can prove: if there is a terrible civil war in Salvador, it is because it is fuelled with arms that the Nicaraguan government sends to Salvador. And you are that government's accomplice!

(Applause from the right)

Mr Dankert (S). — (NL) Mr President, I have just asked to speak on a point of order with reference to a pronouncement made by you. You raised at least the suggestion that a Commissioner was not speaking in the name of the Commission; if I may interpret it differently, you *stated* that a Commissioner was not speaking in the name of the Commission. Mr President, whether that was so or not is not the question which you or I have to answer. That is a question which it is exclusively for the Commission to decide. And I therefore ask you to withdraw your remark on that point because that remark is a danger for healthy institutional relations.

(Applause from the left)

President. — Mr Dankert, I should like to point out the following in relation to what you have just said. In his speech the Commissioner himself said that he wished to make a personal declaration and then began to describe a personal experience. I made no comment on this although it was already close to the limits of what is permissible.

In view of the mixed reactions in the House and the fact that ten Members asked to speak, I said: Commissioner, that is a personal declaration on your part and not a statement by the Commission. I believed that I was entitled to do so in view of the fact that the Commissioner himself had made this clear.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Dankert (S). — (NL) Mr President, I am sorry for Commissioners, but they are Commissioners, members of the Commission. Their personal declarations are pronouncements on behalf of the Commission.

(Protests from the centre and right)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I have meanwhile received eleven requests to speak which would clearly

President

take up all the time set aside for the urgency debate. I appeal to you not to let this happen as each request to speak leads to further requests.

I shall therefore accept only one statement from each group which so requests.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Mr President, I regret that it has been a British Commissioner who has caused this controversy in the House. He made a personal statement, and I believe that that was out of order. I do not dispute he has the right to have whatever views he wishes, but he has not got the right to put them in the name of the Commission.

It won't be the first time that Commissioner Cheysson — who, I gather, is his fairy godfather — in point of fact has represented his own personal views as those of the Commission, when they were not. Therefore, to conclude my point of order, Sir, I demand that the President of the Commission come to our next part-session here in June and clarify the situation on behalf of the college of Commissioners as to exactly what the position of the full Commission is as opposed to the personal position of either Mr Cheysson or Mr Clinton Davis.

(Applause)

President. — Personal statements can be made when the Minutes are being adopted, so I would therefore ask all those who are not speaking on behalf of a group to do so tomorrow morning during the adoption of the Minutes.

I therefore call the group chairmen to give personal statements under Rule 67.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I regret to have to say that I intend to send a letter to Mr Delors and that I shall enclose the text of the speech which we have heard here.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

It is not acceptable that a member of the Commission should insult parts of this House in the name of the Commission, and I feel myself insulted.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

I should like to make that quite clear; and my group as a whole feels insulted, because it was identified with these parts of the chamber.

I should like to add two sentences: as far as I can remember, this is the first time that it has been necessary to complain of an incident of this kind with the Commission in this Chamber, and I have been here since 1973. I should only like to say that for me it is

striking that a Commission whose President has declared to us that it wishes to maintain particularly close and friendly relations with the Parliament should cause such incidents. This matter must be completely cleared up.

(Prolonged applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* It is indeed a black day for us in Parliament today. I state that to all sides of the House.

(Applause from the right)

Mr President, the question whether or not a Commissioner speaks for the Commission, whether or not the member of a government speaks for the government is a matter for the Commission or the government. Secondly, it is extraordinarily interesting to me that the Commissioner, who wished to elucidate the Commission's position with an experience of his own in this matter, and what is more by the example of the flight of fugitives into a church and the reference to a Catholic bishop, was interrupted as he did so.

(Interruption: 'by the Christian-Democrats')

No, he was not interrupted by the Christian-Democrats, that is not correct. He was interrupted by a very loud interjection, which I was able to recognize as that of Mr d'Ormesson. The minutes will prove that. That was what led him to that reaction, which was directed to Mr d'Ormesson. I did not gather, and I think that the Commissioner has also clearly denied, that he meant any other group in this House. Therefore I could not help finding that in this question the Commissioner acted completely within the framework of the Rules of Procedure as regards this House. I must actually express my regret that democratic groups in this Chamber are standing up for the Group of the European Right, which proved yesterday and the day before that they apply the same rules as the Nazis before 1933, for example in the German Reichstag.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Cervetti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I agree with those who maintained here a short time ago that problems concerning the conduct of a Commissioner are a matter for the Commission itself. That applies to all bodies, and I think we cannot depart from this very precise principle.

It is because questions regarding individuals must be assessed by the respective colleges to which they belong that I will draw his attention to the facts as they took place; and I call the attention of the entire Assembly to the fact that, at the start of the Commissioner's statement, we heard from the lips of one Member of this Assembly — Mr Cassidy, who is

Cervetti

moreover accustomed to use epithets when referring to other Members of this Assembly — the term 'socialist' directed at Commissioner Clinton Davis, almost as a term of scorn, if not as an insult.

This occurred at the beginning of the debate in this Assembly. Well then, it is also our duty — and should have been your duty, with the impartiality that is expected from the President — to rebuke Mr Cassidy at the beginning. You did not do this, but you did make a statement, at the end of the Commissioner's speech, that was unjustified, to say the least.

Now, I am one of those — as Mr Klepsch said — who wish to write to the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, but I intend to state all the facts and relate everything that happened in this Assembly, and not just a part of the truth. I shall have something in fact to say about our own behaviour, our behaviour today, and also about behaviour in the running of this Assembly, which ought to have been managed impartially but instead was not.

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, I think that Commissioner Delors will receive a number of letters, and I think that they will be justified.

I shall speak about one point and one only. I am of course not here to defend the character, whether democratic or otherwise, of this or that group in our Assembly: that is a matter for the electors who elected them. That is no concern of mine, but still less does it concern a commissioner. It is intolerable, Mr President, for a member of this college, even speaking personally, to go mad, take leave of his senses and so far forget his manners as to insult, collectively, one group or another — with which I have no connection, though it would be all the same if I had.

(Applause from the right)

The Commissioner has taken leave of his senses. Everyone was affected by the remarks of the Commissioner, who clearly exceeded his terms of reference and forgot his responsibilities, carried away by a partisan passion that shows him to be scarcely worthy of the function that has been entrusted to him.

(Applause on the right)

It is about this question — not the debate as a whole, where everyone is fully entitled to defend whatever sentiments he feels right — that I shall write to Mr Delors on behalf of my Group, calling for an apology from the Commission *vis-à-vis* the Group and the Assembly.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Van der Lek (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, I am more or less bewildered. I have had twelve years'

experience in a national parliament. I have never known it to be questioned whether a member of the government speaking here should have the right to illustrate his words and his views with a personal remark arising from personal experience. Nor have I ever had the experience of members of a parliament being subjected to restrictions in so far as they wish to put forward their opinions and experiences. I should like to tell you, Mr President, that I once took five minutes of my speaking time — that was then naturally the speaking time to which I was entitled, for that is of course important, as I very well know — to tell Members a story which at that moment was in my view more enlightening than any political observation which I might make. Thus I wish to state first of all that all those who found it necessary to interrupt Mr Commissioner Clinton Davis here or to call him to account for the illustration which he thought important in order to make clear his political statements on behalf of the Commission, were responsible for the commotion here. And when Mr Clinton Davis in his answer to a completely unjustified interruption uses an objective description such as 'fascist' for a group which deserves that description, I regard that as a totally different matter from when Mr Cassidy thinks he is entitled to denounce a group such as the German Greens, who are known to have completely non-violent aims, as heirs of Hitler. That is such a different matter, Mr President that I absolutely do not accept that comparison. If we are to confuse these things we shall never get anywhere.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) Mr President, I think that, as has been emphasized, a sad precedent has been set in the Assembly today: a Commissioner has expressed an opinion on a political group. Whatever we may think of one group or another, I think that it does not behove Commissioners to do this, and I think that the wisest thing would be for the President of the Commission to come to the next session and apologise to Parliament.

(Protests from the left — Applause from the right)

It is not for Commissioners to offer their opinions on a Group, whichever Group it may be. We are defending our rights. We have all been democratically elected, and we have the right to express ourselves. That is what democracy means: accepting that all Groups can express themselves here, and that, having been elected, they all have rights, without Commissioners standing in judgement upon them, whatever they may think personally — which again is everyone's right.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Under these circumstances I think that the President of the Commission should come and tell us what he thinks of the behaviour of Commissioners in general,

Veil

and what he considers to be the duties of Commissioners *vis-à-vis* Parliament.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

President. — I still have seven requests to make personal statements under Rule 67. Normally each speaker may speak for three minutes. This will use up the time set aside for the urgency debates.

Provided Members are prepared to confine their personal statement to one minute, we could finish this point now.

Mr De Gucht (L). — *(NL)* I do not even need one minute, Mr President. I should simply like to say that the Treaty of Rome states that the Commission is an independent institution, in other words: what the Commission comes here to say is the responsibility of the Commission. Moreover, I think that it is not for the Commissioner to say that he thinks the Group of the European Right are fascists. They *are* fascists. I can say that because I am a Member of Parliament, but that is not his business.

(Applause from the left)

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, I too will take very much less than one minute. I regard this debate not as a victory for the centre right, but as a defeat for the European Parliament because, although we won this particular argument — and I am very glad that we did — the Commissioner's remarks caused deep offence to me as an individual Member of this House. He also led the Socialists actually to leave the House, as they did during President Reagan's speech. That is a defeat for democracy and I am very sorry about it.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, I think that all that had to be said has been said, as far as the sad incident caused by Commissioner Clinton Davis is concerned. And so it is not about that that I wish to say a few words.

Mr President, I should like to refer to the low trick that has just been carried out on the initiative of Mr Arndt who, in order to prevent the democratic vote of this Assembly from being taken, has arranged for a number of Members to leave the Chamber so that he can then draw attention to the fact that there is no quorum. Although the Rules of Procedure are formally respected, their spirit is betrayed by a low manoeuvre. In reality, the law has been abused. It is inconceivable that a Group of this Assembly can use such methods to prevent us from voting on a resolution.

Mr B. Friedrich (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, the effectiveness of this Parliament essentially resides in its

relationship to the Commission. I have written your words down: You said that what Mr Commissioner Clinton Davis had said was at the limit of what you could accept. I regret to have to tell you that the Commission's rights are embodied in the Treaties of Rome and are not subject to the appraisal of a President who is officiating for the time being. I regret that for the first time since the direct elections an acting President, and this I must say to my Honourable Friend Mrs Veil too, has committed a breach of the Treaties of Rome in relations with the Commission.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I have just encountered, perhaps for the first time, a British Member of Parliament — or a onetime Member of Parliament — who contravenes every parliamentary tradition. That is all I wanted to say to the Commissioner. Today, because of him, is a sad day for the Commission and for Parliament, and I hope I shall not compromise you, Mr President, in the eyes of some members of this Assembly, by congratulating you on the strictness, correctness and impartiality that you have shown.

(Applause from the Right)

Mrs Piermont (ARC). — *(DE)* Mr President, someone has just complained that at Mr Arndt's instigation some people left the Chamber in order to reduce the number of those present. I should like to refer to the fact that in the past few days too provisions of the Rules of Procedure have been monstrously misused, namely when it came to voting on the Marinero Report. We spent hours and hours voting over every individual section, every individual comma, and only so as to delay the vote so long if possible that it could not be taken. That was the only object! I regard that as absolutely unreasonable and that is something that must be said.

(Applause)

Terrorism

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Beyer de Ryke, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the attack in Brussels on 1 May 1985 (Doc. B 2-281/85);
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others, on the terrorist attack in Brussels on 1 May (Doc. B 2-305/85);
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Herman and others, on behalf of the Group of the

President

European People's Party, on recent terrorist attacks (Doc. B 2-310/85);

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Cervetti, on behalf of the Communists and Allies Group, on the terrorist attack in Brussels on 1 May 1985 (Doc. B 2-315/85).

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I hope that a certain unanimity will now be restored, and that we can all be a little more in tune with one another.

There are in effect today two lines of approach that are complementary: that of the Belgian Members of this Parliament, and, I hope, that of this Parliament in its entirety — not simply a majority.

We all, every one of us, condemn terrorism. We say this, declare this, state this. Why then, you will ask, insist yet again? Because what has just happened in our country is one further step forward into Euro-terrorism.

A few months ago Belgium, a transit area, was not a target for terrorism. Now, for the first time, things have changed, and terrorism has struck symbolically. We, in turn, have entered the age of the assassin. We, in turn, have been marked down by the age of contempt and aberration. The defenders — or so they call themselves — of the working class kill the workers at dawn on May Day.

I should like, ladies and gentlemen, to read to you a few extracts from a letter by an anonymous fireman, bitterly upset and roused to indignation by the murder of his comrades — a letter to a big Belgian newspaper in which, addressing the terrorists, he says: 'Understand this. Whatever your motives and your ideals, I and my colleagues formally deny you any rights over the life and death of any person, whomsoever it may be. And don't worry, you terrorists, if you are in danger there will be other Marcells and other Jacques' there, ready to risk their lives for you. And if you kill them, over 1 000 others will replace them at the same wages'.

I shall conclude, Mr President. Yes, at the same wages, the wages of fear and courage, as opposed to the wages of the mercenaries of death and of those who impose death, who inflict death on other, innocent people!

(Applause from the Liberal and Democratic Group)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

Vice-President

Mr Glinne (S). — (*FR*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, there is not one terrorism of the Right, and another of the Left. There is only one terrorism, always a threat to the freedom and political pluralism that political democracies have won for themselves. The hateful attacks that have recently taken place in Belgium, after having long been met with elsewhere, and which killed two workers in Brussels whilst pretending to free the labour world, have suspect origins. Their aim could only have been to develop a feeling of widespread, confused insecurity, to have that feeling simply made into a scapegoat, and to reduce the extent and quality of the freedom that our peoples enjoy.

The trap into which terrorism and its strange connections wants the democracies to fall is the withdrawal of personal and collective rights and their replacement by security measures that strike with less and less discrimination and create a destabilizing effect on all democratic institutions. That is why our original resolution and the compromise amendment call again on the Council to step up immediately the coordination of measures by the Ministers of Justice of the Member States, and of the future partners, Spain and Portugal, and desires the Council to report in July on the joint meeting to be held on Friday 21 June in Italy.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the senseless action which, last week in Brussels, struck down two innocent victims, two workers who, like so many others, were simply doing their duty, can only have been inspired by intellectual perversity combined with moral laxity.

Will the indignation and censure that have spontaneously burst out from every corner of the country and from all levels of society be sufficient to convince these weak spirits that the monstrous project that they have conceived will never receive the approval of a majority of the people? The destabilization of a society that they considered unjust, and its provocation so as to strengthen its police-state character and make it detestable in everyone's eyes — this was already the aim of the Red Brigades and many others, which failed lamentably.

How much suffering there has been, how many lives prematurely ended, how many futile deaths, for a completely negative result! This Parliament would be failing in its job and would lose all dignity if it did not unanimously condemn these attacks on democracy, on human life, and on our common faith in democracy.

In complete agreement with this fundamental paragraph we say again that political leaders and those who are responsible for safety — even the safety of the latter, under the pretext of infiltrating, gaining information and watching — must still scrupulously respect constitutional and legal rights, which must be protected and not weakened, whatever the gravity of the challenge that terrorism constitutes.

Mr Vernimmen (S). — *(NL)* In the name of the SP I should like to express my abhorrence of the senseless bomb outrages which have been occurring recently in Belgium. Abhorrence too of the cowardly murder of two firemen who were simply doing their duty. Responsibility for the outrages was mostly claimed by so-called extreme left or extreme right revolutionary movements. They are no revolutionaries; they are simply assassins. As democrats we must oppose those methods with all our might. But on the other hand I wonder about the judicial inquiries into the matter. The perpetrators of the smallest misdeeds are very quickly picked up in Belgium; it ought therefore to be possible to pick up also the perpetrators of these misdeeds.

If the historical causes of terrorism are investigated the principal cause is often found to be the poor economic social situation. The lack of prospects, particularly for youth, is perhaps the greatest cause. Thus before immediately deciding on police measures we must try to remove the real causes. We must eradicate the evil by the roots and thus together we shall call a halt to the pestilence of terrorism.

Mr Barzanti (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, once again this Parliament has to take a stand against a horrible terrorist attack that has cost the lives of two workers in Brussels, on a tragic May Day.

Some people will wonder whether it is not a ritual, repetitive act to express solidarity with those who have suffered, to denounce the perpetrators, and to emphasize once again the reasons for adhering with conviction to the principles of peaceful, tolerant democracy.

In reality it is necessary to repeat strong words of condemnation, and to reaffirm the will to fight unyieldingly a chain of terrorist actions that aim to increase tension, sow mistrust, and undermine the very foundations of civilized communal life.

For some time, NATO headquarters or Community institutions have been in the sights of the terrorist organizations; yesterday there was an attack in Luxembourg, a very serious attack, which in fact confirms this very character that terrorist action is assuming in an increasingly clear way.

Well, that is all part of a strategy that aims to poison international relations and make them more difficult, or sets out to weaken the determination of Member States of the Community — as has been affirmed on many occasions also by this Parliament — to carry on an increasingly well-coordinated fight against the terrorist organizations, whilst still respecting the rights and freedom of the individual.

In answer to what happened we must finally have concrete policies, and the meeting next June in Rome

must be used to coordinate, in an increasingly clear way, the action of Member States on this point, finally implementing, in the necessary detail and with whatever modifications are needed, the 1977 Strasbourg Convention, the purpose of which is precisely to fight actively and continuously against a terrorism that sows insecurity and mourning, and that cannot be accepted by our democracies.

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — *(FR)* Blind violence has killed, in the country which I represent, two members of the fire brigade in the exercise of their duties. Everyone of us here today, regardless of nationality, is appalled at such hateful action. Words are inadequate to express our disgust at such action, especially when they claim — so falsely, it must be said — to be defending the workers. It was the workers, as we know, that were the first victims on this symbolic First of May.

Alas, all our condemnations will not bring back to life those who died doing their duty. The fact is there, and today we have to prevent the repetition of such action, whilst still avoiding witch-hunts. It must be done with respect for the law and our common good, for democracy. Let us not turn to exceptional measures, which is what the authors of blind violence expect and are in some way hoping for. We must trust the arm of the State that has been set up to fight gangsterism, but we must not, under the pretext of exceptional circumstances, recommend measures the only other effect of which would be to provide ammunition, for the authors of the attacks, in their battle of words.

Mr de Camaret (DR). — *(FR)* I shall be brief. We have for some time been witnessing a very considerable increase in acts of terrorism in Europe. These attacks, which are organized or directed by the special services of the Soviet Union, are designed to destabilize the Western democracies. Unless a clear determination to fight this scourge is manifest in every one of our countries, it is to be feared that they will succeed in what they have set out to do.

Every nation in Europe must recognise this, but, alas, that is not the case. My country, France, through its rash policy of welcome to foreigners from the Third World, has become the favourite resort of terrorist movements from the whole world, who enjoy total impunity.

No overall solution can be envisaged without questioning the unbelievable subversive resources — I am talking about the press, and the radio, and the thieves' kitchens — that certain groups have available to them in my country, and unfortunately in other countries also.

Governments cannot be allowed to refuse — using as an excuse the right to asylum, which is an eminently

de Camaret

respectable right at that — to extradite foreign criminals who continue their action, operating from bases in the rear — notably Baku and Odessa — which are regularly inspected by Mr Ponomarev, whose authority in Soviet circles is well known.

Only political will and the creation of a European legal system will get to the bottom of this scourge, which threatens the very existence of our nations.

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) Madam President, we have just heard an objective ally of the terrorists, that is to say, those who would like to turn their dreams into reality and see the setting up of authoritarian powers.

I would say that Mr Clinton Davis perhaps made a wrong definition just now. They are not fascists, in any case not the Italians, but they are above all racist. We now have the proof of this. We are talking about terrorism, and they use this discussion to get at the emigrants who are in our country to work, and to contribute to the economic effort of everyone.

I think that such speeches show us the dangers threatening us in this Assembly, and I regret that the Right of this Assembly should have defended the Group of the European Right just now. You have just heard how dangerous this question is, how it threatens us all. Our target is the terrorists, whether they belong to the Left or the Right. Perhaps we, too, have within our Assembly the seeds of barbarism and the seeds of authoritarian power.

I make this appeal to the Groups of the Right: when true words are spoken, they should not take them as being directed at themselves, because they themselves are not fascists. They should take them for what they are — that is to say, attacks against the extreme Right, an extreme Right that also, like the terrorists, wants to destroy democracy.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2 seeking to replace the four motions for resolutions)¹

Lebanon

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Beyer de Ryke and Mrs Veil, on behalf of the Liberal and Demo-

cratic Group, on the threat of massacres in Lebanon (Doc. B 2-261/85);

- the motion for a resolution by Mr de la Malène and Mr Coste-Floret, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the situation in Lebanon (Doc. B 2-278/85);

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Stirbois and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the survival of the Christians in Lebanon (Doc. B 2-295/85);

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Mallet and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats, on the events in South Lebanon (Doc. B 2-312/85).

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — (FR) In the Lebanon, death has unfortunately become a boring, everyday thing. Everyone is threatened, many are hit, and the emotion with which we are overcome grows with special intensity.

The Christians in Lebanon are pursued, surrounded and killed. Their villages are destroyed, razed to the ground. Some of them come home, only to find a heap of ashes. Thousands, tens of thousands of others begin the wanderings of humiliated, persecuted crowds. I do not believe that one side is more innocent than the other. Everyone, the Christians as well as the others, bears some responsibility in these collective tragedies, but what I do say on the other hand is that today, Druzes, Sunnites, Shiites and Palestinians are receiving outside support in men and equipment. The Christians, in their struggle for existence, only receive a few words of commiseration.

Not so very long ago it was Europe and the United States that saved Arafat's Palestinians from the Beirut trap. Well, it would be inconceivable for Europe, for the West, not to give those who are its spiritual heirs — whatever sins they, like others, may have committed — an international guarantee. Let us not resign ourselves to there being, on each occasion, one people too many in the Near East. The Jewish people, the Palestinian people, and the Christian people each have a right to live. Let us not commit the sin of those who once stood by with ordered arms as the Warsaw ghetto was being exterminated. Let us realise that, if we are prepared to see the Christians deprived of their assets, of their place in the State, and finally of their lives, tomorrow there will still be a place in the world where the towns are called Sidon, Tyre and Beirut, but this place will have ceased to be called the Lebanon.

On a personal note, I make a wish — and I think that there are many who share it within and outside this Assembly — as I was saying, I utter a fervent prayer to see the Pope visit the Lebanon, to be Christ's witness there, and the witness of all those who are massacred.

¹ Amendment No 1, by Mr Herman, Mr Marck, Mr Habsburg, Mr Croux, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party; Mr Glinne and Mr Hansch, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Beyer de Ryke and Mrs Flesch, on behalf of the Liberal Group; Mr Prag, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Cervetti, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Beyer de Ryke

I would now hope that the resolution of our Parliament will also be transmitted to the Vatican, so that he can appreciate how much the sufferings of those crying out for help are a challenge to us, as they must be to him.

Mr de Courcy Ling (ED). — On a point of order, Madam President. In view of the shortage of time, I ask you to put to the vote now my proposal that we should vote on Mr Beyer de Ryke's motion straight away and then proceed to the debate on Ethiopia, which is a very urgent matter. Otherwise, we are not going to have time for a debate on Ethiopia. I think there is general support for the motion by Mr Beyer de Ryke, and I would urge you to put it to the vote.

(Protests)

President. — Mr de Courcy Ling, I cannot comply with your request. However I can put a proposal to the House, in view of the fact that we lost some 30 minutes during the preceding debate. Does the House wish, by way of exception, to add these 30 minutes to the urgency debate which would mean that we shall finish at 6.30 and not 6 p.m.?

(Parliament gave its approval)

Mr Coste-Floret (RDE). — *(FR)* There are no divisions where the defence of human rights is concerned, and we protested, at the appropriate time, against the massacres at Sabra and Chatila. Today we are protesting just as energetically against the massacre of Christian populations. This is genocide: 29 villages abandoned and burnt, 60 000 people on the roads and thousands dead. It must stop, but in order to decide what has to be done, we must first take stock of the situation in Lebanon.

For ten years, the country has been ravaged by war. In the beginning it was other peoples' wars. East and West, the United States and the Soviet Union, Iraq and Iran, Israel and the PLO confronted each other through other factions and militias. But after the withdrawal of the PLO and Israel it became possible to hope for peace. It did not happen. Why? For two reasons: the first is the intervention of Syria, which has not given up its dream of creating a greater Syria, and which everyone knows is arming the Druze and Shiite militia, who, now, are hunting down the Christians.

The second element in the drama is the weakness of the government in Beirut. We are saying, then, that it is to these two protagonists, Syria and the government in Beirut, that approaches should be made. Our motion does not oppose the compromise motion, but it supplements it by setting out the responsibilities of Syria, which we do not want to conceal, and by stating also that we want urgent humanitarian aid to be sent to the suffering and the dying.

Madam President, colleagues, by voting for the European Democratic Alliance's motion — the Alliance will also vote for the compromise proposal — you will be saying that an end must be brought, quickly, to a situation which is wholly unacceptable, as well as a denial of human rights and a denial of reason and good sense.

Mr Stirbois (DR). — *(FR)* Christian Lebanon, and therefore Lebanon itself, is dying. It has been at the point of death for more than ten years and seems now to be slipping away, with all the consequences that its disappearance will entail. Consequences for the stability of nations which will suffer local disturbance, consequences for the history of the West, which cannot but be weakened by the destruction of one of its members, even a forgotten hybrid. Consequences above all, for Lebanese Christians, who have as much right to survival and land as the Israelis, the Palestinians, the Kurds, the Armenians, as all those nations for which we have so often shown concern only when it was too late. To get a pawn to enter its sphere of influence, to place it in a strategic area, to gain its own ends, the USSR aids and encourages those who have a direct local interest in the disappearance of Lebanon: Syria and the Palestinians.

If the Christians in the Lebanon made a mistake in underestimating the situation and not anticipating the treachery of the allies, according to the Israeli ambassador to France the West bears a share of the responsibility for the misfortunes of the Christians in Southern Lebanon, in that it urged Israel to evacuate Lebanon as soon as possible. According to Emile Rahmé, a close adviser of Samir Geagea, head of the Lebanese forces, it must be admitted that every time the Israelis evacuate an area which has been under their control, it is the Christians who pay. Some observers think that the migration of the Christian population towards the Israeli security zone is part of an Israeli government plan to interpose a Christian shield between itself and the Shiites. There will always be time to analyse the selfinterest, egotism and cowardice of one or the other. The French bishops have asked the real question, will the West remain silent? Are we watching the destruction of a nation which has hitherto been an example of coexistence and brotherhood?

The French prime minister said in a speech that France will do everything in her power to provide the fullest help and support for the suffering peoples of Lebanon. That is the question: what help, what support and to which people? In fact the Socialist party, of which Mr Fabius is a member, had no hesitation in urging the government to help Yasser Arafat and his forces, who are well-known for their humanitarian action. We should not be surprised at the Communists' total silence regarding this tragedy, because Islamic nationalism serves their ends, both in the Middle East and in our own country. What we ought to find surprising, or more precisely, to condemn, is the attitudes which lack

Stirbois

frankness, the declarations made solely for the sake of getting applause from the innocent to strengthen the author's humane image.

Need I remind you that Mr Walid Jumblatt, whose hands are stained with blood, still has a seat in the Socialist International, and that several heads of government of European democracies are members of the Socialist International. How can one really want to provide help for the people of Lebanon and at the same time, after meeting him, tolerate the imperialist aims of Colonel Khadafi, who has never denied his active support of the Palestinian resistance and the Lebanese nationalist movement?

There is, in Lebanon, an anti-Christian racialism which is causing the country to be crushed gradually by Islam. The Left in Europe is not rising and will not rise against this anti-Christian racialism, that is clear. But Europe, free Europe, is not socialist. Through this Parliament it can still take action to enable a nation to survive, whilst preserving the existence of different communities with a respect for the right to differ. It is a theme which we discuss often. Let us speak of it first in a country in which the Christians, with the Maronites, were an essential part and in which they are today the victims of an upsurge of Islamic fervour and nationalism throughout the region. In Lebanon the Arab nation is rejecting coexistence between Christians and Moslems.

If by misfortune Lebanon finally succumbs, let the West remember its mistakes and its cowardice. Our Parliament must act if it does not want also to bear a share of the responsibility for the tragedy which is unfolding in this area of the Middle East.

Mr Bernhard-Reymond (PPE). — (*FR*) Madam President, colleagues, how can one fail to experience a great sense of sadness and tragic helplessness when one remembers once again the situation in Lebanon, where the events of the last two weeks have darkened a situation which had already deteriorated so much. That a Christian community which is so close to us should suffer to this extent the heartbreak of exodus and the spectre of expulsion, even disappearance, touches us deeply. We must declare our readiness to take in everyone who is condemned to flight by this tragedy. We continue to think that Lebanon was a model and that the coexistence of communities which it was able to achieve was exemplary. That is why the ultimate partition of that country would affect more than its own destiny. It would weigh heavily on relations between communities in many countries and would indubitably signify a deterioration in the quality of our international society.

We also think that the collapse of Lebanon is not fundamentally due to the cultural and political pattern it has chosen, but to the absolutely untenable Middle Eastern environment in which it is situated, where the

major powers operate through the intermediary of regional forces and create a situation in which poor Lebanon has to crack.

That is why we are calling so insistently for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the country. On the other hand we firmly support any international initiative which would make it possible to protect the threatened population, especially the reinforcement of Unifil.

This situation, at once so dramatic and so insoluble, once again shows up the tragic absence of Europe. It alone, perhaps, could have used the historical experience which several of its members have acquired in that region, and the power which its unity would have given it in the eyes of the various protagonists, to propose solutions to guarantee the integrity and security of all the States in the region.

Once again we see that peace needs Europe. The suffering of the Lebanese and of all the peoples of the Middle East calls out to us. Europeans must speak with one voice, but they must also involve an effective strategy and provide themselves with the means to enforce it. For that to happen, Europe must be Europe. That is still no the case today. Here, we are paying in terms of income and unemployment; over there, in Lebanon, others are paying with their lives.

Mr Bombard (S). — (*FR*) Madam President, it is significant that, at a time when the Christian community in Lebanon is threatened with genocide, a French socialist is calling on the EEC and on France to intervene to try to save it.

Lebanon is an independent State which has always been founded on religious equilibrium. That has always been the policy behind French action. Now disequilibrium is increasing daily, in favour of the Shiites and the Druse, and the Christians are threatened with genocide, to the advantage of Syria, which has always dreamt of a greater Syria, including Lebanon.

We, who are French and socialists, appeal to the conscience of Europe, to reestablish in Lebanon the dignity of the State and a balanced religious pluralism, which is the only possible way in which the Lebanese State can exist.

France has always acted as a protector of the Christians in Lebanon. It wants to continue that task effectively, thanks to you all, and to save the people threatened with total destruction.

In order to do that, people in France must cease to attack those who have interposed French troops between the communities! France and the Lebanon are brothers, and France is ready to take part in an act of protection, provided that it has help.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, even though it is regrettable that after the heavy attendance at the beginning of this afternoon there is hardly anyone left in the House now, the fact that now all sides of the House are of one mind is the more encouraging. That shows once again that in the great questions — if we think as Europeans — a common ground can be found.

In Lebanon there is above all a European task. Let us not forget the links which exist with Lebanon. The Christians of Lebanon have always had a special relationship with Europe — particularly with France, and European culture has received very much from the Lebanese region. Let us not forget the great monuments which bear witness to our mutual interests. I think we therefore have a responsibility towards this country, for the sake of which the Community must finally summon up its energy.

Madam President, we are not so weak as we persuade ourselves. Since the accession of Spain we are now the foremost economic power in the world. We ought to use this economic power much more as a political instrument in those regions which directly concern us. We ought therefore to look above all to those regions which actually belong to the spiritual circle of this Europe of ours. Here a genuine task has been set for the Community. Thus it may be seen once more, whilst the Lebanese drama is being enacted, that we must bring political Europe into being so as to ensure that we can defend also those who belong with us.

(Applause)

Mr Segre (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, we Italian Communists will vote for the compromise motion because it seems to us that, at a time when a tragedy of dramatic proportions is taking place in the Lebanon, it is perhaps not the moment to try to share out the blame amongst that community.

The drama that is taking place is one that threatens to involve everyone, not only this country and its communities.

A few hours ago the Italian ambassador in the Lebanon sounded the alarm, believing the Italian embassy to be in grave danger. It is a serious situation.

At a time when we are calling on the Commission to intensify aid, we call also on the ten Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to make the voice of Europe be heard loud and clear, to prevent this tragedy reaching a conclusion that would be even more tragic and bloody.

Mr Nordmann (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, I should first like to congratulate Dr Bombard on an analysis and argument which I fully share. But in con-

gratulating him, I must at the same time regret the fact that he, a socialist member of the European Parliament, is so little heard by the socialist power which controls French foreign policy. In fact, had he been listened to more, we should not, perhaps, have had occasion to find once again that the Western countries are scandalously applying the principle of 'two weights, two measures', which has provided the key to western European policy in the Middle East for so many years.

The contrast between the operation to save Yasser Arafat three years ago, and the indifference behind the fine words which prevail today, serves as a warning and proof of my argument and my regret at seeing that Dr Bombard is so little heard.

To that I shall add that if it is essential for France and Europe to mobilise to provide the urgent help which we owe to the Lebanese Christians, it is also essential that we do not forget the political background to this crisis, a background which is dominated by Soviet imperialist exploitation of every troublespot in the region, and which is also a threat to us Europeans. It is essential that we do not forget the mistakes of a European policy which, through declarations which were often pure rhetoric, like the embarrassing Venice declaration of 1980, set the seal on the non-existence of Europe in a region where it had a heritage and where it continues to have obligations.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, the Commission is, of course, following the situation in the Lebanon very closely. We share the deep concern that has been expressed in this House this afternoon about the tragic events referred to by Mr Beyer de Ryke as a collective tragedy. Events are taking place there which add to the suffering of civilian populations, including now Christians in the south.

As far as possible the Commission has done its best to help the people affected by the war and to ease their terrible suffering. Since 1975, when the Civil War began, more than 222 million ECUs worth of aid, including humanitarian and food aid, have been sent to Lebanon. This aid has, of course, been put at the disposal of all sections of Lebanese society. May I add that just recently, in March, emergency food aid was granted to Lebanon to help those in the greatest difficulty — notably those living in the south, whose situation has now been further aggravated by the tragic turn which events have taken. This aid package included 5 000 tonnes of cereals and 1 000 tonnes of vegetables. With regard to the present situation, the Commission remains ready to consider any request for emergency humanitarian aid submitted to it through the competent international organizations.

May I, in conclusion, remind the House of the declaration made by the Community's Foreign Ministers at

Clinton Davis

their Political Cooperation Meeting on 29 April 1985. The reference to Lebanon reads as follows:

The Ten continue to view with concern the deterioration of the situation in Lebanon and, in particular, its consequences for the civilian population in the south which continues to be subjected to unjustifiable acts of violence. The Ten appeal to all the parties concerned, both within Lebanon and outside, to act in such a way as to facilitate the process of restoring the sovereignty, unity, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon — a process which has been seriously compromised by the recent worsening of the political and security situation. The Ten reaffirm their support for Unifil. The Ten call on all parties to respect Unifil's role, avoiding all incidents, cooperating fully with the force and ensuring the safety of its personnel.

That is a policy to which the Commission, and evidently the House, wholly subscribes.

President. — The debate is closed.

(In successive votes, Parliament:

- *adopted Amendment No 1, seeking to replace motions for resolutions B 2-261/85 and B 2-312/85*¹
- *adopted resolution B 2-278/85 and*
- *rejected motion for a resolution B 2-295/85)*

Ethiopia

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Chinaud and Mrs Flesch, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the evacuation of Ibnet camp in Ethiopia (Doc. B 2-280/85);
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Le Chevallier and Mr Antony, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the famine in Ethiopia (Doc. B 2-285/85);
- the motion for a resolution by Mr De la Malene and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the enforced clearing of a refugee camp in Ethiopia (Doc. B 2-301/85);

- motion for a resolution by Mr Herman and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the situation in Ethiopia (Doc. B 2-311/85).

Mrs Flesch (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, everyone knows about the events which led us to table this motion. The exodus, under controversial conditions, of several tens of thousands of refugees from hunger has created an unprecedented crisis between the Ethiopian regime and the principal international humanitarian organisations. The forced evacuation of almost 60 000 refugees has been confirmed officially by the United Nations and by the International Committee of the Red Cross which have discarded their customary discretion and pointed out that the great majority of the people forced to leave were children suffering from serious malnutrition and that there was extreme disquiet as to their fate.

The Ibnet camp, situated on the high central plateau of Ethiopia was a centre specialising in food and medical aid to the victims of famine and infant malnutrition. It was administered by the Ethiopian authorities with the assistance of the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Ethiopian Orthodox church and various humanitarian organisations.

The significant effort made by the international community and the EEC in particular, both through public aid and through that of non-governmental organisations, leads us to enquire very seriously of the Ethiopian authorities what they intend to do to rehabilitate the refugees from famine. Basically it is the very future of our emergency food aid which is at stake here. For it to continue an assurance must be obtained from the Ethiopian government that there will be no repetition of this tragic episode.

In this connection we are very pleased that the Commission reacted officially on Friday last by summoning the Ethiopian ambassador in Brussels to provide an explanation and by asking the EEC delegation to Addis Ababa to carry out an on-the-spot enquiry.

The Ethiopian government must know that its attitude is unacceptable, whether it is a blunder on the part of the local authorities in the Gondar region, or a deliberate act by the central power. Obviously no-one doubts the necessity for a return to the villages and to agricultural activity. But it must happen under acceptable circumstances. Undernourished people must not be forced to undertake such a long march. The Wollo and Tigre regions, to which the refugees were going, are regions which were severely affected by drought last year and can be reached only after a march of several days. In view of the state of exhaustion of these refugees, this evacuation could only be a march towards death.

The Ethiopian government must give an undertaking that in future the evacuation of the camps will be car-

¹ Amendment No 1 by Mr Mallet, Mr Croux, Mr Habsburg, Mr Debatisse, and Mr Fontaine, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party; Mr Prag, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Beyer de Ryke and Mrs Flesch, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Flesch

ried out in cooperation with the humanitarian organisations, which are best able to assess the physical condition of the people. Agency dispatches indicate that several thousand refugees who were chased out of Ibnet last week, have returned in the hope of receiving food and medical care.

Unfortunately famine itself has taken enough victims without man increasing the number by truly absurd decisions.

Madam President, these are the reasons behind our motion. I should add that an amendment No 1 has been tabled, that it has the approval of a very large number of the groups in the Assembly, and that my Group, for its part, will vote in favour of the amendment.

Mr Tripodi (DR). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we do not know how the Communist camp can still have the effrontery to talk of liberating man from the bonds that humiliate his personality when, in a country that is brutally controlled by a Communist dictator, whole populations are deprived of the primary right of existence.

This is happening in Ethiopia, and yet there are still those who claim that, in that country, democracy is the foundation on which the so-called legality of the government is based.

Faced with acts such as those that have taken place at Ibnet Camp, where what is nothing less than genocide has dispersed almost 60 thousand people, the human conscience rebels and denounces the bloody Colonel Mengistu as a worthy heir to the Stalinist purges.

In a camp that accommodated 59 thousand refugees driven from home by hunger, including a great many children, the Ethiopian government, after having burnt down the crowded camp, forced almost all the survivors to flee to the south. The Red Cross only found two thousand at the place where the camp had been.

Where wholesale murder has not exterminated the hungry, deportation, using transport supplied by the Soviet army, is inflicting indescribable hardship on around 300 thousand men living in the Wollo and Tigre provinces.

The Group of the European Right calls on Europe to stop looking weakly on at these atrocious violations of the most elementary human rights. It asks whether, at a certain point, intervention by UN peace-keeping troops ought not to be proposed. Indeed the Group itself proposed that, in the meantime, Europe should organize a massive joint operation to transport — under the escort of a peace-keeping force, and with the maximum urgency, so as to avoid the worst — at least 500 thousand tons of food, in an attempt to save

what can still be saved of those hapless victims of Communist oppression.

(Applause)

Mr Guerneur (RDE). — *(FR)* The situation in Ethiopia calls for some response from the European Parliament, and that is the object of the resolution which we have tabled.

We are aware of the situation: hundreds of thousands of people condemned by drought to suffering and death, and also condemned to despair, because the future offers no glimmer of hope, the country is at war, a situation in which the horror and violence of war is added to what I have already mentioned. Aid supply-lines are blocked by military manoeuvres, by battles, and also, without doubt, here and there by the desire to prevent aid from getting through. The ports are closed in order to receive shipments of Soviet arms, instead of receiving shiploads of foodstuffs which could save whole populations. There has even been machine gunning of food distribution centres — the NGO said so — and now there is contempt for humanity, brutal contempt, as demonstrated by the situation at the Ibnet camp, which our colleagues have just described.

This example is an illustration of an even more serious situation, which affects 30 million people, in the Sahel alone, which appeals to the sense of responsibility of the developed nations, the affluent nations. They must continue to supply aid and to increase it; in particular the European Parliament must do still more than it has done hitherto. But we must also denounce the hypocrisy of the governments of some of the countries affected by famine for their excessive brutality on a level never reached by the most violent of the former colonial powers. I can still hear the ambassadors of one developing country attacking the Western idea of human rights. Would that that idea were shared by some of the countries affected by hunger!

Madam President, there are emergency meetings of the Security Council whenever there is danger of war in the world, and rightly so. What official body will meet to demand that the developed world carry out the greatest rescue operation of all time? It is high time it was done, and perhaps it is our Parliament that should seize the initiative and take responsibility for having saved entire populations from hunger, misery and despair.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — Madam President, 150 years ago, a series of famines started in my country, Ireland, culminating in a great famine which reduced the population of our island through starvation, disease and emigration by 50%. The cause, I need hardly tell you, was not a lack of rain in my country. No, it was the inevitable outcome of a rapidly rising population

Raftery

and static food production, which in turn arose from a government more concerned about the subservience than the subsistence of its subjects and a gross lack of education and training, particularly for those working on the land.

The similarities with the situation pertaining in many African countries today are striking. Drought, I contend, merely hastened the onset of the famine, which was inevitable owing to the mismanagement of resources and the bad governments of these countries. The problem in Ethiopia and the Sahel region must be looked at in the short, medium and long term if we hope to eliminate the recurring famine in that region. Clearly, in the short term we must get more food to those unfortunate people, but in the medium and longer term the more important task is to adopt a policy of helping them to help themselves — in other words, a philosophy of giving them a fishing-rod rather than a fish.

While urging Europe to contribute more generously, I would like to point out that Europe has already contributed more generously towards the relief of hunger in Africa than any other developed region in the world. Lack of food surpluses is no excuse for the USSR and its allies not contributing, as we in the Community would be very happy to sell our surpluses to Russia, which in turn could donate these surpluses to the starving Ethiopians. Grain rather than guns, I suggest, would be more appropriate for the Ethiopians.

I would suggest in all humility that we in Europe have a responsibility to take an initiative, to do something about eliminating the permanent risk of famine in that part of the world. I suggest that we set up a kind of African development corps, something along the lines of the Peace Corps which President Kennedy set up some years ago. In that regard I have no doubt that in time, given development and training, the people of Africa could help themselves, and we should see an end to the continuing risk of famine in that area.

Mr Fellermaier (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, if one reads the motion for a resolution of the Group of the European Right and pays attention to the language and phraseology employed in it — it states that airborne troops from Italy, France and the Federal Republic of Germany should be used and that the Head of State of this country, which belongs to the Lomé Convention, is a barbarous colonel — then I think it is not for this Group of the European Right, which itself has a barbarous group leader at its head, to insult the President of State of another country in this way in this document.

The groups have tabled a motion for amendment, No 1, which takes into account the declaration of the Commission made at a special sitting of the Committee on Development and Cooperation this week. I should like in the name of the Socialist Group to thank

Mr Vice-President Natali, who is here present, for having summoned the Ethiopian Ambassador to him immediately after the occurrences in the Ibnet Camp in order to inform him of the express displeasure of the European Community. Ibnet is one camp of fifty.

I think we should understand and see dispassionately that the Ethiopian Government is not acting wrongly if it has now begun a campaign so that the refugees in the camps should be ready now, when the rains have set in in large parts of the country, to go back to their villages and till the land. I think nobody should criticize that, but what must be criticized is the way in which regional Ethiopian authorities have dealt here with goodness knows how many thousands of people. This must be censured, because European public opinion cannot accept it and because otherwise, when we call upon our peoples for further benefactions for the starving population in Ethiopia, we should be unworthy of belief. Therefore the Commission should now go further than what is termed emergency aid and in close liaison with the coordinator of the United Nations should above all ensure that the people who are ready to go back to the villages in this resettlement programme are provided with what is most essential, namely seed. Only then can they hope after the rain sets in in December and January to be able to reap the harvest and to feed their families themselves.

I think, Mr Commissioner, that we must develop a considerable supplementary programme far in excess of emergency aid in the sense of help for self-help, a long-term European Community programme. For that we need the assurance of the Ethiopian Government that it will show a larger measure of readiness to collaborate with the European Community, because in the final analysis it is a partner in the Lomé Convention. This is an obligation for both sides and you should make contact also with the State President of Ethiopia in the spirit and on the basis of the Lomé Convention. You have been to Ethiopia, Mr Natali. I think that in this situation it would be advisable for you to go to Ethiopia again in order to try on the spot to influence things rather differently, so that Ibnet may remain an isolated case and that this frightful occurrence shall not be repeated.

(Applause)

Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the compulsory evacuation of the refugee camps in Ethiopia is a shameful and degrading occurrence. To compel starving and enfeebled persons including many children to make many days' journey to other parts of the country and all in impossible conditions is so abominable that it does not bear thinking about. But that has happened at least once and who dares to maintain that it has not happened before?

Therefore our group fully supports the compromise text which represents our point of view clearly and

De Backer-Van Ocken

distinctly. Mr Commissioner Natali has had contact on this matter up to the highest level with the Ethiopian authorities and we may assume that there our complete disapproval was also expressed. For other reasons too the advisability of an increase in food aid to Ethiopia has recently been called in question, at least in view of the manner in which it is now being implemented. Food aid is no longer so effective as the generous spontaneous aid movement in the whole world had wished it to be and indeed had been entitled to expect. We remain convinced that a high degree of food aid is necessary but we should be glad to see a thorough investigation as to whether the manner in which our food aid is being dealt with in Ethiopia satisfies minimal essential conditions. In fact whole areas of Ethiopia are still not being reached, for example Eritrea and Tigre. Food still remains stuck in the harbours because the army lorries available are not transporting the food. A rapid and fundamental investigation of the present method of providing food aid is absolutely essential.

We thus support the compromise text, but in view of the fact that our first and principal aim is still the alleviation of the indescribable suffering of millions of starving people, we have no need of the draft text of Mr Le Chevallier, so we shall vote against it.

Mr de Courcy Ling (ED). — Madam President, my group would also like to support the compromise text, but I wish to dissociate myself from, first of all, the proposal that there should be military intervention in Ethiopia and, secondly, the suggestion that Mr Natali should visit Ethiopia yet again, because Mr Natali has been extremely conscientious in visiting Ethiopia recently and it is unnecessary for him to go again. I would recommend to Mr Fellermaier, in particular, the value of intelligence as distinct from perpetual motion.

Substantively, I would like to propose one or two concrete measures to the Council, which is represented by its diplomatic representative, if not its political representative today. One is that it should accept the 100 m units of account — more than 100 m units of account — that we have put back this morning into Chapter 9 of the budget for food aid. Public opinion will not accept that the Member States, the governments, the Council play politics with this money. That is a solemn warning, and I can assure the diplomatic representative of the Council that I have public opinion and every group in this House on my side when I say that.

Secondly, I would urge the Foreign Ministers acting in political cooperation to consider what action they can take in the United Nations Security Council to restrict outside interference in the affairs of Ethiopia, particularly the supply of arms from the Soviet Union. But there are other elements of outside interference.

As far as the Commission is concerned, may I address to Vice-President Natali six points. First of all, in the

context of a Natali memorandum, which I believe is now necessary to succeed the Pisani memorandum, will he consider, in the light of this new famine which is spreading, the relation between food aid, the distribution of Community surpluses and long-term agricultural development. The equation, in my view, has changed since the Pisani memorandum was drafted.

Secondly, will Mr Natali in the new memorandum have a look at the problems of distribution, infrastructure, railways and roads, particularly in East and Central Africa? Thirdly, will he consider again the problem of desertification? Fourthly, there is the problem of uprooting the tropical rain forests, trees and shrubs. Next, there are the effects of desertification, a problem which was considered in the Pisani memorandum but which needs looking at yet again and bringing up to date. Next, will he look, perhaps more audaciously than hitherto, at the problem of the growth of population in some of these countries, particularly in Ethiopia but in other countries of East and Central Africa? Finally, will the Commission be prepared to be more forthright on the bad effects of centralized, Marxist economic planning of the kind perpetrated by Colonel Mengistu?

Mr Wurtz (COM). — (FR) Madam President, the Communist members and allies will not support the compromise proposal on Ethiopia.

For our part we prefer the Commission's approach, as expressed only yesterday before the development committee of our Assembly. Let me pick out three essential aspects.

The first concerns the way in which the Irbet refugee camp was evacuated. The Community firmly condemns the brutal methods used, of course. The second concerns the attitude adopted by the Ethiopian authorities following that affair. The Ethiopian Head of State received the United Nations representative. He expressed his disapproval of the methods used by the local authorities and announced that measures would be taken to protect the refugees. Finally, the third aspect mentioned by the Commissioner, Mr Natali, concerned the fundamental problem of these refugee camps. They are transit camps and their function is necessary limited to providing short-term shelter for the people most severely affected, until they return to their villages, and that in a situation which is characterised by extreme poverty, considerable uncertainty and immense communication problems.

A resolution which took all these factors into consideration could have made a useful contribution towards improving the lot of these people, who are so afflicted.

The one-sided approach which is being proposed does not lead in this direction. That is why we shall not vote for it.

Mr Cicciomessere (NI). — *(IT)* Madam President, I think that this discussion — at least in the terms that I have heard so far — is somewhat futile. I wonder, in fact, what powers of negotiation the Parliament of the Commission have *vis à vis* Mengistu, with regard to this or any other matter.

They have no powers of negotiation whatever, so let us therefore look at where the real responsibilities lie. On the one hand, there are the Parliament and, in particular, the Commission, who are going ahead with plans that are insignificant from the political standpoint, and ineffective in the face of situations such as this.

How can we still speak today, in 1985, of measures to combat hunger when you limit yourselves to food aid, when you limit yourselves to dumping in these countries the food surpluses of our own countries? This is not aid to countries in difficulty, it is aid to our farmers!

How can you complain, then, of the setting up of refugee camps and of all that follows when you know — Commissioner Natali certainly knows — that the almost total prevalence of food aid of necessity leads, in the absence of any infrastructural measures, and in the absence of any action to help the people to find solutions to their problems, to the setting up of these enormous concentration camps? What power has the Commission, what credibility, to allow it to say to Mengistu or anyone else that they should behave in a certain manner, rather than in another?

Equally certain, in my mind, is the guilt of the other responsible parties, the Third World countries, who have just as much responsibility in this dramatic question of hunger.

What, therefore, is the solution? The solution is the one that we have now been trying for many years to indicate. It is the one that I have heard mentioned by some other Members. A great plan is needed, which obviously cannot be the Dublin plan. A great infrastructural plan, a plan that is designed to solve the real problems of these people. And then, starting with this new credibility, Europe can and must require, must insist on, different behaviour from the other parties involved.

As far as I am concerned, not only is what has happened intolerable, what has been denounced in the resolutions, but it is intolerable that Parliament, the Commission, does not make food aid subject to a cease-fire in the war with Eritrea. Here, then, is a plan, and here are the terms of the question, if we are to tackle the problem in a positive way.

And therefore, for these reasons, Madam President, I shall not vote for any of these motions for resolutions, which are fanciful and useless.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(IT)* Madam President, I have already presented a report to the Committee on Development on recent events that have occurred at the Ibnet Camp. I only wish to say that, as soon as we were informed of what had happened, we took immediate action and asked to carry out an on-the-spot inquiry. As has been recalled, the Ibnet Camp is one of the fifty camps in Ethiopia. It is not designed as a camp intended to accommodate refugees permanently, but as a transit camp and a centre at which the people can replenish their supplies.

I must say, Madam President, that we were informed that Colonel Mengistu had received the United Nations coordinator and had said that the Addis Ababa authorities had not been informed of this initiative, but I must also add — this is information that reached me yesterday, which is why I have not passed it on to the Committee on Development — that the Ethiopian Foreign Minister received the delegate of the Commission at Addis Ababa and explained that the evacuation of Ibnet Camp was due to a mistake by a local official who had exceeded his responsibilities, without consulting the government.

This local official was apparently removed from office and arrested. The Head of State deplored the incident, and has taken steps to avoid the recurrence of such incidents. This means that the Ethiopian government also now deprecates such occurrences, as we do.

I will now explain briefly what I think has to be done. I think that the first step is to put everything in hand to enable agricultural production in Ethiopia to recover. Mr Raftery emphasized that we cannot in any way think that the Ethiopians, or any other countries, can live indefinitely on outside aid. Everything possible has to be done to enable agricultural production to recover, and to allow town-dwellers to return to their villages.

Here we have the problem of continuing with our aid. In this connection I have to thank Mr de Courcy Ling for the appeal he addressed to the Council. Of course, if all we did was to point out the contradiction between fine declarations of intent and the very inadequacy of the real resources at our disposal, I think that our discussion would be nothing more than an acknowledgement of these facts, pure and simple.

Instead, we have to continue with our work, since, until the harvest comes, those peasants that return to their villages need to be supported. Emergency aid still needs to be provided. And emergency aid involves transport problems, and has to take into account logistical difficulties that certainly exist, and security difficulties, especially in Ethiopia.

Then there is another type of action to be pursued, with intervention in kind of a long-term character. For the immediate future, we are distributing seed and agricultural equipment; we are bringing about the

Natali

conditions for a resumption of activity. In the longer term, obviously — and here I should like to say to Mr Ciccimessere that I think his pessimism is exaggerated — we propose a set of measures to enable these countries to — I will not say immediately achieve food security, but certainly to develop the conditions to meet their requirements.

I should like to finish on a note of hope. I do not think — and I am convinced of this — that it is worthwhile stirring up, for one's own ends, problems of a political nature. Our aim is to work for the growth, development and security of these peoples.

The European Parliament has always shown itself particularly sensitive to this. At the recent Summit of industrialized countries in Bonn — as President Delors reminded us yesterday — a gleam of hope was also introduced on this subject. For the first time at a summit of industrialized countries a statement of appraisal and commitment was made on the problems of Africa. I have to add — if you will allow me this personal observation — that the lines set out in this statement largely correspond to those that were inserted in Lomé III, for which, once again, the help and support given by the European Parliament must take the credit.

I should like finally to assure honourable members that we will take every step to ensure that the aid reaches those who need it, and that the situation, that we are now complaining about, can change as the result, above all, of the help and solidarity of Europe.

(Applause)

Mr Fellermaier (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, with knowledge of the declaration of the Ethiopian Government with regard to the occurrences at Ibbet, of which the Commission has informed us, I should like, as one of the proposers for our group, to refer to the fact that paragraph 2, as at present worded, is no longer actually quite in accordance with the announcement that these measures were taken by the local authorities and that the leaders of the local authorities had been subjected to legal disciplinary proceedings.

As it is not possible in the present stage of the procedure to put forward a draft amendment, I would ask you to take a separate vote on the paragraphs with Arabic numbers. My group will then abstain in the vote on paragraph 2 as we wish in this way amongst others to take account of the Commission's declaration. I know that that is procedurally unsatisfactory but unfortunately under the strict requirements of the Rules of Procedure a modification of the text is not possible during voting.

I say that also because I think that in such an international situation proper attention must be paid to a dec-

laration by the Commission, nor should it be forgotten in this connection that a delegation from the European Parliament is shortly to go to Ethiopia. There it will voice its concern, but after the Commission's declaration paragraph 2 certainly could not be substantiated.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — *(FR)* Madam President, I think the situation is too serious for us to lapse into compromises like that which Mr Fellermaier has just invited us to make.

It is unworthy. How can anyone believe that the Ethiopian government is incapable of controlling its troops, and that its soldiers acted without orders. It is insupportable!

President. — The debate is closed.

(In successive votes Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 seeking to replace motions for resolutions Doc. B 2-28/85, Doc. B 2-301/85 and Doc. B 2-311/85, and rejected motion for a resolution Doc. B 2-185/85)¹

This vote concludes the actual and topical debate.

Mr Patterson (ED). — On a point of order under Rule 48(3). In spite of the extra time you have allowed — almost 45 minutes — we have still not reached the end of the urgent procedures. Rule 48(3) says that the time spent by the Commission is not included in the three hours and the rest of the time is divided up amongst the political groups. Clearly it is not possible to exceed three hours, the Commission apart, if the Rules are adhered to. So a number of political groups must have well exceeded their speaking time. I would be interested to know which ones. My main point is that the resolution in my name, item No 7 on the list of urgencies is an urgent matter as it refers to the cancellation by the Council of a meeting which should have taken place on Monday. Therefore it cannot be tabled at any other time. May I ask, if I renounce my speaking time and if everybody else does too, that we proceed to the vote on this resolution so that at least we get on record our disgust at the Council cancelling a meeting which should have taken place to benefit the citizens of Europe?

President. — I am sorry, Mr Patterson. I feel that the time taken up by the preceding incidents cannot be included in the urgent debate. We have calculated that

¹ Amendment No 1 by Mr Fellermaier, Mr Focke and Mr Schmitt, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mrs Rabbethge, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party; Mr Christopher Jackson, on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mrs Flesch, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr de la Malène and Mr Guermeur, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance.

President

between 25 and 30 minutes were lost. We shall therefore add one half-hour to the urgency debate.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Madam President, may I first of all thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak when the House should already have risen. As you will be aware I made certain remarks this afternoon during an emotionally highly-charged debate which gave rise to a large number of points of order. May I take this opportunity to make two points. First, the statements I made about the resolutions under discussion represented the policy of the Commission. Second, I much regret the fact that in response to some shouting which was directed at me at the beginning and at the end of my speech when I was making reference to a personal experience which was very emotional as far as I was concerned, I made an unrehearsed observation about a parliamentary group which I clearly should not have done, notwithstanding the heat of the moment. I regret that these remarks gave offence to many Members of the House, and I should like to apologize therefore to you, Madam President, for any breach of the rules of this House and of its procedures, for any offence which I may have given to the Chair and, most particularly, for any sully of the relationship enjoyed between Members of this House and of the Delors Commission which, within my own areas of responsibility, I have been most anxious to foster. I propose, Madam President, to write in similar terms to the President of the Parliament.

(Applause)

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — *(FR)* I should like to thank the Commissioner, Mr Clinton Davis, and to tell him that my group accepts his apology.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

3. *Budgetary policy 1986 (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Christodoulou report (Doc. A 2-25/85).¹

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* A budget is a reflection of the picture one has of society. In it the political

priorities may be read. The guidelines which Mr Christodoulou puts forward reinforce a particular model in which priority attention is devoted to increasing the productivity of our industry as the principal source of well-being. From that principle all salvation is expected.

I do not share that vision. I opt for a Europe in which the social aspect has priority. I opt for a Europe in which the antitheses between the various regions and groups of the population are overcome. Therefore I plead for a substantial increase in the Social and Regional Fund with the understanding that the monies are applied for an improvement in the well-being of the regions most affected and the populations most affected. Mr President, I opt also for a Europe which gives chances to those social movements which are active at the grass roots and help them to take part in a policy which is just. I am thinking of social movements of all kinds: neighbourhood projects, grass root organizations, environmental movements and so on. They are the bearers of a new life force.

I plead also for a fresh approach to the agricultural question. It is not simply the product which must occupy the centre of the picture but above all the farmer and the consumer. We must guarantee the farmer an income by means of which he can produce in a manner which is friendly to the environment and to mankind.

Above all I wish to demand attention to the problem of unemployment. We must set meaningfully to work to create and help to create employment, for and by the unemployed. That must come before any consideration of productivity in its narrow industrial sense. Let us support the grass-roots activities which are now appearing everywhere, such as co-operatives, small-scale undertakings and the like.

Furthermore let not Europe forget its role as regards the third world. We must make an effective contribution to the development and welfare of the third world by assisting populations on the spot. We must refuse all support to those régimes which spurn human rights and deny the peoples the right to maintenance of their individuality, such as for example Turkey, which fails to respect human rights and also refuses Kurdistan its own individuality. And on the other hand we must support those régimes which are going in for redistribution — and I am thinking above all of Nicaragua.

Mr Bardong (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, we are still quarrelling about the 1985 budget, even though it is now time to establish the guidelines of the 1986 budget. I think we could establish that a certain degree of agreement does exist among the EEC Member States about the policy of growth and employment. That at least became clear at the Bonn summit, in spite of the reservations the President of the Commission put forward with regard to other areas. A few years

¹ See Verbatim Report of Proceedings of 7 May 1985.

Bardong

ago, such agreement was not even conceivable. Seven large industrial nations want a policy of stability, reduction of state deficits and encouragement of private enterprise. That must surely have a positive effect on the labour market.

Accordingly, the European Community budget should also contribute towards the convergence of economies, and help strengthen and speed up this positive trend. Yet it can do so only to a very limited degree because of its limited volume. Even if own resources are increased, they are still used largely for unavoidable expenditure, which cannot serve these ends. The guidelines must, therefore, concentrate on a few focal points, some of which have already been mentioned. May I also underline the need for greater emphasis on the research programmes, and on job-creating, productive investment in the framework of technological change, promoting the creation of new jobs by small and medium-sized undertakings, craft and cooperative undertakings and, lastly, the promotion of pilot projects to create jobs for young unemployed people.

In the research field, many of us are in fact waiting for a revival of European policy as a whole, since Community-wide expenditure on research is more effective than ten times one tenth of the expenditure in the Member States. But more emphasis on common research brings with it a number of financial problems which are bound up with our basic principles. The framework research plan was based on a 4% share of the budget for 1987. Today the figure is 3%. The increase ought to begin in 1986. Meanwhile the Commission has even mentioned 6% for research in 1989. Hitherto the research programme concentrated heavily on industry. There was too little emphasis on research in the fields of agriculture, energy, climate or biotechnology. In future we should concentrate on research programmes where it looks as though the research findings can rapidly be translated into industrial production. That is what we expect of, for instance, the Bright programme for future technologies, for surely it is indisputable that high growth rates are achieved there.

Care should also be taken, however, to ensure that the aid package for medium-sized undertakings with a great capacity for innovation is not set so high. There has been some criticism to this effect of the Esprit programme, under which 75% of recent aid was spent on large-scale projects. But we should also remember to make sure that research expenditure does not end up by being renationalized before we have had any real chance of building up Community research.

There has already been some discussion about additional research financing by the governments outside the framework of own resources. Such supplementary financing has long since existed for Euratom. Meanwhile, there is obviously some willingness to accept Community measures in other research areas too, in which not all Member States take part. After some

hesitation, the Federal Republic has also shown itself willing, although clearly only subject to conditions which do not take adequate account of Parliament as regards policy formation.

We welcome the fact that more is being done in this field; we cannot unreservedly welcome the way it is being done. That is why I thought our representatives were being overhasty in giving their assent to this additional financing outside own resources during the conciliation procedure before the discussion in committee. Nevertheless, we are still keeping an open mind about the French Eureka proposal. We do not yet know all the details but we know for sure that it cannot be financed out of own resources.

We should be extremely cautious about creating new authorities or agencies in this field, for we already have a wide range of Community instruments.

We also want to keep an open mind about participation in SDI research. The statement by the Commission President, that there would be room for this research if research expenditure for 1989 were raised to 6%, still seems rather doubtful to me. But my group has an open mind about SDI and of course we think that a correctly defined Eureka programme could pave the way for European cooperation with SDI.

These are questions we must ask ourselves in next year's budget and which are also touched upon in the Christodoulou report.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I shall be very brief. This is a debate which started two days ago; now we are resuming it. I should therefore like to begin by thanking not only the two speakers who have addressed us here this afternoon but also the long list of speakers who took part in Tuesday's debate. Special thanks are due of course to Mr Christodoulou for the way in which he prepared the debate.

It is important for the new Commission to get a clear impression at an early stage of how the Parliament regards the content of the budget for the coming year and the many interventions made are of valuable assistance to us since we are far from completing the formulation of guidelines for the 1986 budget.

I shall therefore not discuss the many details but simply say that I think that the main lines in Mr Christodoulou's report to a large extent follow the actual lines along which the Commission is thinking. Many of the speeches made, including the last one we heard, fortunately also expressed the same train of thought as ours in the Commission.

I should like very briefly to make two comments of a more general nature. One concerns our need for a long-term solution to the financial problems which

Christophersen

have accumulated in recent years, since we have constantly taken on more commitments whilst not being correspondingly in a position to honour these obligations. These financial burdens from the past, which both the Court of Auditors and Mr Aigner's committee — and fortunately I myself — have brought to attention and emphasized, must be disposed of. Therefore it will be possible to see, when the Commission puts forward its budgetary proposals, that there is a very important element in our budget strategy for next year for the liquidation of these burdens from the past. That is a pre-condition for our having greater room for manoeuvre.

The other problem concerns the way in which we manage or administer our tasks and the budget appropriations granted. Here I think it is essential that we in the Commission win greater confidence from the Council and the Parliament so as to be in a position to exercise better control and assessment of the programmes approved. The principles in the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes are in the Commission's view good. They enable us to make a more thoroughgoing evaluation before we launch programmes; they enable us to exercise better day-to-day control over the use of resources, so that at an early stage we can prevent the misuse or wastage of Community resources. These two matters — and this is what I just wanted to say — these two intersecting tasks: the settling of past financial commitments and burdens and the creation of a more effective day-to-day control of the use of resources are pre-conditions for our obtaining greater room for manoeuvre as regards the budget and thus being able to finance new political programmes.

I wanted to make this point because I wished to announce here some of the important inter-connected tasks which we should like to solve when we present our budget proposals now. But I should like also to express my thanks again for the many interesting contributions made. I shall take note of them all. I shall not promise to comply with them all, since it is not of course the Commission alone which has the ability to create resources, but I think that the Commission and the Parliament are broadly following the same line.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

4. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote. We should in fact begin with the continuation of the vote on the Marinaro report. I have, however, a request from the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) to begin with the vote on the Christodoulou report on which the debate has just

been concluded. This would mean changing the agenda. Pursuant to Rule 56 I accept the proposal and put to the vote whether we should begin by voting on the Christodoulou report.

(Parliament adopted the proposal by the Group of the European People's Party)

Report by Mr Christodoulou, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the guidelines for the Community's budgetary policy for 1986 (Doc. A 2-25/85)

Paragraph 13 — before the vote on Amendment No 10

Mr Christodoulou (PPE). — *(GR)*, *rapporteur*. Mr President, if possible I would like the paragraph in question to be read as follows:

'Coordination of the economic and trade policy of Member States, when this is aimed at recovery and convergence leading to the qualitative development of necessary conditions for the smooth running of the Community and the diminution of economic inequalities, and if necessary the disposition of own resources to enable achievement of these aims'

What has been added is the phrase: 'leading to the qualitative development'. If Mr Dankert will accept this verbal addition, then I would accept his amendment.

Mr Dankert (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I accepted the text the rapporteur originally put before me; it is just that I did not hear the words 'qualitative growth' in the German translation any more. If the text we originally agreed on is the real text, I accept it.

President. — I can accept that.

Explanations of vote

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* We think that the resolution proposed by the Committee on Budgets conforms with the familiar framework of the policies followed by the Community in recent years, which result in increased unemployment, the imposition of frugality on working people, the worsening of inequalities between the countries in the Community, and the reinforcement of large capital within the Community.

Over and above these general characteristics, we think that Mr Christodoulou's report contains three features that are especially negative for our country.

Firstly, the matter of market unity, which we think will have negative consequences for countries like Greece, consequences that are already manifested by the

Alavanos

national income, the balance of trade and the balance of payments.

Secondly, the matter of financial discipline, which would result in an even greater reduction of Greece's revenue from the Common budget, taking into account that in 1984, compared with 1983, Greece's receipts calculated in dollars fell by 14%.

Thirdly, the matter of developing Common policies on research, technology etc., from which our country does not stand to gain anything because they are policies that respond to the interest of the Community's large monopolies.

Granted all of the above, anything said about convergence, regional aid, or dealing with regional inequalities, can be considered wishful thinking.

From this point of view, and of course bearing in mind that the budget is judged in terms of the distribution of its items and not on these general reports, we Members of the Greek Communist Party will vote against the report by the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Dankert (S). — (NL) In this Parliament, at least in the past few days, we have had rather a tendency to exchange hard blows. I have the impression that that is not too good a thing in the budget procedure since there we are compelled or condemned to live with qualified majorities and must therefore come to terms at a certain moment.

Mr Christodoulou or the Committee on Budgets in the explanatory statement to the 1986 budget laid down the guidelines for the incorporation of the budget into general economic policy and that cannot do anything but lead, shall we say, to ideological differences of view. I was originally minded to propose that my group should vote against the Christodoulou resolution purely on account of that explanatory statement. Amendments Nos 9 and 10 — on relating to reduction of working hours and the other to qualitative growth — were of crucial importance in that connection. Even the socialists cannot always win everything. I accept the rapporteur's concession with regard to qualitative growth and accordingly no longer feel inclined to vote against.

I should therefore like to advise my group, Mr President, in spite of everything to vote for this resolution in the hope that that will contribute further to a proper development of the budget procedure.

(Applause)

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

¹ The rapporteur spoke
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 2, 3, 5 and 8, and
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 11.

Report (Doc A 2-4/85) by Mrs Marinaro, on behalf of the Committee for Social Affairs and Employment on the guidelines for a Community policy on migration together with a draft Council resolution.¹

President. — I should like to remind the House that there is a request from the Group of the European Right for a roll-call vote on all paragraphs. I would further remind the House that we decided under Rule 74(3) of the Rules of Procedure to begin with the vote on the original text.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) Mr President, would you be willing to inquire and to have published officially how much money the voting about the Marinaro report has cost as a result of the nonsense perpetrated by the Group of the European Right in taking a roll-call vote on everything, so that the European population may know who stands up for their European rights here in this Parliament and who wastes their money here?

President. — That has been noted. That can certainly be determined.

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — (FR) Mr President, would it be possible for Parliament to publish, if it is voted, the cost of the Marinaro report and the follow-up to it?

President. — That is a matter for the Commission.

After the adoption of paragraph 10.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, as a result of this procedure, which is clear to me, all the amendments tabled by me in fact lapse, including the last amendment no 60 in relation to support for neighbourhood construction works, which I myself regard as very important because I am directly affected. I think that is a pity.

President. — It is always disappointing when one's well-intentioned projects come to nought, but those are the rules of the House.

After paragraph 13 — After the rejection of Amendments Nos 80 and 81

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, I myself and a number of Honourable Members have a very big problem on our hands at the moment. We heard yesterday from Mr Le Pen that this report concerns a

¹ See previous day's debates.

Chanterie

matter which is fundamental for the European Community, but I must point out that he is no longer in the Chamber to vote on this matter. Can we then proceed with this vote?

(Applause)

President. — The request for a roll-call vote was made in writing and we must carry out the four remaining votes in this way.

After the vote on paragraph 15

Mrs Weber (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, since you have just placed a remark relating to this on the record, may I ask you to also put on record what the cost of this insane procedure has been for this House and the tax-payer.

Explanations of vote

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — *(FR)* The whole of my Group, without exception, will vote against the motion as debated by Parliament. The problem of migrants is indeed a fundamental one, firstly it affects the destiny of large numbers of men, women and children who need our concern. It is also a fundamental problem where unemployment is concerned. But it is also a fundamental problem in relation to the economic life of our countries. Finally it is a fundamental problem in relation to the national identities of our countries.

But it is precisely because the problem is a fundamental one, Mr President, that it deserves to be studied seriously and with moderation. That is not what has been done, quite the contrary. At the beginning we were faced with an ideological text, generous perhaps, but it looked like a contentious document. The result was what we have seen for several days, not to say several weeks: referrals, discussions, confused debates. That is not to the advantage of migrants, or of our Assembly. I am sorry to say that the work of the committee and of the rapporteur was bad work for migrants and for our Assembly.

(Protest from the left)

Certainly the text has been improved by a majority in the Assembly which revised it. Nevertheless a whole set of measures — civil and civic rights — still remain, which, if they were adopted under the terms set out in the report, would be absolutely unenforceable in our States, because of the mixing of internal and external workers. This is not good work! That is why the whole of my Group will vote, with regret, against the motion for a resolution.

(Applause from the right)

Mrs Dury (S). — *(FR)* People who know me, know very well that I shall vote for Mrs Marinaro's report. I should here like to explain the reasons why.

Let me say that this week I have been afraid. I was afraid because, on the one hand, we remembered those who gave their lives, those who fought to preserve the democratic values on which Europe is built. And I was afraid, because I had the impression that that democratic foundation was showing serious signs of cracking.

I think the Marinaro report goes far beyond the risks to migrant workers. I believe that in voting for the Marinaro report, we are voting for a particular concept of democracy. And I am pleased that the PPE, conservative and liberal groups will without doubt vote for this report and isolate the new right group and their friends, thereby isolating the people who want to use intolerance as a propaganda weapon, who want to make xenophobia an electoral issue and those who want to make racialism the motive for their actions. It is there, as I have said already, the germs of barbarianism are among our ranks and we must fight them.

Today, by voting for the Marinaro report, we are voting for a certain concept of Europe: the Europe of political rights, the Europe of the right to culture, the Europe of tolerance, and, finally, I should like to say Mr President, the Europe of human rights.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — *(NL)* The EVP group will vote for this report because we have always devoted ourselves to the interests of the migrants and we intend to do the same in the future. I therefore wish to protest with all my might against the forces which have attempted to block this report and, if that was not successful, have tried to make this report ridiculous. I agree with Mrs Dury that the groups which vote for this report are in fact voting for democracy and in fact are voting for a place for everyone in this European Community.

(Applause)

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* My political Group will naturally vote for this report. And it will vote for it, even though it is aware that, very probably, there are some sectors where we had not been able to make all the progress that we ought really to have made.

We start from a more general appraisal, which is the only one that can bring us together today. We are accomplishing a deed that is a deep expression — and this has already been said very effectively by the members who have preceded me — of that cultural base that constitutes the greatest patrimony that Europe has

Bonaccini

at its disposal. The only base, that is, capable of resisting the wave of racism and xenophobia that has been unleashed by some sections of our European continent against the emigrants.

It is very important, Mr de la Malène, that we should have been able to meet here, not so much on an ideological basis but as a result of this common base which — I repeat — is the pride of our Continent, and without which it would not be possible even to think of a process of European unification and integration.

I thank both you, Mr President, and the person who preceded you, for the great patience and ability you have shown. I also thank the Committee on Social Affairs for the work it did, even though we might very probably have been able to achieve something more on the subject of police investigations. But, in the end, what prevails is the need for a solidarity that is, at the same time, a recognition of the contribution made by all migrants to the work of the community as a whole.

I hope that the Commission, in the near future, will remember — and this has perhaps on this occasion not been borne sufficiently in mind — that, when working out social measures in the Community, there is an obligation and a commitment to grant wider rights — in particular, civil rights — to emigrants, even those from outside the Community.

(Applause)

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, now that a number of basic amendments have been accepted, which make a clear improvement in the original text, in particular because now a distinction is made between the position of migrants from the European Community and that of migrants from outside the European Community, I shall vote with much pleasure in favour of the Marinaro report.

However well-intentioned it undoubtedly was of the rapporteur to assimilate migrants from the European Community to those from outside the European Community, it is not realistic. Think for example of the administration of social benefits. For non-EC migrants that is only possible in the case of agreements between the Member States and third countries. That is the situation.

I regret that the liberal amendment about education did not get through — an amendment which takes account of bilingualism and the two cultures as an essential instrument for the process of integration but which also emphasizes the importance of knowledge of the language of the host country in the interests of the migrating employee. Now the resolution states that teaching of the mother tongue must be recognized as a graded, compulsory subject on the same footing as other subjects. How are we to carry that out in practice? Teach some ten languages together with the lan-

guage of the host country? Then we shall have a Tower of Babel.

In spite of this flaw I shall however vote with conviction for the Marinaro report.

Mr Elliott (S). — I will, of course, support his report, although I rather regret certain amendments which have been adopted. However, amongst the motions for resolutions taken into account in drawing up this report was one from myself and a number of colleagues which is appended as Annex VII to the Marinaro report. This motion for a resolution was tabled at a rather late stage in the preparation of the report, and I want to draw attention to the fact that there are quite a number of points in it which I do not think have been properly embodied in the report. I hope they will be taken into account at a later stage.

We are all aware that there are people who have tried to frustrate this report in this part-session, but there are those of us who, frankly, feel that it does not go far enough in tackling the disadvantages suffered by ethnic minority groups within the Community. We stress in my motion for a resolution that ethnic minority groups frequently occupy a disadvantaged place in society. They generally suffer higher levels of unemployment and inferior housing. They predominate in the poorer-paid areas of employment, they often experience covert and overt discrimination, they are the subject of harassment by racist elements in the indigenous communities. These things have got to be brought to an end.

In my resolution we called for more positive and integrated action both by the Commission and Parliament, in particular the idea of giving one particular committee an overall coordinating role. I hope that these points which concern us because of our anxiety to do even more to solve the problems of ethnic minorities in Europe will be taken more fully into account.

Meanwhile, I support the Marinaro report because I believe it goes part of the way towards what I want to see achieved.

Mr Stirbois (DR). — *(FR)* Mr President, why the Marinaro report? Why does the left support it unreservedly? The improvement in the standard of living of the workers over the last forty years poses a problem for the Marxists. The ranks of the national proletariat, which used to be presented as the spearhead of the revolution, grow daily thinner. The fiasco of the May 1 demonstrations in France was a revelation in this respect.

How, the leaders of the left ask themselves, are we to retain customers, for whom the impoverishment of the proletariat has always been the main attraction of our business? The resort to immigration is one of the

Stirbois

answers to this question. By importing poverty, by welcoming a foreign proletariat, the class war is kept alive. The communist leaders say that the immigrants must be helped, supported and integrated, because for them this is the new proletariat, which will help them to create revolution. The Communist party has made a strategic choice by preferring a revolution with foreigners tomorrow, rather than protecting our industrial heritage and the interests of our own national workers.

For the socialist leaders the transformation of French society also lies in the engendering, already well-advanced, of a multi-racial, multi-cultural society, leading to immigrants having the right to vote.

In the magazine 'Sans Frontières' — I quote — an immigrant magazine edited by Mejid Daboussi, a friend of Mr Jospin and François Gaspard, who helped draw up a report on the integration of immigrant communities, it says,

(Protests from the left)

'And whether the French want it or not, their future is now cast. *Our future!* It is with the blood of the five million from outside that the old Gallic blood will be revitalised! It is from the great broth of our mixed chromosomes that the next French generations will be born, and the least the French will be able to say for it is, 'Thank you! You are rejuvenating us!'

We have there all the elements of an anti-French, anti-European racism.

Therefore we say *no* to this communist report.

(Vigorous protests from the left)

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — Mr President, my group will vote in favour of the Marinaro report. We agree with the general thrust of the report: it is absolutely correct that the rights of migrants should be established in the Community. I think, however, that a distinction did need to be made between migrants from within the Community and migrants coming from outside. This has indeed been established by the amendment which has been carried.

There are three small points I would like to make. First, we question whether political and civil rights should be given automatically to all immigrants without any qualifications. Equally, we wonder whether it is right to guarantee the families of migrant workers fundamental rights to be reunited without any qualifications. For instance, we suggest that workers should be able to support their families before they come in. Thirdly, we do believe that compulsory teaching in the original language could be more of a burden than a benefit. After all, most young children find it hard enough to assimilate one new language.

Those points having been made, we support the report.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, can I first thank you for according to my two amendments a roll-call vote which I had not asked for. It is a privilege which I appreciate.

I support the motion. Mr Stirbois behind me has, I think, just given many reasons why reasonable people in this House will support the report. It offers a rational and compassionate attitude to people who have come here to live in our midst. I am happy to support that attitude.

I am glad that my amendment which drew a distinction between Community migrants and third-country migrants was passed. It does seem to be rather important in the context of Community law. But I regret that my amendment making a distinction as in Britain, between those, who come for permanent settlement and those who, in many other Member States, only come for a limited period of time was rejected.

With that qualification, Mr President, I am happy to support the report.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* In 1983 I was Parliament's rapporteur on a report on migrant workers and as a quite logical consequence thereof, and of the large majority which supported that report, I am naturally very pleased to vote for the report before us. There has never been any doubt in my mind. I have been deeply disappointed with the way in which some Members of Parliament have tried in the sacred name of democracy to misuse the working methods we have. Do not forget that we are dealing with human destinies! The people we are working for here are people who came to us in Europe at a time when we ourselves asked them to come because we needed them and when we either did not wish to do a job ourselves or did not get enough for doing it.

(Applause from the left)

Are we suddenly to say, because there is an economic recession: Back home with you, we don't need you!? These are human destinies irrespective of colour of skin, culture or religion. It is for us in a democracy to behave like true democrats. There has therefore never been any doubt in my mind that we must of course vote for this report, and do not forget one thing: The Commission has still not acted and that is what we have been asking it to do the whole time. Let us show that we as true democrats are putting pressure on the Commission and getting it to act. That will be a worthwhile outcome, which some have tried to prevent.

(Applause)

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, I would like to welcome this report and say that I shall vote for it. The question of migrants and migrant labour is very important in many countries, and it is particularly important in parts of my own constituency.

I must say I think the report, as it has come to Parliament, has fortunately been improved by many of the amendments, and I do think it should really have been better presented to this Parliament. I feel that the behaviour of one particular group, whatever it might do for them in their forthcoming elections in their own country, has totally ruined their reputation in this House. I would like to suggest that you, as President, and the Bureau of this House should in fact refer to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure the particular way in which this report has been handled, that we should draw the Committee on the Rules of Procedure's attention to the decision which this House took as regards amendments, and that that particular rule should be brought up to date. We should ask the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to see to it that this House does not have to suffer on a serious subject such as this the performance and behaviour which we have had in order to get this decision.

(Applause)

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, the acceptance of this report reflects credit on this Parliament. The acceptance of immigrants in their diversity, the acceptance of the fundamental values can only enrich further our European society. The ideals of freedom, the ideals of solidarity, the religious ideals which embellish Europe find their finest expression this evening. We are one with the third world. All my life I have lived amongst immigrants and shared their lot. They have sent me here even though they had no voting rights. This evening and tomorrow there will be celebrations in the district in which I live. I am proud to endorse this report.

Mr Cervetti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, may I be allowed, at the end of what has been a tiring day for this Parliament, with its continuous voting, to say a word of thanks and make a jocular observation that is for me at the same time a happy one: I have noted that in this Parliament the ranks of my Group are very much enlarged today. Allow me to joke about this matter — having regard, of course, to the speeches made by some members — and to thank everyone for this act of generosity. I should also like to thank you for what you have done.

Mr Le Chevallier (DR). — *(FR)* Mr President, colleagues, we are coming to the end of this drama of the disastrous Marinaro communist report.

I am surprised that when it was referred to the legal committee for an opinion, the committee did not see

fit to give a reasoned opinion on the report which affects the very principles of Community law. The communist Marinaro report does in fact violate the letter and the spirit of the Treaty of the Community, in particular Articles 48 and 52, which provide, expressly, that the provisions of the Treaty of Rome apply only to migrant Community workers.

At this point I should like to reply to a remark which was made to the effect that the compromise amendment which has been voted could satisfy some people. It is in fact a Tartuffe-style amendment. The wording has been changed so as to give exactly the same rights to Community and extra-Community migrants. To try and extend this legislation to extra-Community immigrants is to commit a misapplication of the law which could be penalised by the Court of Justice.

The procedure which followed was not the result of capriciousness on the part of our Group, whatever you may think. The object of that procedure was simply to ring an alarm, to give every member an opportunity to study carefully Mrs Marinaro's motion for a resolution, to uncover the traps in it and the danger to our European Community.

You will therefore, colleagues, show your opinion of this report, in full knowledge of the facts. By voting in favour of this report, you will be placing in the hands of your government a work of reference which will allow them gradually to convince public opinion in their countries of the validity of this multi-cultural, multi-confessional society for which Mrs Marinaro is calling.

We have the example of Lebanon in front of us to demonstrate the failure and the gravity of such an enterprise. To open up our frontiers to these foreign populations and to act as though we are forgetting their extraordinary demographic expansion, populations eroded by war and attracted by our saving States, is to vitiate our ability to welcome and offer asylum to genuine political refugees, victims of Soviet totalitarianism.

Colleagues if we yield to the communist minority in this Parliament today, we shall be yielding to all kinds of blackmail tomorrow. Colleagues, we must put a stop today to the subversive intrigues of communism, to the decay and dissolution of Europe, which yesterday was praised here . . .

(Protests from the left)

here, by Mr Reagan himself, European Europe, which we love.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Mallet (PPE). — *(FR)* I wish to make an explanation of vote in order to say quite simply that a number

Mallet

of members of the PPE Group regrettably feel that in all conscience they cannot vote for this report.

We approve the generous spirit of it. We are hostile to all forms of racialism and xenophobia. We are mindful of the social and human problems of migrant workers, but the report as tabled today remains confused, because there is not a sufficiently clear distinction between Community and non-Community workers. There are also some provisions which we cannot accept. Namely the right to vote of non-Community workers.

Therefore by rejecting the blend . . .

President. — Mr Mallet, you have exceeded your speaking time.

Mr Welsh (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — I do not intend to make any comment on the political content of the Marinaro report. People are perfectly capable of doing it for themselves. As always, I shall follow the line of my group.

I would however like to make two points. The first is that, as you will be aware, Mr President, Parliament did pass an amendment to the draft resolution for the Council to adopt, which seeks to bind the Council to adopt the Commission's short-term programme. No Commissioner is present, so we cannot use Rule 36, but I take the absence of the Commission to mean that they accept Parliament's resolution and that it will be duly incorporated in the document that goes to the Council.

Secondly, I would like to make a point to our colleagues on the European right. Whatever one's view of these things, it is a great pity that none of their members felt able to participate in the debates in the committee and none of the amendments that we have voted on today were placed before the committee to discuss. Had that been possible, then perhaps we would not be in the embarrassing position where one group feels that its rights have been ignored. I hope that in future, if they hold these passionate views, they will at least come to the committee which is the proper place to express them.

I also very much regret that it was found necessary by a minority of Members to hold the House in ransom in this way, and I think it reflects great credit on the Members of the House that they were not blackmailed into giving up. I think that says a lot for our democracy and I hope that our colleagues will join it.

(Applause)

Finally, if I may, Mr President, I would like to say a word about the rapporteur. Mrs Marinaro and I have

vastly different views and her original text is not one I personally would have written. But with that I must say that she has conducted herself with great dignity and restraint on a matter about which she feels very passionately indeed, and I think the committee owes her a debt for the way in which she has presented this report, and I think it reflects great credit on her cause.

(Applause)

Mrs De March (COM), in writing. — *(FR)* When confronted with the discrimination faced by 17 million migrant workers in the Community, confronted with the revival of racialism and xenophobia, and with the attacks suffered by workers, and more especially migrant workers, on their rights and living conditions, the representatives of the right — liberals in Mr Le Pen's group — chose discrimination and reactionarism, as their numerous amendments prove.

Conversely, by fighting against the crisis and unemployment and for the economic recovery which brings progress, the French Communists and Allies are remembering that these workers help to create the wealth of our countries: economic, and also cultural, wealth. Because of that they and their families should enjoy the same rights and obligations as national citizens. We therefore think that they should now also be given the right to vote in local elections, and that there should be no discrimination between workers originating in the EEC and workers originating in third countries.

The report of comrade F. Marinaro is the concrete expression of the struggle to which we are committed within the European Parliament in favour of new dignity for migrant workers and of resolutely fighting against the scourge of racialism. Although we dislike the discrimination between European and non-European migrants which has been introduced by a Conservative amendment, we shall vote for the report of our comrade F. Marinaro.

Mr Galland (L), in writing. — *(FR)* I shall vote against this report in spite of the improvements which have been made to it by some amendments.

Despite them a number of the proposals contained in the report are still dangerous or ambiguous.

For example the wording of the third indent of paragraph 3b implies that it is desirable for migrant workers from outside the Community to be able to vote at communal and regional level.

In my view giving the right to vote to migrant workers in a country like France would be a grave mistake and likely to promote racialism.

Galland

That is why I shall vote against the Marinaro report.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

Report (Doc A 2-21/85) by Mr Mühlen, on behalf of the Committee for Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy on the production and supply of iron ore in the Community.

Explanation of vote

Mr Würtz (COM), in writing. — (FR) Mr Mühlen's resolution as tabled is set against the perspective of iron-ore mining. It ignores the perspective of a steel mill, which could nevertheless satisfy the requirements of the countries of the Community. The report granted a reprieve to a small number of mines in Lorraine — even that has disappeared in the resolution laid before us! It goes without saying that the French Communist and Allies cannot approve such an approach. For our part we are firmly committed to that fundamental principle of the Treaty of Rome, without which there is no European policy worthy of the name: Community preference.

The question is therefore this: does the Community need iron ore mines? The answer is yes. Should those mines be given aid for modernisation, for retraining miners, diversifying industrial activity in mining areas? Yes. European funds ought to be devoted to objectives which expand production and create skilled jobs. That unfortunately is not what this resolution is proposing. Under these circumstances we shall vote against this report.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)²

(The sitting was suspended at 8.10 p.m. and resumed at 9.10 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

5. *Mediterranean countries (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on relations between the EEC and the

Mediterranean countries (Doc. A2-24/85 and A2-27/85)¹.

Mr Papoutsis (S). — (GR) Mr President, the accession of Spain and Portugal to the European Community offers undoubted advantages, both for the two countries and for the Community itself. However, it will certainly have negative consequences for many Mediterranean countries with which the Community maintains traditional links, both economic and political in nature. The concern of our Mediterranean partners, expressed at every opportunity, is focussed mainly on the undesirable consequences that enlargement will bring in the sector of their trade and economic transactions with the Community.

We all know that the existing preferential agreements with the Mediterranean countries did not bring beneficial results to the economy of those countries. That is in fact confirmed by the official statistics relating to the EEC/Mediterranean countries sector of the trade balance. Besides, in a related report the Commission itself stresses that the way in which the Community's Mediterranean policy was applied deviated from its own aims, and did not achieve the results envisaged. That is because to face up to the world-wide economic crisis, the Community implemented a defensive policy in all directions, by restricting its imports from third countries to some extent.

It should however be pointed out that in recent years the Community has been the basic receiver of exports from those countries. At the same time, it adhered scrupulously to the various finance protocols. In this way it stood as a prop for the economies of many Mediterranean countries, at the same time giving guarantees that the countries in question could continue to exercise their own independent policies.

We have heard our colleague Mr Galluzzi developing his report. I think he referred quite clearly to the initiatives that must be taken to ensure that the enlarged Community will work well as a new entity that creates new conditions and makes new efforts in the economic and trade sectors, while preserving unscathed the complex of traditional links that link it to the Mediterranean countries.

Those initiatives that the Community must undertake, should in no case threaten the interests of the Community's Mediterranean countries, because this would constitute a serious departure from the principle of the Community's philosophy on converging the economies of the Member States. The spirit that should govern the Community's new Mediterranean policies, should not be confined to mere troubleshooting. It should be directed towards supporting the productive structures in those countries in a rational way, to promote their autonomous economic development.

Within this framework an essential and direct way to deal with the painful consequences of enlargement is to determine a substantial increase in the appropri-

¹ The rapporteur spoke:

— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 4 to 6, 85, 86, 88 to 92, 95 to 97, 100, 103, 123, 124/rev., 126, 133, 135, 139, 145, 149, 153, 156 and 162, and

— AGAINST Amendments Nos 7 to 15, 19, 23 to 29, 34, 45, 51, 57, 58, 66, 80 to 84, 101, 105, 110, 116 to 118 and 129.

² The rapporteur spoke AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 3.

¹ See previous day's debates.

Papoutsis

tions available for the financing protocols, and in parallel to carry out a restructuring of the CAP. In that way we will establish a more profound cooperation with the Mediterranean countries, while restricting the negative consequences of enlargement both within the Community and outside it.

On this point I should like to stress that we completely agree with the idea of establishing a permanent institutional body of parliamentary character between the EEC and the Mediterranean countries, exactly like the existing EEC-ACP counterpart.

It should also be stressed that the immediate implementation of the IMP's would contribute decisively to supporting the South, and that would stabilise the fluctuations in the balance of trade between the EEC and the Mediterranean countries.

Mr President, it was not my intention to make specific reference to any one of those countries. However, I think I have a duty to refer specifically to the Republic of Cyprus. The recent unilateral initiatives by Mr Denktash for a referendum on the constitution of the so-called 'Turkish-Cypriot State' give rise to a new unacceptable situation. Disregarding the fact that there is already full international condemnation for these initiatives, it is appropriate that we should restate our position. When the European Community refers to its relations with Cyprus, it means the one and only Republic of Cyprus.

I believe, therefore, that the EEC-Cyprus agreement assumes a different dimension if we bear in mind the importance for the Community of restoring political stability not only in Cyprus, but throughout the eastern part of the Mediterranean basin.

Following these comments it is clear that the Galluzzi report is an important contribution to the Community's effort to restrict the problems created by enlargement in our relations with the Mediterranean countries. And in that spirit we shall vote in favour of it.

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, Western Europe has traditionally regarded the Mediterranean as a European sea of its own — *mare nostrum*. The Roman Empire worked on those lines, colonialistic Western Europe worked on those lines and German, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese fascism likewise penetrated deeply into Africa. The Mediterranean today is more than ever a polluted sea, not only because of the dumping and draining of poison and filth, but politically, economically and socially it is a polluted sea.

The Cassanmagnano Cerretti report and practically the whole of this Parliament express themselves as surprised and disturbed that the Maghreb and Mashreq programmes will not succeed. Why surprised and disturbed? Is it so as not to need to recognize and name

the causes? Because free market enriches the rich and impoverishes the poor? But development aid often kills. But that has traditionally been the European idea. Development co-operation cannot alter that. High investment, Mr Commissioner Cheysson said yesterday. We know why: for the profits of European firms.

The times of the Algerian war and the Suez crisis are over, but the bad relations between the EC area and the regions of North Africa and the Middle East have since become worse. In Tunisia food price riots have been put down by force. The régime wishes for export currency instead of a population which needs to eat. In Egypt the same food shortage threatens. In Morocco the Hassan régime rules, which makes thousands of Moroccans seek, far from home, regions in the EC countries in which they are not welcome. The Polisario desert liberation movement is supported and recognized within the EC only by individual action groups and parties. The EC is having to restrain itself tremendously in order not to declare Turkey prematurely a democracy. The EC countries are happy to trade with the Middle East. The oil from the Arabian States continues to keep EC machines turning. In exchange enormous status projects are being constructed over there.

The civil wars and State wars in those regions are kept going daily above all by European trade in armaments. Without them Iraq and Iran would have to stop their war tomorrow, and so would the warring parties in Lebanon. If you say: there are at least as many Soviet arms there — yes, they will only disappear if the Western arms disappear. The Middle East and the North African region are both geopolitically of strategic importance in the cold war. Therein lies the heart of historical relationships and problems. The Maghreb and Mashreq regions are situated in the southern back garden of the EC superpower. Hence the Pershing IIs at Comiso in Sicily, which stand aimed at the broad horizon of the Middle East and North Africa. Is it a matter for surprise then that Israel has nuclear arms against those Pershings too? And that Libya wants them? The EC and NATO are hand in glove, they are the economic, political and military organization of ever-greedy Western Europe. The Mediterranean is being increasingly incorporated in them.

These views, I know, are scarcely ever expressed in this Parliament. They are like a taboo, they sound like a curse. For that reason people exhaust themselves in praise and boasting about the extension of the EC and the coming of the European Union.

Fortunately, Mr President, many citizens in Western Europe do not approve that at all. They wish to forestall the dangers in 1985 before it is again too late.

Mr Filinis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, on behalf of the Greek Communist Party of the interior I should like to express our particular satisfaction at the final

Filinis

agreement on Spain and Portugal's accession to the Community, which enlarges the latter in the Mediterranean area and is an important step towards the unification of Europe.

We agree with the content of the relevant reports, and especially that of our colleague Mr Galluzzi on this matter. We think it desirable to develop economic and trade relations between the EEC and the Mediterranean countries. However, we also believe that this can only be to the benefit of all the Mediterranean countries, both inside and outside the Community, provided that enlargement is accompanied by an increase in the Community's resources, and especially by a substantial start in the implementation of the IMP's. Thus, it is essential that appropriate and adequate appropriations should be recorded in the budget, and that truly integrated and coordinated activities should be promoted.

We also hope that along those lines more general contributions can be made by agreements related to the three institutional bodies of the Community, and by the adjustment mentioned in the special majority system for the way that Council reaches its decisions.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

6. *World Conference in Nairobi*

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate by Mrs Lentz, on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights, to the Commission (Doc B 2-182/85) and to the Council (Doc B 2-183/85), on the Nairobi World Conference in July 1985 ending the Decade for Women.

Mrs Lentz (PPE). — (*DE*) Mr President, we want to put this question to the Commission this evening, and at a given moment next month we will also get an answer from the Council. In July 1985, thousands of women, especially the delegations of the governments of the UN member states, will assemble in Nairobi to take stock of what has happened in the past Decade for Women. A delegation from the European Parliament will also be there, represented by members of the Council, the Commission and the European Parliament. The Committee on Women's Rights has repeatedly requested information on the attitude the EEC delegation will adopt at that conference.

In two major resolutions from the last legislature, the European Parliament, in addition to analysing the situation of women and demanding improvements, also called for improvement in the situation of women in the field of EEC development policy and in the con-

text of aid measures for countries which do not come under the Lomé Convention. To date we have not received a satisfactory answer to all this and there is very little time left before Nairobi. Our committee warmly welcomes the fact that a working party is now examining this question in the framework of the ACP — European Parliament Assembly, and has already succeeded in presenting a resolution. We endorse its objectives, for a number of our members are also active on that committee.

What we now want to hear from the EEC institutions — and from the Council tonight — is their critical assessment both of what has and what has *not* been achieved, to which we have often referred in this House. We would like a differentiated opinion and would hope that the Member States will also make a critical assessment. I do not want to go into the details now. They have been referred to often enough and are clear from the resolution. For European women, the accent lies on problems engendered by the new technological revolution. Against the background of persistent and disproportionately high women's unemployment, the issue here is equal access to training and education, to the labour market, to social security and other concomitant fields — but all this looked at from the aspect of the need to combine working and family life in a spirit of partnership.

Equal rights has always been one of those factors that has secured the peace and thus also the freedoms in our Community. In our view, equal rights for men and women means a change of mentality, reducing social tensions, preventing injustice and eliminating one-sided discrimination. Only if they have equal rights can men and women ensure the survival of our free democracies. That is why we call for an equal say in all decision-making centres, at all levels of society. The high number of women Members here in the European Parliament, which is a good thing for Europe and for the world, has already made such co-involvement and co-responsibility possible to a large extent — especially in committee work. We women are trying to do justice to this responsibility.

We would also like the Commission to give an answer about strategies for the future and, we beg it, not just to repeat the familiar old words. Hence our second request for a critical assessment of the current situation and for an answer to our question about the attitude the EEC institutions will adopt and to our request for more involvement of women in development policy. People do not build machines without consulting engineers. People object to quacks without medical qualifications. Yet for projects which benefit the people — the poorest of the poor, families who fear for their livelihood and daily bread, which they often have to struggle for in a subsistence economy — we do not have the engineers of daily life, that is, the women, who often have to hold the family together by themselves.

Lenz

Of course we cannot prescribe their conduct to our partners in the Third World unless we ourselves set an example and employ women where they are needed.

I am not talking about well-meaning and idealistic aid projects or of medium- and long-term agricultural projects, cooperative arrangements, craft centres, training and health measures. At times the costly execution of prestige projects reminds me of the suffering of housewives in housing projects built by very talented but very impractical men: kitchen on the hot south side, bathroom and children's room on the cold north side, as small as possible, no working space for the housewife — except for the kitchen — but certainly a den *cum* hobby corner for the master of the house, who works outside and not in the house anyway. So we want definite information about current and future strategies to cut down on idiotic projects and increase the sensible consultation of and participation by women, in the case of food and disaster aid too. Isolated projects may at best give evidence of goodwill, but not of planning.

Let me talk about a third area, much more crucial for the EEC, which as we know is made up of highly civilised and industrialised societies and above all of highly democratized institutions. Once again I am referring to women's rights of political participation at all levels of the decision-making centres. It is great to talk about positive action — demonstration models are far more efficient. That applies at the political and administrative level as much as at the important level of the media and information.

Secondly, we must take stronger action in the difficult field of human rights. Here too we should have the courage to define our concept of freedom of movement, of access to information, the exercise of religious freedom, without regard to race or sex, to mention only a few areas, for if they are misused for the purpose of maintaining power-political structures this causes endless suffering, which once again often hits women and children hardest. We therefore also oppose any misuse of the World Conference of Women for ideological purposes. The fate of one half of humanity surely deserves its own conference. We therefore also support all common action by the European Community at that conference and hope it will have positive effects for the next decade. The year 2000 will without a doubt force us to take stock.

Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, the Nairobi World Conference represents the keystone and the final culmination of the efforts made worldwide over the last ten years in the field of equal rights for men and women.

The Commission is also preparing the Community contribution to the Conference. It will shortly submit a communication to the Council; that communication will, of course, also be sent to the European Parliament.

For the Community the Nairobi Conference is primarily an opportunity to make a critical, and I am sure an overall positive, appraisal. In spite of all the problems still outstanding the Community really has nothing to fear from international comparisons.

Over the last decade, in fact, considerable progress has been made in the Member States of the Community, especially on the basis of European initiatives. This is true of the legal aspects as well as of the effective implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women.

A substantial part of these results is due to the action of this Parliament. That is why I am happy to use the opportunity given me to thank you for the critical support and the benevolent support which you have given the Commission in the past.

Nairobi will probably offer a further opportunity to continue our joint efforts, and the Commission hopes that three members of Parliament will take part in the Conference as members of the Community delegation.

As I have told you, the Commission's position is being worked out now and you will have it shortly. Therefore is replying to the question which has been put I shall confine myself to a few essential points.

Firstly, we shall endeavour to present a provisional appraisal of the 1982-1985 Community action programme for the promotion of equal opportunities for women. The detailed final report will probably be completed at the end of the year. We intend to provide in it information about the measures relating to equal treatment implemented by the Community and the Member States during the last four years.

Then, we shall endeavour to present the initial outlines of a new medium term action programme. As the Commission announced in its programme of work some time ago, it intends to continue, deepen and develop action being taken at present. In this context the Commission will essentially devote its efforts to the following areas: to monitor the practical application of current directives and of directives not yet adopted by the Council, and to fill in gaps in the legal structure; to encourage concrete measures to promote equality of opportunity in practice, especially in accordance with the Council recommendation of December 1984 on the promotion of positive action in favour of women; finally, to take concrete action to change social attitudes, particularly within the framework of education and the training of young people.

The final version of the programme will also take into account the results of the Nairobi World Conference. With this in mind the Commission will introduce into the discussion its ideas on future oriented measures designed to further the situation of women in the year 2000. We are convinced that more effort is needed on an international scale in order to achieve equality of

Mosar

opportunity and we are determined to make our contribution to it.

The Community position will probably primarily reflect the theme of equality of opportunity for women at work and in society, but it will also tackle the problems peculiar to women in developing countries. In these fields too considerable efforts have been made on a Community scale during the last ten years.

I shall only mention briefly the Council conclusions adopted in November 1982, which emphasise the important role of women in the developing countries.

I refer to the two seminars on that theme, organised by the Commission in 1984 at Lomé and Nairobi. Representatives of various African countries took part. I should like to mention in particular the Third Lomé convention of December 1984 which, in Article 123, expressly underlines the need to try to raise the status of woman's work and to pay particular attention to access for women to all aspects of training.

To sum up in conclusion, I wish to say that the Commission is firmly resolved to make a positive contribution to guarantee the success of the Nairobi World Conference. In the event it will clearly be necessary to take into account the general atmosphere and the political framework of the Conference. It is therefore particularly important that the Community position be set out carefully.

President. — In her speech Mrs Lenz expressed regret that the Council was absent. May I say that the President-in-Office of the Council stayed in the Chamber yesterday evening to answer this particular question but was unable to be present tonight. I understand that the Council's answer to the question has actually been distributed in writing.

May I also say that I have received from Mrs Lenz and others, on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights, a motion for resolution (Doc B 2-252/85) with a request for an early vote to wind up the debate on the oral question. The vote on the request for an early vote will be taken at the end of the debate.

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, I would probably not have put this question earlier if I had received a written reply from the Council. But I have seen no document of the kind, nor anything of the kind among other colleagues. We actually intend to put this question in the form of an oral question. At present I can merely state this for the record.

President. — Mrs Lenz, the information available to me here in the Chair is that the answer is being issued. This, I think, means that it will not be available until the next session. That bears out what you have said. My information was not quite accurate.

Mrs Gadioux (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies, gentlemen, colleagues, the Nairobi World conference, which has been organised by UNO for the end of the Decade for Women in July is to assess the progress made and the difficulties encountered in achieving the objectives set by the world action programme at the Mexico conference in 1975 and by the action programme of the Copenhagen conference in 1980. The members of conference will also lay down strategies for the period up to 2000. The objectives — equality, development and peace — with the subsidiary topics of employment, health and education will provide a basic framework.

What conclusions can one draw as regards the work carried out during those ten years? I have been very aware of what has been achieved in the field of equality. In this respect the Decade essentially acted as a catalyst to the adoption of legal reforms affecting the status of women in society and equality before the law. The equality of rights as between men and women is almost universally recognised by the States, which nearly all have adequate legislation.

It now remains for these laws to be applied and made a part of everyday reality, because we have to ensure that *de jure* equality is also *de facto* equality. Although we can congratulate ourselves on the establishment of organisations for that purpose in the Member States of the EEC and in some other countries, it is unfortunately not the case everywhere.

In my view this process faces two major obstacles: mental attitudes and a lack of information. Sexual stereotypes in individual behaviour are persistent and difficult to eliminate. In this respect it is very important that they be eliminated from school text books, and teachers play a fundamental role in this area.

In the same way, information is very inadequate, even non-existent, so leaving women in ignorance of the rights to which they are legally entitled, and a special effort must be made in this direction in the years to come. A right which is not known to exist, or which is insufficiently known, is a useless right. Rights information programmes should be set up in as many States as possible.

To my mind the contents of the programmes put out by the media are of particular importance. Not only must they pass on information, and make the public aware of this topic, they must also carry an image of women which is devoid of sexual stereotypes and any degrading connotations, so that the multidimensional aspect comes to the fore. It is desirable for women to occupy positions of responsibility at the highest levels in the media, so that they can take decisions on programmes.

The Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, which calls for equality of rights for women in the political, economic, social and

Gadioux

cultural sphere, is a major achievement. For my part I am delighted that an increasing number of States are parties to this Convention. A report on the obstacles encountered in applying it should also be drawn up at the Conference to clarify this point for us.

We must be very watchful and insist on the elimination of existing discrimination in legislation on the status of women as regards the right to choose a husband, matrimonial law, the disposal of property, custody of children, freedom of movement, nationality, inheritance. In the same way, it is our duty to invite all the States to ratify the ILO conventions on workers with family responsibilities.

Development is another of the great objectives of this decade. By development we mean development as a whole, including economic, social, political and cultural spheres, as well as all other aspects of human experience. The research into the role of women in development, which has been carried out during the decade, has shown that not all women have received the same benefit. It also showed that women have always played a part in development, often without remuneration, and that that contribution has not always been recognised. In this respect it cannot be said often enough that women must not just benefit from development, they should also be agents of it, and that this idea must embrace not only the implementation of proposed programmes, but also the drafting of them. They must be fully responsible for and benefit fully from the benefits which society derives from change.

A true development policy must aim to satisfy the basic needs for food, housing, health care, accompanied by family planning, literacy programmes, education and vocational training. They must also be closely linked to the planning and introduction of rural development.

In this respect, the resolution of 7 February 1985 on the requirements and results of the ACP/EEC Joint Committee at Bujumbura is of particular importance.

On the question of employment, statistics show that women at work in the world account for 35% of the working population. That is much more than ten years ago, but the exercise of their rights in this sphere is very unequal in large areas of the world. It must be ensured that they are treated fairly and that they enjoy benefits and guarantees such as decent wages, working conditions which are acceptable from the point of view of hygiene and safety, the right to join trades unions, social security, access to communal facilities.

The problem of access to employment is a major problem and is linked both to the education of women and to economic outlets. For many States overall growth in the future will be lower than in the years 1960 to 1980. Everything possible must be done therefore to ensure that women cease to be the first victims of the econo-

mic crisis and that specific measures are taken in their favour and that those measures are applied.

The theme of peace is also extremely important. Documents relating to the problems of refugee women and displaced women will be studied at Nairobi. How should it be possible not to think also of the women who are victims of apartheid, a system which goes against the fundamental rights of the person and which makes victims especially of women separated from their husbands or companions, when the latter have to go and work in the regions reserved for a certain category of the South African population. The continued existence of this system of inequality is a violation of the most fundamental rights.

In conclusion, we must be vigilant at Nairobi and do everything to prevent the World Conference from being deflected from its aims. In effect, discussion of world problems must not be allowed to eclipse examination of women's particular problems. If State representatives limited themselves to reaffirming their international positions, conflicts would still not be resolved. On the other hand the hopes of women would crumble if they had to watch the disappearance of the fight against the specific forms of discrimination to which they are still subject.

(Applause)

Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to call attention to an amendment tabled by our group, which we should also like to bring to the notice of the Commission.

With this amendment we wish to call attention to an aspect which, it is true, arose from the women's liberation movement but which of recent years is often forgotten or misunderstood by that movement. It concerns the economic value of domestic work. When under the influence of the Women's Year 1975 and the accompanying activities a start was made in eliminating the flagrant instances of discrimination with regard to women, we grasped this obvious truth in order to reinforce our position. In the case of the changes to the law on dowries for example and the right of succession of the surviving spouse there was much opposition on the part of husbands whose wives wholly or partially ran the household. These men thought that the one who brought the money in should be entitled to control it. Only by showing that the money brought in by husband or wife is equally earned by the partner assuming other tasks within the family did we encounter more understanding and finally secured equality in the legislation. A UNO study which claimed that domestic output constituted 40% of the GNP provided further support for this view. More and more women have meanwhile taken up duty in economic, social, cultural and political life, but this by no means diminishes the economic value of domestic work, by whoever it is performed.

De Backer-Van Ocken

If this concept is valid for the Western world it applies with still greater force to the developing countries, where women's domestic work is difficult to distinguish from their economic contribution to agriculture and other sectors and where it is the women themselves who assume enormous duties in these areas. These duties must be assessed positively. We say with great emphasis that we demand for all women anywhere in the world the right and the opportunity to play a similar rôle to men in all sectors of society, but we stress too that domestic work must be evaluated at its true worth, whoever performs it and whatever the form of society and whatever the form of household in which it is performed.

This is naturally only one aspect, Mr President, but we have still considerable time before the Nairobi conference and we hope that the Commission will use this time to meet the wishes expressed here and that before July next a firm strategy will be worked out.

Mrs Daly (ED). — Mr President, firstly, let me say that my group supports in general the policies outlined in the resolution submitted by Mrs Lenz, on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights. Miss Brookes, our Member for North Wales, has asked me to mention particularly, as she is not here this evening, the situation of women in rural areas. She comes from an area like this in Wales.

A recent survey in Wales has shown that about 60% of all working women tend to occupy part-time jobs. This sort of work is scarce in the rural parts of the country, so we would like the Commission to take all the action that they possibly can to encourage people to promote part-time work in rural areas throughout the Community.

Turning to other points in the resolution, when the members of the Committee on Women's Rights were in Rome recently, the representative from the Council asked us to talk to our Ministers about the outstanding directives. I do want to assure the representative of the Council, if he reads this debate, that we in our group have, in fact, sought a meeting with our Minister to find out what is happening to the outstanding directives which particularly affect women, i.e. those mentioned in paragraph 12 of Mrs Lenz's resolution.

Our group feels very strongly about the need for the Commission to employ all available means, in particular the mass media and other cultural and information networks, to help bring about a change in attitudes to women's role in our society in regard to their importance in the family, where they fully share with men the responsibility for creating a more humane society.

The main point I want to turn to is that of the position of women in developing countries. My group will support any measures the Commission takes which aim to

speed up the achievement of women's full and equal participation in economic and social development in the developing countries. We do stress the economic importance of the work done by women in all domains.

We are particularly concerned about paragraph 31 of Mrs Lenz's resolution, which was, in fact an amendment from our group. We believe that population control is very important indeed in the developing countries. The fact that it is a sensitive issue does not mean that we should shy away from it. The truth is that the global population growth in the last ten years has declined from 2.03% to 1.67% per year. In the next decade, the growth-rate will decline more slowly. However, the annual increase in numbers is expected to continue and may reach 90 million by the year 2000, and 90% of that increase will occur in developing countries. In 10 years time, 6.1 billion people are expected to inhabit the earth.

Demographic differences between developed and developing countries remain striking. The average expectation of life at birth, which has increased almost everywhere, is 73 years in developed countries, while in developing countries it is only 57 years. Families in developing countries tend to be much larger than elsewhere. This gives cause for concern, since social and population pressures may contribute to the continuation of the wide disparity in welfare and quality of life between developing and developed countries. In the past decade, population issues have been increasingly recognized as a fundamental element in development planning. To be realistic, development policies, plans and programmes must reflect the inextricable links between population resources, environment and development.

Although considerable progress has been made, millions of people in developing countries still lack access to safe and effective family planning methods. By the year 2000, some 1.6 billion women will be of child-bearing age, 1.3 billion of them in developing countries. We believe that major efforts must be made now to ensure that all couples and individuals can exercise their basic human right to decide freely, responsibly and without coercion the number and spacing of their children and that they should have the information, education and means to do so.

(Applause)

Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is very regrettable that the Council is not here to answer our questions, because, in particular, it would have interested us to know what attitude the Community will adopt at Nairobi on fundamental issues.

Will the Community present itself in Nairobi strengthened by the approval of the directives, which are still

Cinciari Rodano

pending before the Council, regarding equality — which is referred to in the motion for a resolution proposed by Mrs Lenz on the subject of employment, social security, dependent female workers, parental leave, part-time working, and the reduction and reorganization of working time?

What concrete measures will there be for tackling the serious problem of women's unemployment, especially unemployment among girls?

Finally, what action is it proposed to take as part of the Community's policy for cooperation and development, both within the framework of Lomé and within the framework of cooperation with non-associated countries?

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize the need for joint, coordinated action by the Member States of the Community, where the questions that will be discussed at the Nairobi World Conference are concerned — joint, coordinated action which has been lacking in the preparatory meetings.

Mrs Lemass (RDE). — Mr President, while we review the United Nations Decade for Women which is drawing to an end, and recognize that the Community has created a number of legal instruments for the defence of women's rights and made progress towards equality of opportunity between men and women, we must regret that at national level our performance does not match the ambitions of our EEC institutions.

The directives are there, but they now have to be completely implemented and applied correctly in all the Member States. For example, legislation has been drafted in Ireland relating to provisions of the 1978 directive on equal treatment for men and women in matters of social security. The bill has not yet been discussed by the Irish Parliament, and I call for the implementation of this legislation without delay.

There is little doubt that against the background of the present economic recession the position of women, and particularly working women, in Europe, is not good. For the future, we must strive to achieve true equality, not only in the workplace, but in social security, where discrimination between men and women is still widespread.

We must also give due recognition to the important role of the women in the home. The greatest obstacles lie in the current attitudes concerning the role of men and women in society. Those obstacles must be eliminated.

As far as the position of women in the developing countries is concerned, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the European Community must bear a great responsibility for the future of

women in those developing countries. Progress has been made in the texts of Lomé III referring explicitly to women. Cooperation shall support the ACP States' efforts aimed at enhancing the work of women, improving their living conditions and expanding their role, etc. Progress in the texts must be followed by progress in the facts, and I insist on the fact that the European Community has responsibilities in the evolution of the situation.

Could I end by making the comment that I think it is a great pity that more members of the Women's Committee are not in a position to attend this conference in Nairobi.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — (NL) Mr President, the UNO conference to conclude the Decade for Women is to take place in a developing country. That is one reason more for us to place the main accent on the theme 'Women and Development'. We are supported in that by, amongst others, the working party set up within the Joint Committee between the Lomé countries and this Parliament, a resolution of which was accepted at Bujumbura. I hope therefore that in the package which is to define our position and that of the governments of the Member States, this resolution of Bujumbura will be included. The resolution in fact arose from an equivalent joint discussion between representatives of women from both the developing countries and the Member States of the EEC.

We must not forget that 80% of the women in the developing countries live in the rural areas. As Mrs Daly has already emphasized, that is often a group of women of whom one does not immediately think. Even if we do not include China there are 700 million women living in rural areas. We have not counted the women from the rural areas who are attracted by the mirage of the towns or the women who suddenly become head of a one-parent family because their husbands have followed the same mirage of the towns.

A West African poetess has written: 'I am the basket in which the ground-nuts are carried and after the nuts are eaten the basket is thrown away'. That is a picture in which Western women may also appear.

Woman in the Third World produces, processes what she has produced, transports and sells it and is an economic agent. 60 to 80% of agriculture is in her hands. But there is no economic relationship between her work and the fruits of her work. Her work has a useful value and no exchange value expressed in wages. In the country she works in her family's field and in her husband's field and in her own field. She processes the food crops but also other products. She husks and she spins cotton, she makes soap, she takes part in craft activities such as basket-making, pottery, weaving and dyeing, she carries the harvest from the field to the granary without any means of transport, on her back, she drags goods for sale to the market

Van Hemeldonck

and she carries water and firewood supplies every day. At the market she sells the processed products such as rice, cotton, agricultural products from her own field and the fish caught by the men and dried by the men or the women. If agricultural work is modernized, often only this happens: that the cash crops for sale and export are transferred into the hands of the men. The training programmes, the redistribution of land, the credits for land-purchase, mechanization and finally money-wages go solely to men. Meanwhile the women continue to produce the food for the family without the economic value of their work being recognized. Naturally it is absurd to attach to this kind of slavery the Western label 'Woman by the hearth'. There are examples. . .

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

Mr President, I thought I had four minutes plus a number of minutes in addition because other speakers from my group are not going to speak?

President. — No, that is not correct. I have no other speakers from your group on the list and I have other speakers coming up on other questions. You have four minutes, Mrs Van Hemeldonck, and there is no bonus!

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — *(NL)* In that case, Mr President, I shall stop here because I have a sense of discipline. In any case I would recommend this Parliament to support the resolution which was accepted in Bujumbura by the Joint Committee.

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I would be extremely grateful to the Commission if it went into the questions we are putting rather more specifically in the document it is working on. We put plain questions about a strategy for the future. All I have heard in the answers so far is facts already familiar to us.

We called for this document a long time ago. So we are not just a bit but very disappointed not to have received it yet. May I at the same time inform the Council, by putting it on record, so to speak, that we are specifically asking about strategies for the future, both as regards European women and as regards women in the developing world. We have not received an answer to these questions.

President. — The debate is closed.

I put to the vote the request for an early vote.

Mrs Dury (S). — *(FR)* The President did not seem to hear the voting bell. Certain colleagues, who would perhaps wish to vote, are not in the hemicycle at present.

President. — Maybe, I was more alert Mrs Dury; I had heard the bell, and in fact it has been rung again. In any event I do not think that at this hour of the night it is going to cause a stampede.

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, on a point of order. I have the impression, and some of the group chairmen may have thought so too, that there would not be any more votes at all tonight, so that many of my colleagues have made corresponding arrangements. At least that is what was said in some groups. Is it consistent with the agenda for a vote to be held now, immediately after this question?

President. — It is standard practice not to have a vote at this hour of the night, but in deference to yourself — and I am the only poor unfortunate male chairman here; everybody else has been having a bash at the males here since this afternoon — I must point out that you yourself requested an early vote and it is pretty much a formality to have this done. I am now going to put the request to a vote.

(Parliament approved the request for an early vote)

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

7. Social Fund

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (Doc B 2-287/85) by Mr Arndt on behalf of the Socialist Group, to the Commission on the blocking of European Social Fund expenditure by the Commission.

Mrs Salisch (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, honourable Members, yesterday President Delors of the Commission insisted firmly on the need for cooperation between the Commission and Parliament, and I can only agree with him that it is a very good thing for Commission and Parliament to work together very closely.

I find, however, that cases sometimes arise which cast doubt on the Commission's willingness really to maintain this close cooperation with Parliament. One case in point is the fact that there are certainly one or two matters connected with the European Social Fund which we regard as crucial, which is why the Socialist group is putting this oral question to the Commission today.

You know what the issue is: the fact that the Commission has not yet informed us which Social Fund projects for next year it intends to adopt and aid. That has serious implications for those applying to the Social Fund.

Salisch

May I claim on behalf of my group and certainly for my own part that we have always taken great pains to increase the European Social Fund resources. There are also other groups here in the House who want the same. So the Commission really has enough support in Parliament. We want it to get more money into its hands so that it can execute more projects for young people.

That makes it even harder for us to understand why the Commission does not take important decisions connected with the implementation of the Social Fund, on what seem to us extremely spurious technical budgetary grounds. So we put the penetrating question: does the Commission not realise that if it further delays its decisions on the European Social Fund, it will bring a whole range of projects to nought? This will create difficulties not for the government authorities, but for the whole range of medium and small-sized projects by organizations who do not have the financial strength to provide pre-financing or interim financing for their projects.

So it looks very much as though the Commission is quite willing to stretch out its hand when this Parliament puts money in it, but that it is clearly either negligent or does not consider the consequences of its actions in time when it comes to really implementing the Social Fund. So I would be most interested to hear from the Commission tonight whether by any chance there are better reasons than those we know which prevented it from informing us of its decisions on projects for the year 1985.

To put it very plainly once again: surely it is either simply a question of a certain negligence, or there must be some serious reason which has prevented the Commission. After all, thousands of training places for young people depend on the Commission's attitude, so I would request it most cordially not to give us any evasive answers now but to make it clear how it came to behave this way.

To conclude, may I mention one more point. We have also failed to understand, in all the discussions we have had in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, why the selection of projects has changed, as it has in the past two years. Although the same selection criteria still apply for the Social Fund, a project is accepted one year while next year a project of exactly the same kind is not. Here too we would ask you to explain, tonight if possible, the Commission's behaviour.

(Applause from the Left)

Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President, may I remind you that the legislation relating to the Social Fund stipulates that the Commission shall take a decision on requests for assistance from the Fund before 31 March of the financial year in

question, or thirty days after the adoption of the Community budget, should the budget not be adopted on time.

The delay concerning the decision on the 1985 applications is therefore due to the fact that the budget has not yet been adopted. The Commission's intention is to take a decision on the 1985 applications in June, once the budget has been adopted. That at least is what the Commission is hoping. By acting in that way it will be entirely within the bounds of legality. Should the budget still not have been adopted at that date, the Commission, having regard to the financial needs of the recipients of Social Fund assistance, will take a decision on some of the applications, depending on the credits available within the system of provisional twelfths. The payment of advances will then follow quickly.

Moreover the Commission is fully aware of the inconvenience associated with delays in payment. For that reason it will do everything it can to resolve this problem as quickly as possible. The Commission nevertheless considers it advisable to wait for the adoption of the budget, rather than taking a decision on the basis of a partial budget. The reason for it is simple and provides the answer to some observations which have just been made: a decision at the present stage would in fact pose a number of problems of a technical nature. It would result in an arbitrary choice as regards the selection of applications to be financed as a matter of priority. Nevertheless if the 1985 budget has still not been adopted by June, the Commission will have to take a partial decision. But, I repeat, such a solution will be avoided as far as possible.

President. — I have received two motions for resolutions with request for an early vote to wind up the debate: one by Mrs Salisch and others (Doc. B 2-317/85) and the other by Mrs Dury and others (Doc. B 2-264/85).

The vote on both those requests for an early vote will be taken at the end of this debate. And we shall be ringing the bells in good time, Mrs Dury.

Mrs Dury (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should still like to reply to the Commissioner and to say this: I was rapporteur for an opinion on the budget of the committee on social affairs, and for the European Social Fund in particular. I have to say that where my colleagues were concerned, I did not find the task an easy one, because the Social Fund will effectively have no more than it had several years ago, and the management and the efficiency of the Social Fund are undergoing a kind of credibility crisis.

I have to say that the Commission is largely responsible for that.

Dury

Since we have not yet voted the 1985 budget, the problem did of course arise of what should be done with the projects filed for 1985.

There is a system, that of provisional twelfths. A more refined system is that of supplementary provisional twelfths. By June the Commission will have a sum of money which is intended to provide the promoters of Social Fund projects with the wherewithal to start implementing them.

Let me say that at the moment we are in a situation where the prevailing impression is that the Commission, or at least the administrators of the Social Fund, have completely ignored the fact that there exists a way of using these funds, that it was used in 1980, when we were in an identical situation, and that the Social Fund really does seem to be loth to aid promoters, who in their own way are helping to combat unemployment, especially among young people.

Next it should be emphasised how incredibly inconsistent the Commission is in choosing projects. I shall put matters very simply, even if they are perhaps a little more complicated: it has not been possible to complete a number of projects which were accepted in 1984, because the Commission did have difficulties. In fact, instead of arriving in June, the advances arrived in December, so that it was difficult for promoters to carry out their projects, or they had to abandon them. They said to themselves, all right, we shall defer our project to 1985; then in 1985 the same projects, which had been accepted in 1984, were turned down. That is what happened with some projects in the Netherlands, as well as in Belgium, France and Greece. Mr Commissioner, the Commission has made an incredible mistake here. Nobody will believe in Europe any more if projects accepted in 1984 are turned down in 1985.

Let me end by saying this — I could say much more, but I am short of time — the matter is still urgent now. Amongst the people who ask the Social Fund for money there are public authorities, whose shoulders are broad, they have ample funds; there are also private firms, small ones in particular. Some small promoters do not have much in the way of funds. What we ask is that before the month of June, you pay at least one advance, not just in areas, which are priority areas according to the Commission's criteria, but also to promoters established in regions which are experiencing large-scale employment problems.

It is possible for you to do it, you have the means, and you do not want to do it! You throw the ball back into our court, to us, the European Parliament, by saying that we did not vote the budget and therefore nothing can be done. What is the point of having set up the entire system of supplementary provisional twelfths, if no-one uses it? I do not believe in the Commission's goodwill. I do not believe that it really wants to turn the Social Fund into the instrument for which we, the members of the European Parliament, are calling. The

Commission — and not just you, Mr Mosar, since you are responsible for energy, not the Social Fund — bears a heavy responsibility to the citizens of Europe, to the unemployed and to young people. I wish the Commission would show a little more energy in resolving these problems.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, the European Social Fund, which has the task of helping in the fight against unemployment, is coming up against ever more problems and even in our national Member States is falling into disrepute. In 1983 we carried out a reform of the Fund with great difficulty and in the same year also laid down guidelines for the submission of projects. But now that the reformed Fund has been working for a second year we must state that the problems are rife.

The first problem is of a financial nature. Last year the Commission approved only in August projects for the year in progress and only in October and November did it pay out the first amounts. Mr President, the consequence was that last year very many projects could not even be embarked upon or else were started much too late. In an oral question in January I put this matter before the Commission and the Commissioner then confirmed this position and said in addition that he would do his best to ensure that this situation would not occur again this year.

And what do we see now? We see that at the moment although it was officially settled that grants would be awarded at the end of March, there are still no awards and no money has yet been paid out. It is true that in various Member States all kinds of unofficial rumours are in circulation about the award of grants but they are not yet confirmed. The Commission says, and defends itself by arguing, that the budget is not yet approved and that it therefore cannot yet approve any projects.

Well, last year the budget was approved in time and then the Commission was in a position only in August to approve projects and money was handed out only in November. Thus one can well understand that the Member States and above all the proposers of projects simply do not have any confidence in the matter any longer. It must be understood that we too as Members of Parliament are involved in this question.

There is a second problem and that concerns the projects which actually were approved last year. Mr President, in my country too there are a number of municipalities and institutions carrying out projects approved last year, which have now heard unofficially that this year their projects will not be approved. These people are informed of this in May, whereas a number of these projects were started last year and naturally are normally completed at the beginning of this year.

Maij-Weggen

Even more disquiet and more indignation have arisen over this situation than over the fact that no money has been paid on time. How is it possible that exactly the same projects, falling under exactly the same guidelines, are approved in one year and not in the next? We have already raised this point in the parliamentary committee and the Commission defended itself by saying that last year it was lenient and this year very strict. But between the lenient application of guidelines and the strict application of guidelines there is naturally a world of arbitrariness and this is the way it is seen by those affected. The Commission defended itself by saying that it informed the Member States last year that it had been lenient and would be stricter this year. But, Mr President, such a general notification just does not work. It should have been made clear to those affected, project by project, what, if anything, would not do and what would have to be improved when the following project was handed in. But it seems to me still better that the guidelines should always be applied in the same way and that there should be no room for leniency or strictness and that there should be no room for arbitrary decisions. Because everybody knows that arbitrary decisions simply lead to feelings of indignation.

Mr President, I feel that the Commission should have another very careful think about the manner in which it is dealing at the moment with the European Social Fund. Naturally payments could have been made from the twelfths. Certainly for those projects which were already started last year and were handed in again this year. And naturally it is essential that approvals should be issued in good time. If we continue in this way with the European Social Fund then ultimately an expedient which is in itself good will prove to be a bad expedient. People will not be hopeful about it but indignant and that will lead eventually to its being a disadvantage to the European Community. I can tell you that local authorities in my country simply no longer know what they get out of the EEC and are actually waiting for an honest statement as to whether the projects will be approved at the agreed time and whether they count on the money.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Mr President, may I say what a privilege it is to appear yet again under your gavel. I hope that, with your usual benevolence you will be prepared to recognize the occasional point of order, even if it comes from this quarter of the House.

Unusually, I am speaking on behalf of my group tonight. I find the answer to this oral question produced by the Commission profoundly unsatisfactory. The Commission actually asked for what originally started as an urgency motion for a resolution under Rule 48 to be converted into an oral question with debate so that it could give a considered answer. If what Commissioner Mosar has read out is a considered answer, then I think it is high time the Commission started examining its policy in this area.

The fact of the matter is very simple: there are 923 m ECU sitting in the coffers of the Commission in Brussels for the Social Fund which have not yet been disbursed. For this Commission to tell Parliament that it is our rejection of the budget that has prevented the Social Fund from being disbursed in the proper way is a disgrace! The Commission comes back time and time again to this House asking for provisional twelfths to be released. Those provisional twelfths are released, and they are released against the chapters in the budget to which they were allocated. Frankly, it is unacceptable for the Commission to pretend that it cannot disburse this money because Parliament has not made the funds available. Parliament has made the funds available, and the Commission cannot take shelter behind technicalities of this kind.

I know Mr Mosar is not in charge of this portfolio, but I hope he will tell his colleague, Commissioner Sutherland, that he will be appearing before the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment the week after next and that we shall want some very clear answers to some very hard questions as to why funds that have been made available for the unemployed people in Europe have been sat on, have been put into other chapters and have not been released and why, in fact, we have not had a proper explanation tonight of why this has been done. It is unacceptable! It is disgraceful, and we are not prepared to stand for it!

(Applause)

Mr von der Vring (S). — *(DE)* If the legal situation is as the Commissioner says, why was Parliament not adequately informed of it on time? As far as I know the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment was not kept informed. So the Commission must immediately improve its provision of information to the committee.

Secondly, the Committee on Budgets is convinced that even before the 1985 budget was adopted, suitable arrangements could have been made as regards the Social Fund and, above all, the applicants could have been informed. The Commission has failed even to discuss a solution to the problem with the Committee on Budgets. Parliament and the Commission already know — at least they will after this vote — more or less the scale of the sums involved.

Thirdly, I drew the Commission's attention to this matter in February in the Committee on Budgets. I requested clarification and assistance. I got the impression during the meeting that the matter was now in good hands. Obviously, nothing has happened. In April I put the same question in the Committee on Budgets, and again got no answer. That is why we are here today. This makes it clear that the cooperation between the Commission and the Committee on Budgets is still not working satisfactorily. We must insist on a systematic improvement in the Commission's handling of such initiatives in the committee.

von der Vring

I have reason to assume that the interpretation of the legal budgetary situation as regards the Social Fund we have heard does not agree with the auditor's interpretation. How can that be? Are we dealing with two or more different Commissions or with one Commission? This has worrying consequences. The information we have heard does not correspond to what we heard in the discussions with Commission representatives in the Committee on Budgets. They too were appalled at the situation. We in this House thought that Parliament and the Commission were resolved to do their utmost to ensure that no third party suffered from the problems of the rejection of the budget. Parliament has always endeavoured to resolve any such problems that cropped up. I need only think of the financing of the Greenland catch licence fees. That was a masterpiece of interpretation of budgetary law. That is what can be done when people are in agreement.

Now it looks as though we are letting thousands of young people run the risk of losing the planned training places, just because the decision on the proposed Social Fund resources will come too late. So the recipients will be kept in the dark until June. Many projects will come to nought if the information — and it is primarily a question of information and not of money — is not received. You know that training contracts have to be signed and before that teaching staff have to be recruited, who also need contracts. Perhaps the various organizations can take on this responsibility without the money if they know that they will eventually receive it. The money always comes too late, everyone knows that — but people must at least have the information! In many areas there is now total despair and I think the Commission should have known that. It could have supplied adequate information, and that is still possible now and next week. Therefore — since the Commission has given such unsatisfactory answers here — I must insist that we vote on our motion for a resolution here on Saturday.

Mr Huckfield (S). — Mr President, it must be the lateness of the hour and your delightful chairmanship that cause me to actually agree with Mr Welsh, which is something I am glad not too many of my colleagues are here to see me do.

I would very much like to echo the points he made and also the point made by my comrade Heinke Salisch. We really are facing a very desperate situation now, particularly in some of the voluntary-aided sector organizations which have hitherto benefited from Social Fund financing. I am sorry to say that the response which has come from the Commissioner tonight in no way matches up to their expectations. These very desperate organizations are now ringing our offices for help in finding out whether some kind of advance payments might be made.

Coupled with this we find that organizations that were funded last year and have made similar applications

for the future have, as has been said already, had their applications this time turned down. This really amounts to a moving of the goal posts, a changing by the Social Fund of their interpretation of the regulations half way through the existing guidelines. This is even before the new guidelines have come in. Then of course we have just had the publication and issue of the new guidelines which, I am bound to say, really are going to hit many of these organizations very hard indeed, particularly in my own constituency, given the Commission's new found insistence on an emphasis on high technology, an emphasis on job placements and an emphasis on minimum training periods.

So I am not just concerned about the difficulties many of these organizations are now encountering in receiving payments on which, I am bound to say, I find the Commission's answer totally unsatisfactory. I am talking now about the whole direction in which the Social Fund now appears to be moving. My conclusion must be that the whole direction in which the Commission is now moving will eventually lead to the Social Fund being irrelevant to the hardest hit areas, being out of touch and beyond their reach.

(Applause)

Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President I have followed very attentively the various observations which have been made on the question put and on the reply which I have had to give, a reply which was certainly dictated to a large extent, as you will be aware, by the file, and by the position of jury and by administrative data.

After listening religiously to the arguments put forward, I cannot conceal the fact that there are some points with which I am inclined to agree. I am prepared to convey the opinions expressed on this subject to my colleague who has responsibility for this matter.

Having said that, neither would I wish to conceal the fact that there are certain legal and actual constraints which do not allow us to anticipate any one outcome rather than another. That is in fact why, when it was a question of the 1985 budget, I tried to explain to you just now the reasons why we thought it advisable to wait for the budget to be adopted, rather than take a decision on the basis of a partial budget. One of the reasons I put forward is that to take a decision at the present stage would involve certain risks or offer certain possibilities and would in fact create numerous problems of a technical nature. Finally, and above all, that solution would result in arbitrary choices in the selection of applications to be given priority financing. But if the 1985 budget were not adopted in June, the Commission would have to take a partial decision. I repeat, such a solution would not be acceptable to you either.

There was also the question of the 1984 budget. In that respect, it should not be forgotten — I think I

Mosar

have to say this quite objectively — that the 1984 financial year was a transitional one, in view of the new legislation on the Social Fund adopted in October 1983. That is precisely why the Commission exhibited a certain flexibility in accepting applications involving the Fund. It did nevertheless warn beneficiaries that the selection criteria applied during the 1985 financial year would be stricter.

As regards the decision in question — that of July 1984 — yes, it is true that it was not announced until August 1984, because of a problem of transition. Applications have to be submitted in October and in 1984 they were submitted six months later. The whole decision process was delayed by it, that is a fact.

Having said that, I think that as I wish to be objective, I am, of course, prepared to put to my colleague, and to discuss as necessary, the suggestions and comments which you have made.

Mr Muntingh (S). — (NL) Mr President, I should like to say something on a point of order. I have understood that my report on whales, according to present calculations, may come up at roughly eight minutes to twelve. That means that the report as a whole cannot be dealt with before midnight. However this compels the speakers to stay here until twelve o'clock and there is a considerable chance — and this has already happened to me repeatedly — that I shall be told at twelve o'clock that this report must be dealt with on the next morning, which in this case means tomorrow morning. What I should now like to ask you is, with the consent of the Assembly, to defer my report until tomorrow morning. That means in all probability that a number of people will not need to wait here pointlessly the whole evening, dog-tired. I therefore ask you to propose to this Assembly that my report should be deferred until tomorrow morning.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Mr President, I would like to say something as chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I think it might be more appropriate if you call my distinguished vice-chairman, Mrs Salisch, and my honourable friend, Mrs Majj-Weggen, first and me after that.

President. — If you are giving way, I suggest that you give way. But according to my list you are down to speak now.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Well, I would like to be last on your list as well, Mr President.

President. — I will consider that request when we come to the end of the list.

Mrs Salisch (S). — (DE) Mr President, it is quite amazing to see one's own chairman acting as a kind of

chameleon this evening, but I must say, I really liked him when he spoke as representative of the Conservative Group. I hope this will not change when he speaks as chairman of the committee. I see, Commissioner Mosar, that you are the whipping boy tonight, and I am very sorry about that, since you are not to blame at all this evening.

But since we have already heard today, on another occasion, that the Commission is always responsible as a whole, this must apply to you too. I do not consider it right for the Commission to retreat this evening through your words to what is purely a legalistic standpoint. In May you tell us that the budget that has not been adopted puts you in such a difficult spot that you now have legal and technical difficulties. In one month's time, dear Mr Commissioner, were this budget not adopted, you would no longer take this fact into consideration and then you would decide, i.e. the criteria you are putting forward tonight are no longer logical if you simply forget them yourself a short time later.

So, the Commission is performing an about-turn here that we cannot accept, and I think you really should answer the question Mr Welsh put as representative of the Conservative Group of this House: where are the 930 million ECU you have in your pockets and which we gave you so that for God's sake you can give jobs or training places to young people? The money must be somewhere! Where have you put it, I beg you? Surely you have not gone off with it!

Surely the Commission must be able to answer this question, and I would like to know the answer. Someone in the Commission must be able to answer. These unpleasant questions to the Commission happened to be in the text and you could have been kind enough to deal with them.

Mrs Majj-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) I feel I must criticize the Commissioner, naturally not personally, but in his capacity as temporary spokesman of the Commission, for his formal attitude with regard to the approval of the budget. For let us be honest: the social part of the budget has been increased by the Commission, by the Council and by the Parliament as well. You could thus in any case be sure that for 1985 you would get more money than in the previous year. Thus you could without any risk have implemented the system of twelfths. And if you say: but then we should have had to approve an arbitrary number of projects, then I must reply that you could without any risk have put those projects which were also approved last year straight away on the list of projects to be paid now out of the twelfths. Thus I have the feeling that the Commission has been sheltering behind a formal attitude and that great harm is being done thereby to the projects affected and in fact also to the Community, because it is a question which brings us into disrepute.

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) Mr Mosar is very courteous and tells me that he will pass complaints on to his colleague, but I should like to point out that we are going to vote two resolutions, one, tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs and employment, which asks that at the end of June the 930 million ECU in question, which are available and which can be used for Social Fund projects should be used.

There, we have had a friendly discussion. Nevertheless, I hope that these two resolutions — which are closely linked — will be adopted and that in June we shall be able to ask the Commission how, when and where the money is to be used, and that at that time the reply will be much less evasive, whatever the outcome of the 1985 budget. Because one has the impression that the Commission is linking the two problems. But they are not so closely linked as it might seem. You have the money, what we are asking is that you use it.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Mr President, as chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment I would like to thank Commissioner Mosar for his courtesy in attending and for answering, to the best of his ability, the question that was put down. However, I must say that I hope he will convey to his colleague, Commissioner Sutherland, the House's grave dissatisfaction with the nature of the answer. And perhaps we should remind the whole college, Mr President, that they are accountable to the Parliament not merely as co-budgetary authority. Because, in the end, the Parliament has the power to dismiss the Commission. I give notice to Commissioner Mosar and his colleagues that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment will want satisfactory answers to the questions that have been raised; that we shall use the resolution that will be adopted tomorrow as a basis for those questions and that, if necessary, we shall report to the House in June on the quality of the answers we get. As chairman of the Committee I mean that very seriously indeed.

(Applause)

President. — I will deal with Mr Muntingh's request when we have finished with this item.

We must now consider the request for an early vote on the two motions for resolution (Docs 317/85 and 264/85).

(Parliament approved the request for an early vote)

The vote on those motions for resolutions will be taken at the next voting time.

With regard to the request from Mr Muntingh. Under Rule 56(2) the agenda, once adopted, shall not be amended except on a proposal from the President. I think it would be wrong to create a precedent by tak-

ing this particular report off the agenda at the present time. My understanding, however, is that it is quite likely that the debates on the Dupuy and Mertens reports may go on until 12 p.m. That is one of the problems. However, Mr Muntingh, I have to say that I have regularly been presiding here on Thursday nights and there is always somebody's report hanging in the balance. Unfortunately, it happens to be yours tonight. However, I certainly do not propose, as President, to change the agenda at this stage.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, I am grateful to you for reminding us of the many happy occasions when you have presided on Thursday evenings at this hour. I am referring to Mr Muntingh's request. There have been many occasions when I have wished to despatch Mr Muntingh's proposals to many places very far from here. On this occasion, he is proposing to despatch his report to tomorrow morning. I would like to agree with him so that the matter can be properly heard.

Mr President, if I may put it this way: As you are representative of Ireland, I hope you will agree with Mr Muntingh's point of view about Wales.

(Laughter)

President. — I have to say, Mr Pearce, that you are not a whale of a help!

Mr Muntingh (S). — (NL) Mr President, you said that you were reluctant to create a precedent. You do not need to be reluctant, because that precedent has long been created. Even this afternoon we decided to amend the agenda. I do not see therefore why you are creating a precedent if you agree to my request too now. It makes no difference to the course of the activities of this Parliament, in view of the fact that my report is one of the last. If we were to deal with that report tomorrow morning we still have ample time, even with all the other reports, to deal with the agenda at a convenient time for all members. I simply do not see therefore the reason why you are determined to go on till midnight when there is time enough tomorrow morning.

President. — Mr Muntingh, I do not propose changing my mind on that issue. I am sorry.

Mr Welsh (ED). — On a point of order, Mr President. I would like to express our support for your position and say to Mr Muntingh that we will do our best to give his report every attention if it starts tonight and goes on tomorrow morning. Unlike Mr Pearce, I think, Mr President, that you are absolutely right in the decision you have taken.

8. *Environment*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-19/85) by Mrs Dupuy, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on

— the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc 1-268/84 - COM(84) 206 final) on the protection of the environment in the Mediterranean basin.

Mrs Dupuy (RDE), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, colleagues, without doubt the protection of the environment of the Mediterranean is one of the prime duties of our Community: because the Mediterranean washes the coasts of three, and tomorrow four, Member States; because pollution has reached a critical level there; because that pollution represents a serious hazard for the development of our regions; because the protection of the environment in the Mediterranean basin is still regarded as a matter of secondary concern; because the diversity of the countries concerned means that solutions must be sought at all levels; because the EEC, which is responsible for a large part of the pollution, has a particular debt to pay; finally, because the protection of the Mediterranean basin has been seen to be a priority matter by the Community action programme.

The extent of the problem under study, the actual effect of the geographical definition of the territory involved, in my view mean that the Communication from the Commission to the Council on the protection of the environment in the Mediterranean basin is disappointing. People should be aware that this area, whose main characteristic is its special climate, represents a rare and fragile balance, which man, since antiquity, has sometimes destroyed and sometimes protected. For forty years industrial development, urbanization and tourism have been the signs of increased human occupation of the soil and the Mediterranean environment. The Mediterranean is virtually an inland sea: its supply of new water is very uneven and combined with the high level of maritime traffic leads one to fear the worst.

Fortunately the reaction has come. It must be followed up, bearing in mind, as a primary concern, the impact which human activity can have on the environment.

In the report which I have tabled on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection I have analysed the various Commission proposals very carefully. I have to tell you that our Commission found these proposals rather inadequate in view of what is at stake. It seemed to us that the focal point of the Commission's proposals, around which one would hope to order a constructive policy for the environment in the Mediterranean basin,

was the establishment of a consultative committee, provided, of course, that it is equipped with more human and financial resources than those provided, that its field of action is closely defined, that there is never any duplication with existing organizations, that its first task is to establish a data bank accessible to national, regional and local organizations, to assemble all the data available in the European organizations already existing in the various countries of the Community, thereby making it possible to carry out an appraisal of what has been done.

Action will of course have to be carried out at the level of the countries of the Community, and also jointly with other countries with which there are bilateral agreements: the Maghreb countries and the countries of the Middle East, including Israel. This proves that international cooperation of the Lomé convention type is possible. It is not sufficiently well-known that since its inception the Blue Plan has been financed by the Community and all the countries of the Mediterranean basin, with the exception of Albania. We think it essential that a thorough assessment be made before any new action is started. It is not specific action proposed by the Commission — some of it questionable in itself, and in any case disparate and without any plan — which will make possible the harmonious development of human and economic activity. An overall programme ought to set store by redressing the mistakes made in the developed countries and guiding the developing nations towards self-surveillance and monitoring of their activity and its effects on the environment. Let our past mistakes at least be of use in the future!

Mr President, the inadequacy of the Commission's communication is disturbing in the light of what is at stake where the environment of the Mediterranean basin is concerned. It appears that the action proposed is unlikely in any way to reduce the pollution of the Mediterranean Sea, to protect its shores, to preserve and improve the coast and the Mediterranean areas.

At a time when the EEC is preparing to extend to two further countries in southern Europe the Commission's text seems to me to be simply a thing of the past, a past when all too often the problems of the southern EEC were either ignored or given scant attention. You are all aware of the mishaps of the integrated Mediterranean programmes. You know that for a long time the common agriculture policy has been dedicated to northern produce. And you are not ignorant of the fact that enlargement will pose new problems, which if they are not dealt with realistically risk jeopardizing the operation of the EEC itself. And yet, does not the conservation of the Mediterranean Sea, the protection of its coastline, provide a natural sphere for action by the EEC? Should the latter not lead to exemplary action so that after two or three thousand years of human intervention, for good and ill, where the environment is concerned, development and protection of the environment henceforth go hand in hand?

Dupuy

Mr President, I hope that the European Parliament will adopt the Committee on the Environment's proposal regarding a programme to be submitted to us by the Commission as soon as possible in the form of a memorandum.

(Applause)

Mr Bombard (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, colleagues, I should first like to pay tribute to Mrs Dupuy. I read the Commission's proposal at the same time as she did, it was really pathetic. Nothing was taken as a whole; a few little examples were given and very much biased towards Greece, in particular, and Italy.

Obviously I do not wish to expand too much, but I shall mention the pollution of which Mrs Dupuy spoke, and pay tribute to her. The city of Cannes — pollution very often comes from large cities — is without any doubt an example which many Mediterranean towns should follow. Which provokes me to say that Marseilles is making an effort, is about to achieve something, but that on the other hand nothing is being done at Toulon, nothing is being done at Nice, and I shall not mention the town of Genoa!

Consequently the task is twofold. On the one hand the pollution of the Mediterranean has to be stopped, and on the other the polluted areas of the small Mediterranean continental shelf have to be cleaned. Let me tell you that I have had contacts with the French Navy to ask whether in times of peace the minesweepers of the Navy could be used to sweep the continental shelf to bring it back to life, because there is life under the pollution. Quite simply, it needs the window opening! I fully agree with Mrs Dupuy on the need for an overall plan and for agreement between the countries of the Basin, whether they are members of the EEC or not.

In her report Mrs Dupuy speaks of water resources. In this respect France can provide a remarkable example of freshwater resources: the Canal de Provence, which distributes the gift of water which was so much needed, and which worried us so much when one saw it being constructed, without seeing the dams to hold back the necessary reserves of water, the supplies. Mrs Dupuy also mentions the quality of the water for bathing. But all our colleagues know that the Mediterranean is their seaside and that it is therefore their duty to look after the health of the Mediterranean.

That is why I say to Mrs Dupuy, three cheers for the example which she mentioned, Helmepe, the Hellenic Association for the Protection of the Marine Environment, but she is a little unfair, because there are also many other associations which should be supported; in France I can think of URVN, the Group on scientific aspects of pollution, the Group on scientific aspects of aqua-culture, the Blue Plan, which is at last reaching the action stage.

Let me say at once that there is hope, if Mrs Dupuy's text is followed by what she proposes. If we all try together, the countries in the north and in the south of the EEC, the Mediterranean Sea, which might be described as dying, could begin to recover. Let us remember that this sea is the origin of our civilisation. And after being so worried about the possibility of another Dead Sea, we shall be able to watch the transformation of the proposals contained in Mrs Dupuy's report into a shining therapeutic success and finally the birth of a live sea, the bearer of food, the bringer of life, the bearer of health, a sea which will be an example to the world.

(Applause)

Mr Lambrias (PPE). — *(GR)* The Commission's initiative to begin at long last doing something to conserve the Mediterranean environment is certainly not something we can argue against, though it comes tragically late and is above all quite inadequate in relation to the fearful dimensions of the problem. The pages of the report are like aspirins administered to treat a serious disease, and as previous speakers have pointed out — and I completely share their views — the problem is both urgent and complex, and must above all be faced in a spirit other than that of narrow-minded book-keeping or formal bureaucracy. Of course the sorry state of the Community's economics make us all regard initiatives and ambitious programmes for saving the Mediterranean as luxuries we call ill afford. But let me ask: can it really be a luxury to make every effort to prevent making an open sewer and completely disrupting the ecosystem of the maritime zone that washes the shores of so many European, Middle Eastern and African countries, the area which is the cradle of Western civilisation? There are already indications of tragically disquieting deterioration in the fauna and flora, and in the form of climatic changes. For a problem of such huge scale — and Mme Dupuy's report is indeed a last-minute S.O.S. — we must adopt immediate measures. However, with its book-keeping mentality the Commission restricts itself to proposals that comprise very little potential.

Mr President, I do not think it will be possible for the many individuals and organizations interested in the matter to grasp the size and complexity of the problem unless two basic factors are clearly understood. Firstly, that concern about the pollution of the Mediterranean should not be limited only to those peoples that live along its shores, and secondly, that it is not they alone who are responsible for the environmental maladies of the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean is polluted from many sources other than its own; by ships and tourists who come to it, and by industries that discharge their waste into its waters.

With this in mind, Mr President, the European People's Party adopts the report which, in any case, was accepted unanimously by the Committee on the Envi-

Lambrias

ronment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and by the other committees that expressed opinions, and regards it as an SOS.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, let us hope that the representatives of the Commission can sleep easy tonight, after the lively speeches that have been made in Parliament and that also concern this communication on the Mediterranean. We should like to thank Mrs Dupuy for the report, and to assure her of our support, especially if she will accept the amendments that we have put forward.

I should like to draw a brief identity card of the Mediterranean. Three million square metres; the largest coastal perimeter is that of Greece, then comes Italy, and then France, which will, however, be exceeded by the coastal perimeter of Spain. 44 million people live on the Mediterranean, and that number becomes at least 100 million during the summer. There are 120 large cities along the Mediterranean, and of these 120 cities, at least 100 discharge all their waste into the sea.

But it is, obviously, not only city waste. There is all the industrial waste. I will give only a few figures: 21 thousand tons of zinc, 3 800 tons of lead — but I cannot go on with the list, for I should have to list 180 substances that are harmful to the environment. Crude oil is present in vast quantities — from half a million to 1 million tons, equivalent to about 108 milligrammes per square metre.

In addition, the Mediterranean is a closed sea, in which the profit motive has in recent years caused serious damage; at the same time, it is an economic asset to be protected, an economic asset that affects complex areas of high unemployment or underdevelopment. The Commission's answer is really non-existent, with a negligible budget and initiatives that, instead of forming part of a plan of action, are random measures, carried out to plug a few holes here and there. Mr Lambrias said: 'It is like giving a sick person aspirin'. I would say that it is like giving a tranquilliser to the Mediterranean peoples, so that they can forget the real problems. But the Mediterranean peoples do not forget the real problems.

The meanness, therefore, of the appropriations, and also the random character of the measures, is something that makes one think very seriously about what real intentions there are of really doing something for the Mediterranean.

There is, furthermore, a general lack of programmes, for example, regarding the protection of the land and sea biotypes, those that are in the process of becoming extinct, or those that are typical of the Mediterranean area. I am talking about the monk seal, for which Mr Muntingh also has fought very hard; I am also talking — still with regard to the Mediterranean area — about the Pyrenean bear, the corals, the sponges and,

in addition, a whole range of botanical and animal species in which the Mediterranean basin and also the countries of the Community that flank the Mediterranean are very rich. Italy, for example, is particularly rich in plant species, and there is not a single word about any of this. Yes, something was said about the water supplies of the coastal areas, and about waste disposal. We have to consider these problems at the time when they become most acute, that is to say, when the tourist traffic is at its peak — when, that is, to the 40 million inhabitants living along the Mediterranean coast we have to add the 100 million tourists that flock each year to the different parts of the Mediterranean.

It is also necessary, I would say, to remind Member States very severely of the need to comply with all the Community directives designed to protect the marine environment, and which concern all discharge of waste into fresh water and sea water, the discharge of pollutants into the aquatic environment of the Community, and the accidental discharge of hydrocarbons.

I should like to recall, in this connection, how tragic are the discharges of hydrocarbons into the Mediterranean — even though, luckily, so far, the amounts involved have been less than those in the North Sea — for the very reason that the Mediterranean Sea is a closed sea. A few weeks ago, in the Straits of Messina, 5 thousand tons of oil were discharged: a drop in the ocean, compared with the misfortunes of the Amoco Cadiz or other cases of the kind, but a real disaster for a closed sea, which has no means of renewal and into which — I was forgetting — amongst other things, at least 500 tons of plastic bags are thrown each year.

The last problem, Mr President, that I wanted to speak about is eutrophication. The Commission's communication envisages very modest action on this problem, which is instead a very serious problem, and one that sounds the death knell for that part of the Mediterranean Sea that is least mobile — the Adriatic.

It is a very complex problem, for which the inhabitants of the coastal regions are probably not responsible, since it originates upstream of them, and is caused by washing-machine detergents, chemical fertilizers, and products for agriculture. All of these problems as a body explain why we have not rejected the communication from the Commission, since we could not allow ourselves the luxury of its rejection. We say however that it is absolutely insufficient, that it is like an aspirin for someone who is really ill. We have to get really to the heart of the problem if we are to have any credibility. The appropriations that the Commission has allocated for these measures, and the random nature of the measures that have been indicated, are certainly not such as to earn the credibility of the Mediterranean population.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — *(DE)* Mr President, without a globally conceived policy of protection

Bloch von Blottnitz

and preservation the seas will be irrevocably lost to future generations, as the situation analyses clearly show. So a programme to protect the Mediterranean basin must be taken seriously. That makes it all the more incomprehensible why the Commission is tackling such a long-term project in an incomplete and, as so often, superficial manner. It is incomplete for many reasons.

Firstly, it is confined to only three coastal states, namely France, Italy and Greece. But it is not only the geographical borders that are narrowly conceived; there is no clear concept either of official cooperation between the authorities and the independent international environmental protection organizations and institutions.

Most of the causes of environmental pollution are not taken into consideration at all or if they are, only very inadequately, such as the increasing contamination of the Mediterranean by heavy metals which are carried in tiny particles by the wind from Central Europe and deposited in the Mediterranean by the rain. On the basis of research to date, the experts estimate the annual deposit of lead alone at six tonnes. That is twice as much as flows in from the rivers. The same applies to cadmium, zinc chromium, mercury and various radionuclides, all poisons which reach the human body not only in the air we breathe or the water we drink but also in fish and shellfish. I do not want to go into the effects on health here; I hope everyone is aware of them.

One essential demand must be to carefully monitor the poisons that come from the air by measurements and observations of wind directions. This provides the advance information needed for successfully combating this evil. In the long run it is no use at all to pursue an environmental policy which only comes into effect when pollution and destruction has reached such a level that there is little hope of salvation. It should tackle the problem immediately.

The same applies to the rivers which flow into the Mediterranean, for they alone discharge an annual 120 000 t of mineral oils, 100 t of mercury, 3000 t of lead, 2400 t of chromium, 21 000 t of zinc, 20 t of organochlorine pesticides, more than 1 million t of nitrogen- and phosphorus-containing nutrients and 2500 t of chloridized radionuclides, which in fact is nearly all tritium, into the Mediterranean, where they are deposited. All this is happening in spite of the 1975 Barcelona Convention, which once again shows us quite clearly that so long as all the directives and agreements allow for countless exceptions, these provisions are quite useless.

Because of the uncontrolled building on the Mediterranean coast, because 120 towns usually channel their sewage into the sea untreated, the sediment deposits grow by one meter a year. They cover animals and plants with dust and sand and choke them. The conse-

quence is large areas of death on the surface of the sea. A further important regulation should ensure that supervised centres are set up to dispose of toxic rubbish and waste. The dumping of radioactive waste should be prohibited immediately. An additional protocol to the Barcelona Convention should be adopted which prescribes environmental compatibility tests for all existing and future projects and industrial plant in the Mediterranean.

It is certainly also very necessary to examine precisely what damage exists and the degree of pollution. The situation in the Mediterranean is very serious and really must be changed drastically. The EEC in particular is able for political and economic reasons to offer more than a merely rudimentary solution here. That is why I would call upon the Commission on behalf of my group to comply with the requests made in Mrs Dupuy's report.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, this has been a very interesting debate, and a very well informed and concerned one. I want to assure the House that we take it very seriously indeed.

It is of course first of all my duty to congratulate Mrs Dupuy on preparing such a comprehensive and useful report. It reveals not just a wide knowledge of the environmental problems afflicting the region of the Mediterranean, but also a keen determination to ensure that these problems are rapidly resolved by the implementation of workable policies.

I am well aware that as Mayor of Cannes, a city with a very creditable record on pollution control, she has a direct interest in these issues which has been evidenced in her report and in the speech she made. The study which she has prepared successfully argues that these are issues which are of concern to all the people of Europe and to people in many other countries. May I add that it is indeed a rare pleasure to read a report which makes lyrical use of quotations from writers ranging from Plato to André Malraux.

I am happy to acknowledge that the report specifically approves the Commission's proposals for the introduction of a coordinated strategy to protect the environment in the Mediterranean region. But I must also acknowledge — although I do so with regret — the air of disappointment which attends the motion for a resolution. It is specifically suggested that, given the magnitude of the environmental problems involved, the response of the Commission is somewhat inadequate. In the body of the report the criticisms are more precise. I shall return to a number of the points raised during the course of my remarks.

At the outset may I insist that on the part of the Commission there is absolutely no complacency about the threat to the environment of the Mediterranean basin. Some Members may be aware that I did make a speech

Clinton Davis

about the Mediterranean a couple of months ago in Marseilles — Mr Bombard was there — and I concluded that speech by saying 'I am aware that safeguarding the Mediterranean basin and reducing marine pollution are problems that cause acute concern here in the south of the Community. These are problems I consider to be of extreme importance, and they are at the top of my political agenda'. I did not make those remarks idly.

Obviously it is for parliamentarians to decide whether to applaud or attack this or that detail of Commission policy. But nobody should be in any doubt about the Commission's resolve first, to give the highest priority to the protection of the environment and, secondly, to develop in advance practical policies which will guarantee that protection throughout the Community.

Let me remind the House of the principal elements of the Commission's communication to the Council. It is the objective of the Commission first, to direct greater political attention to the particular environmental problems of the Mediterranean basin: hydrocarbon pollution, industrial effluents, scarcity of clean waters, and so on; secondly, to create a coordinated strategy and plan of action for the protection of the Mediterranean environment, a strategy known by the acronym of MEDSPA — we live in an unfortunate age of acronyms; thirdly, to support this strategy by specific scientific and technical research; fourthly, to implement a number of short-term measures, notably in the fields of water supply and quality, waste management, rational use of land and coordinated international action; fifthly, to plan with the aid of a specially-established advisory committee a long-term strategy for environmental protection in the region — this would involve information gathering on foreseeable ecological problems, feasibility studies, pilot schemes, etc.; and sixthly, to earmark a sufficient volume of resources to allow these measures which I have just summarized to be effectively carried out.

I invite Parliament to agree that this is a comprehensive set of environmental policies complementing the economic and social provisions contained in the Integrated Mediterranean Programme. I can't share the view of the author of the report, therefore, that the Commission's communication is disappointing.

I turn now to some of the detailed criticisms that have been made. Mrs Dupuy correctly emphasizes that in order to tackle effectively ecological problems in the region, Community action on its own is insufficient. She suggests that the terms of bilateral agreement which the Community has with the southern Mediterranean be extended to make provision for environmental protection. I must point out that such provision already exists inside these agreements. Indeed, they cover Arab States bordering on the Mediterranean as well as Israel, a point to which she specifically referred. Should suitable projects be agreed, the Com-

munity is ready in principle to provide the necessary finance.

In the motion for a resolution — I here refer to paragraph 14 — the Community is invited to launch a major information campaign to alert the public to the need to protect our sea and coastal areas. In reply, I have to say that the Delors Commission is, for its part, giving a very high priority to environmental protection. I trust that this is reflected in all the policies which we are bringing forward. Secondly, preparations are now well under way inside the Commission for the European Year of the Environment in 1987. I assure the House that marine pollution will receive the attention it deserves in those preparations. Making people even more keenly aware of the threat to our natural surroundings will also be a principal theme in the European Year of the Environment programme. I hope this goes a long way to meeting the specific concerns which have been expressed by Mrs Dupuy and by other Members of the House in this regard.

The report regrets the fact that scant attention has been paid in the Commission's communication to the problem of forests. I can only remind the House of two points in this regard. First, that the communication obviously does not provide the last word on the subject of environmental protection in the Mediterranean. What it is is a framework which will allow the Community to respond to the whole gamut of environmental problems in the region. Of course, there is so much more to be said about each aspect of policy, including forestry. The communication represents simply a beginning.

Next, I call honourable Members' attention to the remarks that I made to Parliament in February about the review of forestry policy, which I have initiated inside the Commission. Obviously, I shall report to Parliament on this review as soon as possible.

This has been, I think, as I said at the beginning a useful and important debate which has once again directed our attention to the pressing need to guarantee the environmental heritage of the Mediterranean for future generations. While we may disagree over particular aspects of policy, it is obviously true that both Parliament and Commission share the same basic objective. Of that I am quite certain.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

9. *Animal feedingstuffs*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-23/85) by Mr Mertens, on behalf of the Committee

President

on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection,

- on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc 2-686/84 - COM(84) 445 final) for a directive amending Directive 74/63/EEC on the fixing of maximum permitted levels for undesirable substances and products in feedingstuffs, Directive 77/101/EEC on the marketing of straight feedingstuffs and Directive 79/373/EEC on the marketing of compound feedingstuffs.

Mr Elliott (S). — Mr President, under Rule 85 I should like to move that this report be referred back to committee. In a few brief words I should like to explain why. The principal reason is that important though this report is and much as I agree with the basic principle of attempting to secure a greater enforcement and tightening up of health and safety requirements as far as human consumption of milk and dairy products is concerned, there have been, very unusually in the case of this report, adverse opinions from two other major committees of this Parliament. What is at issue here is not necessarily the principle but the detail of implementation which contains within it some very complex and difficult technical aspects and it therefore seems to me that it would be to everyone's advantage if this report were to go back for further consideration. In that way we might end up by achieving the objectives of the report in a more satisfactory manner. I would like to so move.

Mrs Daly (ED). — Mr President, I would like to support what Mr Elliott said. My group feels that the report is worthy of further consideration. It is clear that there are differences of opinion between the various committees that have submitted opinions. As Mr Elliott says, it may be to the benefit of everyone if it could be referred back to the committee. My group supports his request for this.

Mr Mertens (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, let me begin by saying that I find it unusual for a motion for referral back to committee to be moved before the discussion and consideration of such a matter. Quite apart from that, this kind of move was to be expected because the UK position — as I must admit — is a rather difficult one. Historical developments in the United Kingdom, and the fact that no compound feedingstuff manufacturers exist there although they obviously should, has given rise to the wish on both sides for referral back to committee. I must tell you quite plainly that I do not think much of that. There are differences of opinion. If we are seeking legal uniformity — which is what we want in Europe — we must accept the situation that rather different conditions obtain in nine of the Member States from those in the tenth.

I do not think referring the matter back to committee again will make much difference. What is that

expected to achieve? I am asking you in all seriousness! The committee will not change its opinion! The committee has examined very carefully the two opinions to which Mr Elliott referred. I am quite prepared to discuss them in my report, but I am also quite sure that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection will not reach any different conclusion after examining these two opinions. That is why I categorically oppose the motion by Mr Elliott and Mrs Daly.

Mrs Weber (S), Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is inevitable for committees to make different recommendations. The committee responsible, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, has submitted this report for a vote in this House in full knowledge of the other committees' opinions and takes the view that this report should be voted during this part-session. As chairman I can only give my full support to the rapporteur here.

What the rapporteur just said about the problems of referral back to committee is quite right, for it is hardly likely that the committee will reach a different conclusion on the basis of the same documents, the same preliminary considerations and the same reasons, i.e. when this report is next submitted we will come to the same conclusions and have the same difficulties in the House. So I would ask you to proceed along the lines proposed by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

(Parliament rejected Mr Elliott's request)

Mr Mertens (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, when you announced this item on the agenda, Mr President, you made it clear that we are really dealing with three directives which are now to be amended or made more specific at the proposal of the Commission. Let me make some preliminary remarks here. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, which had to draw up the report as the committee responsible, was not entirely pleased about that. I do not want to discuss this procedure at any length, but I would advise the Commission not to proceed this way in future.

I will come to the heart of the matter at once. What are we concerned with here? We are concerned with the fact that the Commission discovered in recent years that the basic directive was inadequate, especially for combating the dangers of aflatoxins. This dangerous poison, aflatoxin, can enter the food chain through feedingstuffs, milk, etc., and is very bad and carcinogenic.

Why did the Commission discover this? Well, because it noticed that the definition of the maximum permit-

Mertens

ted value for the finished products and the individual ingredients of feedings-tuffs contained in the basic directives was not adequate. These compounds are now manufactured in nearly all farms. Who is going to control this in the end? That is a very uncertain question. That is why the Commission decided to lay down maximum values for the raw materials for feedings-tuffs to avert this danger. So far, so good.

Then we got the opinions of the other committees, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Development and Cooperation, who asked whether if we set very rigid maximum values for the raw materials we will not then run a great risk of getting into difficulties with the supplier countries of these feedings-tuffs. To name only a few, they are Argentina, China, Brazil, India and in particular Third World countries such as Sudan, Malawi, Gambia, Senegal, Guinea, etc. And the second cause for concern was that if maximum values are laid down, will it then be possible to avert the danger by organizing the necessary spot checks? Let me say a few words on the first point. It is not inconceivable that difficulties may arise here and there. But the committee has tried to take that concern into account by allowing itself to be persuaded that the maximum values should not be fixed so strictly, and it decided by a large majority not to fix 0.1 or even lower ppm values but to fix a value of 0.2 ppm.

We are now convinced in the committee that this will work, because some Member States have already been applying these maximum values and because the committee has said that we will talk about it with the supplier countries, we will keep them informed, to ensure that everything works out.

Let me now say something about controls. Of course one can say that it is not easy to check a ship's cargo at the port of entry because many ships have delivered supplies here. One would have to take several samples; but we were also convinced in the committee that if the necessary care and modern methods of analysis are used, it will be possible to make such checks successfully.

We have tried to take account of the various opinions. I need not discuss any further the British position since we already dealt with it earlier in the context of Mr Elliott's motion. Just let me say that I have much understanding for it, but I would also ask the interested Members from the United Kingdom for their part to show some understanding for other countries. One cannot always take a one-sided view and there have now been a number of occasions on which we too have found it difficult enough to show understanding.

Let me now move on from this general matter to that of Community feedings-tuffs, for time is running out. Mr President, you are beckoning to me already, I can see. I will be very brief and say that anyone who is interested can read it up, it is all in the report.

To repeat, Mr President, and I will conclude now, it would be no help to us to rethink this matter, to discuss it again. Let me close this chapter by quoting from Goethe's 'Hermann and Dorothea': 'He who vacillates in his mind in times of vacillation only increases the evil and spreads it even further; but he who makes up his mind firmly will shape the world'. I think that is what we should say about this matter and that it should also serve as a guideline for this European Parliament.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, I would just like, more on a point of personal refutation and refutation from my national groups — if I may call them that — to make it quite clear that Mr Mertens is totally erroneous when he claims that we are expressing a UK point of view. Not in any way! I did not move this reference back. Mr Elliott did from the Socialist Group, which I believe, had agreed between themselves so to do . . .

President. — Mr Sherlock, I am going ahead as it is late at night. Mrs Daly, from your own group, will be speaking and she will have the opportunity of making any of the refutations that need to be made.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — (NL) Mr President, one of the pleasantest things about sitting in this hemisphere so late at night is that European poetry sometimes has a chance.

Thank you, Mr Mertens, for that splendid quotation. Mr President, this directive is particularly important for the health of the population. It always seems a little strange when one suddenly sees people putting on their armour because they demand the right to have cancer. The rules presented relate to all EC countries. They concern the raw materials intended for the preparation of animal feeding-stuffs which after some time reappear in the food chains and if something goes wrong with them they may in fact cause cancer. The cancer-producing fungus is identified as *Aspergillus flavus* — that is not Goethe, but at least a kind of Latin. This mould produces a toxin, aflatoxin, and that aflatoxin is very frequently found in, amongst other things, stocks of ground-nuts and also in maize and rice. Aflatoxin B1 is one of the most carcinogenic substances. It is therefore important that we should ensure that ground-nut meal, which is much used in cattle feed, and for that matter also poorer quality maize, soya and so on, are aflatoxin free. Because aflatoxin reappears in the milk and produces the notorious aflatoxin M which is very clearly identified in all scientific publications as a carcinogenic factor.

The consequences are sometimes catastrophic as a result of the presence of even a small amount of fungus occurring in cattle-feed. In the winter of 1983/84 for example traces of aflatoxin M were found in Belgium in 48.1% of samples of milk. It is therefore tre-

Van Hemeldonck

mentously important that action should be taken. I realize, and the disagreement between the three committees concerned, namely Public Health on the one hand and Agriculture and the Committee on Development on the other has become clear, that the logic is that we must seek the most appropriate rules so that the baby is not thrown out with the bath water.

It is clear that we must ensure that good technical committees are established and that we have uniform operation of those technical committees and also that there are more experts, that is toxicologists, as members. There is no sense in putting on them all sorts of representatives of no matter what. The question is the identification and quantification of a toxic product.

Complaints have been made that we wish suspected cargoes to be preventively impounded. But you also know well that if parts of those cargoes enter a harbour, a considerable time elapses between the time of the taking of a random sample and the availability of the laboratory results. By the time the test results are known tonnes may have been shipped to other countries, particularly if it is known that the harbours of importation for ground-nut meal amongst other things are in particular Rotterdam and Antwerp, from where transshipment to other countries takes place very rapidly. Hence we insist that rules must be made and hence we insist that the rules must be prepared with the collaboration of expert toxicologists. On the other hand we also feel that thought must be devoted to the question who must bear the costs of examination. In Belgium that is the Ministry of Agriculture and we thought that in fact it could be inserted in the rules on public health.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — Mr President, may I straight away congratulate Mr Mertens on his report and on the very well-balanced and reasonable approach to what must be regarded as both a serious and very difficult matter to take care of.

No matter what our interests are, none of us would want to risk the possibility of people's health being put in danger through residues in meat or milk arising from contaminated animal feeds.

As we all know, raw materials are very often fed straight — and I am pleased to see that when precautions are being taken, not only the compounds but the ingredients that make up the compounds are being included for analysis and standards. Mr Mertens is himself an experienced farmer. I am sure he has looked at this from all angles. I must say that I am not particularly happy that the Commission has thought its proposals through sufficiently, or if it has, that sufficient information has not yet come through on the methods to be used on the monitoring and on the enforcement procedures generally. Neither have I seen even a rough estimate of the cost to producers, consumers or taxpayers. Are the suppliers of the raw materi-

als to be held responsible, or is to be the importers or the exporters? Is it the final user of the products? If it is, I am very concerned because, as we know, at least in Ireland, much of the feed used by farmers is both prepared and produced by themselves — the grinding, the mixing and the whole ingredient preparations. They are not equipped for this, and I hope that it will be done exclusively at import level where raw materials are concerned; raw materials that we know are likely to provide the right type of medium for the growth of the type of fungus that we are talking about.

I have learnt a lot about this since this set of proposals came before us. I certainly did not know what the whole thing was about for a long time and I have come across a lot of new things that I never saw in writing before. Obviously, aflatoxins are very dangerous substances, but I think that we may well be using a steamroller to do a nut-cracker's job and that we could stop this at import points on products that we know to be dangerous from the point of view of providing the suitable growth medium for this type of fungus.

I am very pleased that we are looking at this report seriously, but we talk about the dangers of cancer arising from this. How much information have we to indicate that this is a serious source? We all know that cancer arises from many sources and we know, for instance, that smoking is a very serious cause of cancer. We have not, to my knowledge, any common approach to restricting smoking or getting people not to use cigarettes if they want to avoid cancer. Wouldn't we have as much right to interfere in that area as we have in feeding stocks? I would like to get a good deal more information, and I have some sympathy with the views of those here this evening who said that this should be looked at more seriously, because I have not enough information personally to know whether this is a very necessary move and whether it wouldn't be better to reflect on the matter a little longer and produce more of the sort of information that all of us would want to have. Why are we just picking on this particular item, this particular thing that causes cancer? Does it cause other diseases as well?

This is a very wide-ranging set of proposals. I was nearly frightened, Mr President, when I read that Article 1(7) of this amending directive proposes a new annex which is to fix maximum permitted levels for residues of pesticides and organic chlorine compounds. This list contains 12 substances, and groups of substances including hexachlorobenzene, and heptachlor. If a farmer has the responsibility for ensuring that that sort of feed is not fed to his stock, how is he to equip himself to do so? I hope that it is certainly confined to raw materials and to a limited number of well-known raw materials in which this type of fungus grows.

Mrs Daly (ED). — Mr President, I am sorry that Mr Mertens did not accept the proposal to return this to

Daly

the committee. I understood that he would be prepared to do so before the proposal was put by Mr Elliott. However, I must reject his suggestion that I am speaking on behalf of the UK and only in the interests of the UK. I prepared my report on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, and I was representing the interests of developing countries. That is made very clear in my opinion.

Mr Mertens said that aflatoxin is a dangerous substance which can possibly cause cancer. It is because it is a dangerous substance that can cause cancer that I fully agree with Mark Clinton when he says that we need to look more closely at what is being proposed. You are suggesting that you have all the answers, and I put it to you with great respect that we do not have all the answers. That is why we are asking for it to be looked at again. I did not know anything about aflatoxin and, like Mr Clinton, I have learned a lot about it, but I have not been given one shred of scientific evidence by the Commission, who asked to see me twice, and on another occasion, Mr Sherlock and myself. We have not been given a shred of scientific evidence to back up their case. Not only did they tell us that more than one substance needed checking, but when I put it to them that up to 150 substances might need checking, they did not deny that either. They said that they had in mind five or six but that they would not put any specific number in their directive. I think this is extremely silly, indeed extremely dangerous, when we are talking about a substance like aflatoxin. I really want to appeal to you to look at this again.

As far as the developing countries are concerned — and I cannot go along with Mr Clinton about checking at the point of import — we believe that it should be checked in the compound feedingsuffs. As to your observation that the UK has a special interest here, the UK is one of the two countries that have actually implemented the original Council Directive. We believe that if other countries had implemented the original Council Directive, we would not have the problem we have today. I understand from the Commission that aflatoxin has been found in German milk. If the original directive had been applied that would not be the case. Is it right to put in jeopardy the economies of many of the developing countries? There only has to be a fear that a substance which causes cancer is coming in, and not only would one cargo be returned but all cargoes would be refused from some of those countries. That would have a tremendously serious effect on their economies. So I really do appeal

to you, Mr Mertens, to look again at the whole question and to reconsider the request to refer the report back to committee so that it can be more properly examined with all the facts and not just the few that are in front of us at the moment.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, we all know what can happen if contaminated feedingsuffs are marketed. In the end we find that whole herds of cattle have to be slaughtered because the meat is already so polluted that it is no longer suitable for consumption, at least not without serious damage to health. So, directives are urgently needed.

The directive before us now is really no more than a first, very small step. I am deliberately saying small step, for unfortunately it is really no more than that. We simply must reject the proposed maximum value of 0.3. By now agreeing to 0.2, we are making an exceptional compromise. For my own group, I would have had to demand at least 0.1, and then I would have had a bad conscience.

These EEC directives should also have covered any residues of pesticides. We should also have a ban on mixing over-contaminated raw materials in feedingsuffs. Moreover, we should ban imports of over-contaminated raw materials. In addition, the labelling should indicate the country of origin and, of course, the composition. Furthermore, and that is the most vital thing of all and not mentioned here at all, total tolerance level should be introduced for harmful substances and residues in feedingsuffs.

Finally, it would be most important for our entire EEC agricultural budget to make it compulsory to use Community feedingsuffs in the compounds, for then we would get rid of a lot of problems.

Looked at from these aspects, it will, of course, unfortunately be necessary for the Commission to present a new directive for us to adopt very soon and I would ask it to do so, for the directive before us really is only a tiny step and a patching-up job.

President. — In view of the lateness of the hour, we shall now adjourn.

(The sitting was closed at 12. midnight)¹

¹ *Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 10 MAY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Arndt; Mr Fich; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Klepsch; Mr Arndt; Mr Herman; Mr von der Vring; Mrs Viehoff</i>	268	<i>Cornette; Mr Mertens; Mr Sherlock; Mrs Weber</i>	278
2. <i>Votes:</i> <i>Mr Ford; Mr Bombard; Mr Eyraud; Mr Pranchère; Mr Zarges; Mr Marshall; Mrs Rabbethge; Mr Wurtz; Mr Chambeiron; Mr von der Vring; Mrs Dupuy; Mrs Squarciar- alupi; Mrs Dupuy; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Adamou; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Filinis; Mr Kuijpers</i>	270	6 <i>Whaling — Second Report (Doc. A 2-22/85) by Mr Muntingh:</i> <i>Mr Muntingh; Mrs Gredal; Mrs Peus; Mr Sherlock; Mr Toksvig; Lord Cockfield (Com- mission); Mrs Gredal; Mr Møller; Mr Mun- tingh; Mrs Péry; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Kuijpers</i>	281
3. <i>Fishery — Report (Doc. A 2-31/85) by Mrs Péry;</i> <i>Mrs Péry; Mr Guerneur; Mr Mosar (Com- mission); Mr Seligman</i>	276	7. <i>Toxicology — Report (Doc. A 2-26/85) by Mrs Schleicher:</i> <i>Mrs Schleicher; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Elliott; Lord Cockfield (Commission); Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Lord Cockfield; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Filinis; Mr Kuijpers; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark</i>	287
4. <i>Provisional twelfths — Report (Doc. A 2-32/ 85) by Mr Fich:</i> <i>Mr Fich; Mr Mosar (Commission</i>	277	8. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	291
5. <i>Animal feedingstuffs (Doc. A 2-23/85) (con- tinuation):</i> <i>Mr Elliott; Mr Mosar (Commission); Mr C. Jackson; Mr Arndt; Mrs Daly; Mrs Lentz-</i>			

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Madam President, I see from the minutes that, contrary to what Mr Klepsch claimed yesterday, when the vote was being taken on the motion by the Committee on Budgets on the British contribution, a clear majority of the Socialist Group voted in favour of the Fich report. In fact, the number of Socialists who voted for it was exactly the same as the total number of Christian-Democratic Group members in the Chamber. I wanted to make this point to correct a false impression given.

While I am on that subject, I should also like to say — and this goes for all the groups, my own included — that I am deeply ashamed that in a budget vote only 250 Members saw fit to fulfil their obligations as Members of this House.

President. — Your remarks have been noted, Mr Arndt.

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Madam President, on the same subject: I too have gone systematically through the list of who voted for what yesterday in the budget vote and I must place on record that on the question to which Mr Klepsch referred yesterday the Socialist Group voted unanimously, with the exception of the British Members, as regards what Mr Arndt had proposed. Mr Klepsch, your statement yesterday that Mr Arndt was a minority leader of the Socialist Group is thus disproved.

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — (FR) You will doubtless recall that on Thursday afternoon Mr Cassidy called certain members of my group 'heirs of Hitler'. This unfortunate phrase, for which he has still not apologized, although his group dissociated itself from what he said, is reproduced today in an official document of Directorate-General for Information and Public Relations of this Parliament, and it seems to me unfortunate, to say the very least, that one should find these words reproduced in a document of that kind.

I would ask you to take appropriate steps to ensure that the final version of this document either contains Mr Cassidy's apologies or excludes all reference to this unfortunate incident.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Roelants du Vivier, I take note of your statement. I am not quite sure whether the publication to which you refer is really an official document, but I will take up the matter with the Bureau and we shall see to it that it is put right.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) I made two observations yesterday on which I should like to say a few further words. It is true that because of the small number of votes in favour of the Fich report, I assumed that the majority of the Socialist Group could not have voted for it. Having perused the voting lists, however, I realize that Mr Arndt was right in what he said just now. He also put his finger on the reason why such an impression could have been given, namely, the meagre number of Members present in the Chamber. However, I did make a second point yesterday which I should like to stress once again. Mr Arndt disputed it yesterday and continues to dispute it. I said yesterday that the second part of the Barbarella amendment, which was to have stitched Parliament's legal position into the draft budget, was rejected because of the Socialist Group, because only the other parts of the House — which were in favour of this legal position — voted for this amendment.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) It would seem to me that we are not on the same wavelength here. I expressly pointed out that Mrs Barbarella's Amendment No 287 to Chapters 13 and 21, i.e. on own resources, hence on revenue, had been withdrawn. This was the amendment we were dealing with, and it was on that that I spoke. You should listen to me more carefully and not be dragging in other amendments by Mrs Barbarella which I did not mention at all.

President. — Gentlemen, I feel we have had all the explanations we need on this particular matter.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) The Minutes of Proceedings list the explanations of vote, and I should like to point out that my name is not included even though I did ask to make an explanation of vote and provided it in writing.

President. — Mr Herman, I think you will find the written explanations of vote in the Report of Proceedings.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) I am well aware that the Minutes do not reproduce the explanations of vote, but they do list the persons who gave an explanation of vote, and since I was among them and my name is not included, I am asking for it to be inserted. That is all.

President. — Very well, Mr Herman.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Madam President, I thought for a moment that the floor was being thrown open again for explanations of vote. Obviously, however, that was only for political group chairmen. I do not want to make any further explanation of vote at this point.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) Madam President, in the Dutch version of yesterday's minutes, on page 50, it is stated: '*mevrouw Viehoff vraagt dat de posten in verband met de bekendmaking van de hoofdelijke stemmingen over dit verslag officieel worden medegedeeld.*' I take it there is a printing error here. It should read *kosten* and not *posten*.

President. — That was a misprint, Mrs Viehoff. It will be corrected.

(Parliament approved the minutes)¹

¹ Documents received — Membership of committees and parliamentary delegations — Petitions — Referral to committees — Change in referrals Procedure without report: see Minutes.

2. Votes

Interim report (Doc. A 2-24/85) by Mr Galluzzi, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the economics and trade relations between the EEC and the Mediterranean countries pending the development of the plans to enlarge the European Community to include Spain and Portugal

Explanations of vote

Mr Ford (S). — I shall be very brief. I would like to apologize to Mr Galluzzi for not being here at the beginning of the vote. I only realized that it was taking place as I was walking across. I will be supporting the report, which is a very good one. Nevertheless, we must recognize in this Parliament that the issue of Gibraltar is an issue with which we must deal sooner or later. We continually ignore it and hope it will go away. It will not. It is a small part of the Community, I agree, but it is a part that this Parliament will have to start dealing with some time.

Mr Bombard (S), in writing. — (FR) I shall vote for Mr Galluzzi's resolution. However, a new state of mind must be born in the Mediterranean region if those States which are not members of the EEC are not to be reduced to wretchedness and despair.

We must establish a proper economic environment in the Mediterranean region — that is to say, a balance.

Israel and Morocco have to pay for the transport of their citrus fruits and Tunisia and Algeria for the transport of their olive oil: the Community must establish trade agreements with these countries. Let us not forget that they, too, are Europe's customers.

I say 'Yes' to Community preference for Spain, but there must also be economic and social justice for all the Mediterranean countries. The EEC's desire for these things needs urgently to be seen in order to remove the legal and economic uncertainties affecting non-member countries.

The Mediterranean region must remain a region of balance and harmony among nations. In that way we may, perhaps, help to achieve peace in the Near East.

Mr Eyraud (S), in writing. — (FR) Most Europeans are happy to see Spain and Portugal entering the European Economic Community. At the same time, they are aware of the precarious balance that reigns around the Mediterranean seaboard.

The political stability of the Maghreb countries — Morocco, Algeria and particularly Tunisia — and of

the Mashreq countries — Egypt, Syria and Jordan — not to mention the Lebanon and Israel as well, depends to a very great degree upon their economic equilibrium.

This is conditioned by their exports to the Community. Commissioner Cheysson made the point very well during the debate by taking the example of Tunisia, two-thirds of whose population live from agriculture — essentially, olive-oil production.

I would also stress the importance of citrus fruit exports from Israel and Morocco to the EEC.

A clear mandate to the Commission and the Council to negotiate with these countries is therefore indispensable, and this is emphasized in the motion for a resolution, particularly now that Amendment No 8 has been adopted. The agreements must lay down the quantities to be imported into the Community, and fair competition *vis-à-vis* Spanish and Portuguese produce must be made possible.

Such an attitude would strengthen not only the internal situation of these countries but also the image of the Community.

Moreover, a normalization of relations between Spain and Israel would be welcome, since this would finally efface the dispute inherited from the Franco dictatorship, which Felipe Gonzales' Government has done much to attenuate.

Having made these points, we shall vote for the motion for a resolution.

Mr Pranchère (COM), in writing. — (FR) It is our view that enlargement is not in the Community's interests, but there is every indication that it will also have very undesirable repercussions on the economies of the Mediterranean countries and on the future of our trade with these countries. The Mediterranean countries have, moreover, long been aware of this and have made known their concern on more than one occasion.

The Community undertook to state its position regarding the future of relations with these countries before negotiations on the accession of Spain and Portugal were concluded, but we have still got no further than declarations of intent. Not only have no practical measures as yet been taken, but the Commission proposes to maintain present trade levels during the transitional period — one asks oneself how — and only afterwards to engage in discussions aimed at preserving the balance in our relations with these countries.

Permit me to state emphatically that these discussions should have been started before the negotiations on accession had been concluded and not after.

Pranchère

In actual fact, the Community has no solution to offer these countries. If it had had one to offer, it would already have done so. As it is, it is asking them to retreat in order better to attack.

When one bears in mind that olive oil provides a livelihood for roughly one million people in Tunisia and citrus fruits and tomatoes do the same for 900 000 in Morocco, one cannot remain indifferent to the grave social consequences that enlargement is bound to have for the Maghreb countries. I will go further and say that in the long run these countries will be forced to look for other partners — and let us not forget that in the year 2000 the market Europe stands to lose will amount to 100 million individuals.

The report now before us sets out the importance of finding solutions within the framework of a plan of concerted action, but it does not say specifically what these solutions are to be. In our view, this is because one cannot work for one goal and at the same time for its opposite. The enlargement advocated by the rapporteur does not allow of any possibility of envisaging in a positive way the future of our relations with these countries.

These are the reasons why the report now to be put to the vote cannot have our approval.

Mr Zarges (PPE), in writing. — (DE) For the EPP group I should like to emphasize strongly the demand in the Galluzzi Report that the enlargement of the EC shall not damage the riparian countries of the Mediterranean region. It is true that we have no right, as Mr Galluzzi claims, to prescribe for these countries how they must organize their market, nor can we deny them access to the EC market. Let us not forget that it was the EC that encouraged those countries to organize their range of products in such a way that they could supply the needs of the people in the Community particularly as regards citrus fruits. I am thinking today particularly of Israel, with which I fully sympathise.

And let me interpolate this: It will not do, on such a day, to remember with due sorrow the Jews to whom such cruel wrong was done, particularly by my native land, and yet at the same time not to be prepared to stand at the side of that country in the questions of life and death which beset it today.

These countries are therefore entitled to expect from us that by our policy we shall at least ensure that tomorrow too access to the EC for their most important fruit and vegetable exports is guaranteed to the same extent as before.

Allow me to make a comment on another point in the Galluzzi report, namely the problem of emigration in relation to the traditional countries of emigration, Spain and Portugal. On this historical ninth of May,

on which we must concern ourselves particularly with human rights for Europeans, we must refer above all to the basic right of freedom of movement for persons, a basic requirement of European policy. But freedom of movement means in its most basic sense that a human being has the right to determine by the exercise of his own free will whether he wishes to remain in his own familiar land of his birth or to choose another country as the centre of his existence. Many Spaniards and Portuguese leave their native land, not voluntarily but from poverty, from fear for their existence, because at home they have no chance of feeding their families and themselves. European policy, which claims to be socially responsible, must change this situation, must overcome the social disequilibrium in the Community as regards now Spain and Portugal because only so can a genuine people's Community of right and social justice be created. For such a policy we must exert ourselves in the European Parliament and at home — which means too that we must passionately resist campaigns of racism and xenophobia. Certainly the State ought not to become the initiator of measures and programmes; it is rather the task of politicians and parties and all social groups within our States to combat racism and to convince our citizens that we wish to construct Europe not only at the top but in and for human beings. And that means that we are for an integration of those who are ready for it and that we stand for peaceful and harmonious co-existence of people from the most varied nations. Only then can we build a Europe which will be a treasury of justice, of humanity and of freedom, worth fighting for.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-27/85) by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the cooperation agreements with the developing countries of the Mediterranean region in the context of a global Mediterranean policy of the Community

Explanations of vote

Mr Marshall (ED), in writing. — Our traditional Mediterranean suppliers suffer from grave economic problems. In Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria they have low incomes, widespread unemployment and poverty on a scale many in Europe cannot comprehend. One of the most harrowing experiences in these countries is

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 5 to 7 and 11;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 4 and 8 to 10.

Marshall

the sight of young children, often suffering from malnutrition, begging in the streets.

In Israel the problem is different but severe — very high inflation and a massive trade deficit with the Community. Israel has a major dependence on Europe as a market for her fruit and vegetables.

In the case of Cyprus trade relations between her and us have developed more slowly than Cyprus wishes because of a lack of will on the part of the European Community.

Thus in the case of all of these countries we owe a deep debt. They have served Europe well — adding variety to our diet and providing us with a guaranteed supply of good products. They have never let us down. We must not let them down.

Mrs Rabbethge (PPE), in writing. — (DE) He who does not recognize the limits of what is financially possible will get nowhere in politics'.

In our debate on a new Mediterranean policy we are caught between this axiom of the Mayor of Hamburg, Klaus von Dohnanyi, and the view of the Founding Father of the European Community, Jean Monnet.

From the latter I would quote the following words: 'Those who will take no action because they are not sure that things will turn out as they were originally planned thereby condemn themselves to stagnation... A man has got to pursue the same course unwaveringly day after day, never losing sight of a goal that is clearly etched on the eye of the mind'.

Here in Parliament I too have joined with particular fervour in the choruses of welcome to Spain and Portugal, and now I see the political, economic and above all cultural problems with which we are going to be faced in this entire Mediterranean area.

Olives from Tunisia and lemons from Israel have already been mentioned here today. From the point of view of development in general, however, it seems to me that some thought needs to be given to the question of how throughout this very varied Mediterranean region politics, economics and culture can be released from the isolation and compartmentalization which have characterized them hitherto and harnessed so as to make them work smoothly and effectively together. One of the first points that must be made more clearly is that there is no use in promoting development from above unless there is a corresponding push from below, that is to say, unless the population in general is prepared to be actively involved.

Hitherto the magic word for developing countries has been industrialization. They must be shown that it has no magic powers and that it will not work wonders. The essential precondition for industrial development

is a modern system of agriculture, the creation of which is not a technical but rather a sociological problem.

This entire complex of agriculture, industry and services must be accompanied by what I would call 'cultural investment'. Unless we are prepared to be generous with what we have to offer in the cultural and intellectual fields, there is always the danger that development policy, even here in the Mediterranean region with its varied cultural and intellectual spectrum, will somehow take a wrong turning. We speak of partnership; that is one of our modern buzz words. Partnership, however, has certain severely logical consequences which cannot be shirked. For example, one of these consequences in the cultural field is that our universities must throw open their Arts and Humanities Faculties in order to give the younger generation a chance to learn about the origins and history of their peoples and about the various specific elements in their cultures. All this therefore will call for reforms in our educational systems.

We must do more to get away from the fixed idea we have that development projects are mainly a matter for governments. There is no reason why groups of intelligent and concerned persons should not become more involved in them. Finally, we must learn not to be afraid of the frantic pace of modern life and the speed with which it has been changed by technology and science — something that has often almost frightened us out of our wits — but to understand rather that it is an opportunity that must be grasped. Mankind's enslavement to hunger and want can be overcome with the technological resources now at our disposal.

We in the Christian-Democratic Group support this excellent report by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti in the hope and the firm resolve that East and West, which have such an enormous respect for each other at the present time, will go further and ultimately forge a common overall policy in the Mediterranean region that can only benefit all their peoples. In this area it is not always the greater threat that prevails in the long run but very often the better idea and the clearer vision. A parliamentary assembly along the lines of Lomé — must that remain for ever a dream incapable of fulfilment?

Mr Wurtz (COM), in writing. — (FR) Some ten years ago, the EEC conceived a 'global policy' aimed at establishing relations with each of the countries on the Mediterranean seaboard. The application of these agreements, however, has suffered a setback from the economic crisis, with the result that a re-evaluation of the EEC's policy in this region appears almost as necessary to its Mediterranean associates as it does to the EEC itself.

Today, this re-evaluation is more than ever necessary. The accession of Spain and Portugal, whose products

Wurtz

are in direct competition with those of the EEC's Mediterranean associates, would seriously aggravate what is already a tense situation.

Morocco and Tunisia, for example, have the misfortune to produce goods both agricultural (citrus fruits, olive oil, tomatoes, etc.) and industrial (textiles) which are in direct competition with these two countries of the Iberian peninsula. To this must be added the fact that a Europe of Twelve would be self-sufficient in all these products. Such a situation contains all the seeds of a veritable war of paupers between the peasants of the Mediterranean seaboard and the farmers of Europe.

What are the prospects offered to these countries, who have never been consulted on the consequences that enlargement may have for their productive activity?

Will the EEC make draconian use of Community mechanisms to evict neighbours that have become a nuisance? Or will it have the wisdom to respond to these countries' legitimate concerns by opting for a more appropriate policy which takes the need for complementary relationships better into account and assures them a better development?

Today, the question is still open. Mrs Cassanmagnago's report attempts to furnish a reply, but unfortunately, by accepting enlargement, she is unable to recommend any solution capable of meeting the tremendous problems of these countries. Consequently, we cannot vote in favour of Mrs Cassanmagnago's report, even though it contains certain positive aspects relating to new fields of cooperation between the EEC and the countries of the southern Mediterranean.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-252/85/rev.) tabled by the Committee on Womens's Rights on the World Conference to mark the end of the UN Decade for Women to be held in Nairobi in July 1985

Explanation of vote

Mr Chambeiron (COM), in writing. — (FR) The Nairobi conference which is to close the Decade for Women is, as suggested by the Women's Rights Committee, to provide a special occasion for reviewing the progress made on the position of women throughout the world.

If we take the situation in the EEC, we cannot deny that there have been many changes. Thirty-two mil-

lion, or one-third of the female population, are exercising a gainful occupation. The ambition of women to work, to find more interesting and more highly-skilled employment and to take part on an equal footing in the economic, social and political life of their countries constitutes a new and irreversible phenomenon which is without any doubt the most conspicuous development of these last ten years. With their massive entry into working life, women have conquered for themselves a new place in society, but in many fields, particularly that of gainful employment, equality of status still has to be reached.

Despite the important conquests made during the last ten years, for a majority of women life is harder today than it was in 1975. While it is true that today there are more women gainfully employed, it is equally true that there are ten times as many who are unemployed or who are looking for work.

Women are not tolerating this situation in silence. During these last few years, their demands have become more insistent and they are taking an increasing part in social struggles. Conquests have been made not only in the sphere of legislation but also in that of people's awareness and way of thinking. These conquests are irreversible. The same is true with regard to contraception and abortion, legislation on rape and divorce, and the evolution of new views on the rôle to be played by parents, both within the married couple and within the family. These achievements are considerable, it must be admitted, but for women much remains to be done. Their resolute desire for equality of status and for greater welfare comes up against a major obstacle in the capitalist system based on the fight for the greatest possible profit.

If there is any important lesson to be learned from these last ten years, I would say that, whatever the country and whatever the government, the determining factor has been the intervention of women themselves. The road to equal status is above all the road of action.

Several goals must be worked for: full employment and professional equality, the upgrading of low remuneration scales, the reduction of unequal pay and increase of family benefits.

Work along these lines, if vigorously pursued, would help to get the Community out of the crisis and achieve true equality of opportunity for the women of Europe.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-264/85/rev.) by Mrs Dury and others on the procedures for the payment of aid from the European Social Fund for 1986: adopted

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-317/85) by Mrs Salisch and others on the Social Fund

Explanation of vote

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) I should like to urge the Commissioner to get a very accurate report of what was said yesterday about this matter. The Commission made a very, very poor impression! If there is a threat of jobs for thousands of young people being lost due to negligence or a bureaucratic approach, then this is something that I think the Commission should look at very seriously.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-19/85 by Mrs Dupuy, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-268/84 - COM(84) 206 final) on the protection of the environment in the Mediterranean basin

Paragraph 9 — Amendments Nos 16 and 6

Mrs Dupuy (RDE), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, I am against Amendment No 16. It is pointless. I fail to see how the local authorities can install and dismantle their equipment to suit the season of the year . . .

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) I think that Mrs Dupuy — perhaps because she has come into the Chamber very late — has not read the amendments carefully. The interpretation she is putting before Parliament has never been espoused.

If Mrs Dupuy had read the amendments carefully, she could not now say that the local authorities were involved in the matter. What we are talking about here is the over-population of the Mediterranean during the tourist season.

I realise that Mrs Dupuy has many commitments; however, as rapporteur she is bound to read the amendments attentively and not to present them to the Assembly in a distorted fashion.

Mrs Dupuy (RDE), rapporteur. — (FR) I cannot let it be said that I have expressed a view on amendments without having read them attentively. Indeed, this I have done several times, Madam President.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) Whilst several amendments have been rejected, happily the Assembly has adopted the most important amendments, that is to say, those that best complete Mrs Dupuy's resolution. This being so, we shall vote in favour of the motion for a resolution.

The Mediterranean problem is a gigantic problem. The Mediterranean is an enclosed sea bordered by urban and industrial installations which have a damaging effect on the environment. I believe that, faced with the modest proposal of the Commission, Parliament, by accepting a good few of my amendments, but also by adopting Mrs Dupuy's report, has shown that something more really has to be done. We cannot limit ourselves to what were described in yesterday's debate as aspirin or tranquillisers: the problem of protecting the environment of the Mediterranean basin must be solved quite differently, most especially on the basis of a different sort of political will in conjunction, at the very least, with the third action programme on the environment.

Mr Adamou (COM), in writing. — (GR) Protection of the environment in the Mediterranean basin is an exceptionally urgent and vital need for the population of the countries in that area. Yet the Community's responsible bodies are showing unacceptable sluggishness, which is not unconnected with the well-known interests of monopolistic employers.

The resolution by the Committee on the Environment very rightly voices its disappointment with the Commission proposal, which envisages limited measures many of which are questionable and lacking in cohesion and do not form part of any overall plan for common action.

From a methodological standpoint we think that the problem of protecting the Mediterranean from pollution should be considered entirely separately from the matter of research into and exploitation of maritime resources in the Mediterranean regions. For the latter there exist both integrated studies and a sufficiency of specialized personnel. All the more so, since that sector can be covered by other funds such as the ERDF, the EAGGF and so on.

As for the problem of environmental protection, this should be dealt with in two directions:

Firstly, in relation to the prevention of pollution, legislative measures are needed to localize and neutralize

Adamou

pollutants at source. This should be paid for by the polluters themselves. The 'polluter pays' principle should be ruthlessly implemented, because what has gone on until now has shown that while the responsibility for pollution is usually individual, its cost most often falls upon the public purse.

Secondly, in relation to effective protection, there must be collaboration between all countries whose hydrographic network reaches as far as the Mediterranean. In other words, the problem cannot be dealt with without the cooperation of Central and Eastern European countries, whose hydrographic network is twice the size of the Community's and empties into the Black Sea (Ebro, Danube, Dnieper, Don). This means that huge quantities of fresh water are discharged into the Black Sea, pass through the Dardanelles into the Aegean and the Mediterranean and play a fundamental part in determining the climate, the hydrosystem and the biosystem of the latter. Consequently it is meaningless to speak of protecting the Mediterranean against pollution unless those countries cooperate as well.

On the basis of the above comments, Greece's position and the extremely acute problem of environmental pollution that Greece faces, we will support the resolution and the report by the Committee on the Environment, in the hope that something positive may be achieved.

Mr Buttafuoco (DR), in writing. — (IT) I am grateful to Mrs Dupuy for the excellent report she has presented, on behalf of the Environment Committee, on the protection of the Mediterranean basin. I am grateful to her because she has focussed on a problem that concerns me very much as the inhabitant of a littoral State and, what is more, of a Mediterranean island. The Mediterranean, the Community sea *par excellence*, the cradle of civilization, is now in a state of extreme pollution.

Leaving aside the learned quotations of our French colleague on the erosion of the seabed, on the specific climate, on the crisis in the Mediterranean's fishing resources, I think it should be pointed out that the protection of the basin's environment has so far been utterly ignored by the public authorities and by the senior officials of the countries concerned. I am of the opinion that all the Community States should be deeply concerned with the problem, and not just those that directly border the Mediterranean — of which there are three, to be joined tomorrow by Spain.

The Community must step in, and it must do so on the basis of integrated policies involving the regional, agricultural, social and industrial sectors, since the ever-growing deterioration of the situation has now reached a critical stage and the outlook is catastrophic.

One has only to think of the tons of waste which our industries discharge into the Mediterranean by way of

rivers that are now irreversibly polluted: five thousand tonnes of zinc, two thousand tonnes of lead, one thousand tonnes of chromium and mercury — twenty times as much as the poisons that go into the Atlantic, and not counting the recurring accidents — like that which recently occurred in the Messina Straits — which make the situation even worse.

As to what can be done about all this, Mrs Dupuy referred to a plan of action for the Mediterranean drawn up by the Barcelona Convention of 1976 under the auspices of the United Nations, of which the most interesting part, in my opinion, is the setting up of a Consultative Committee chaired by the Commission and comprising 12 experts from the Member States, the purpose of which, among other things, is to coordinate all the Community bodies concerned with the problem with a view to avoiding unnecessary duplication of effort.

The Consultative Committee, which has completed only the first part of its five-year programme launched in 1978 and which is still waiting for the go-ahead to finalize its programme, would appear to be a necessary requirement pending integrated action to solve the environmental crisis of the Mediterranean basin.

It is important that the populations concerned by the serious threat of pollution should be kept constantly informed and that the regional and local authorities should be involved in the various Community projects to protect the Mediterranean environment, a region which is of great importance not only for its history and culture but also on account of its character as a centre of equilibrium and exchange.

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) The problem of pollution in the Mediterranean has become increasingly acute to such a degree — and is besides so well-known due to the publicity devoted to the matter in recent years — that nobody is unaware of its importance. Both statistics and our day-to-day experience show how compelling, for those of us who live in Mediterranean countries, the need to do something about the many ecological disasters that have occurred has become.

From this point of view, the development of an overall programme of action by the Community for environmental protection in the Mediterranean is an essential step. And this is precisely where we agree with the motion for a resolution when it characterizes the Commission's announcement as disappointing. Its proposals fail to define any general action, with a resultant lack of cohesion and fragmentation of activities which could have constituted specific thematic unities. Another very important comment in the motion for a resolution is that it will first be necessary to draw up a systematic catalogue of the damage done and of the efforts made, though this must not delay the initiation of measures and the formulation of guidelines.

Filinis

At this point I would like to stress two matters which we believe merit more attention. One relates to cooperation between the Community and other Mediterranean countries. Greece is greatly affected by the environmental policy of her neighbours, and much less so by the policy of the other Community countries. For us it is important that the Community should exercise its authority and weight to secure the widest possible cooperation within the Mediterranean area.

A second basic point is that there must be economic and technical support, so that the necessary technology can be acquired. Some efforts do not prosper precisely because there is a lack of technological know-how, especially in the sector of cleaning up dumped wastes. To acquire the necessary technology is often impossible without adequate economic aid.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC), in writing. — (NL) In September 1984 we had the *Mont Louis* accident off the Flemish coast of Belgium. In early May 1985 members of Greenpeace conducted a campaign against the dumping of titanium dioxide in the North Sea. These are just two examples that show how little is really being done to look after our North Sea.

As far as the Mediterranean is concerned, the situation is alas even worse. It is the most polluted sea in Western Europe and its level of pollution is now becoming critical. Spanish accession to the EEC makes it easier to set up a European action programme.

In the short term therefore urgent protective measures are needed, whilst in the longer term an internationally coordinated rehabilitation programme is necessary. This programme should provide for sanctions against the polluters and be coupled with an international information campaign. Consequently, we support this report and urge once again the introduction of a maritime code within the framework of general transfrontier environmental codes.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

3. *Fishery*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A2-31/85 by Mrs Pery, on behalf of the Committee on

Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM (85) 33 final — Doc. C2-13/85) for a regulation concerning the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar on fishing off the coast of Madagascar.

Mrs Pery (S), rapporteur. — (FR) The Agreement negotiated between the Community and Madagascar, at the request of this country's government, concerns fishing off the coast of this island. The Commission's proposal is entirely positive, respecting, as it does, the interests, properly understood, of both the Community and of Madagascar. At present, Community vessels do not fish in the waters of Madagascar. Fishery resources in this part of the Indian Ocean are not well known and so it is something of a gamble, but European fishermen have to be found new fishing zones in view of the losses suffered by deep-sea fleets in the exclusive zones and also in view of the forthcoming enlargement.

One can conceive of ocean-going refrigerator vessels or French canning vessels fishing for tunny, or Italian and Greek fishermen fishing for ground-fish and shell-fish in deep waters. Spain, too, is to carry out an experimental fishing-year.

For Madagascar, the Agreement may be expected to promote its in- and off-shore fishing and make possible development projects. Today, fishing supports 8 000 families, and most of their vessels are simple pirogues. This in-shore activity is concentrated on catching prawns and tunny. Some third countries have already made agreements with Madagascar, which has begun to practise the system of joint ventures.

Let us take a closer look at what has been agreed upon. The Agreement is valid for a period of three years, and renewable for two years at a time. It grants fishing rights and licences to Community vessels against payment of a fee. Apart from the financial aspect, however, the Agreement contains a number of provisions concerning the training of Madagascar fishermen, the implementation of projects for developing Madagascar fisheries, the study of fishery resources, and participation in the management and conservation of the biological resources of the Indian Ocean. One of the problems confronting these developing countries is undoubtedly the plundering of their resources by third countries.

We call upon the Commission to make an especial effort to help those developing countries with which we have concluded agreements to carry out inspections in their waters. Both the third Lomé Convention and the FAO World Conference have stressed the fundamental part that fisheries can have to play in the food strategy of developing countries, and we must therefore respect their small-scale fisheries and

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendment No 12;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 4, 6 to 9 and 13 to 20.

Pery

in-shore fishing-zones, take part in the modernization of their fleets and ensure, together with them, a proper management of stocks, whilst helping them to establish an appropriate marketing policy.

Mr President, the thrust of this report has the approval of the Fisheries Sub-committee and also of the Committee on Development. It serves the dual purpose of serving the Community's interests and, at the same time, of pursuing a policy of solidarity with the developing countries. What we are considering here represents a step on the Community's part which has our full support.

Mr Guerneur (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, first of all I offer Mrs Pery my wholehearted congratulations on the excellent quality of the report she has produced. It comes as no surprise, as we are accustomed to receiving from her reports of absolutely first quality.

To this I would simply add that this Agreement is a model of its kind. It does not amount to a purchase of fishing rights in the waters of another country for the purpose of sparing the resources of our own waters; neither is it a pillaging agreement like those we have seen concluded by the Japanese, the Koreans or other Eastern countries: it is a cooperation agreement which reflects a profound desire often expressed by the European Parliament through its initiatives in favour of international solidarity, cooperation and, in particular, food aid.

This Agreement pursues the dual aim of making developing countries self-sufficient in food and offering them economic development. I think it should be followed by many other agreements of the same kind, and I should be highly gratified, for my part, to see the Commission and the Council together launching an energetic diplomatic campaign to increase the number of agreements of this kind in the world, since this would bring development to those countries that need it so urgently and, at the same time, offer new possibilities for employment and economic activity in the countries of Europe.

Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, the Commission congratulates Mrs Pery on her excellent report.

The Commission is gratified to find itself in full agreement with the European Parliament on the principles governing this fisheries agreement. This document is part of the process of extending the exploitation of fish stocks in the Indian Ocean, where the Community is represented by the Island of Reunion and is, thus a riparian State, and also by a fisheries agreement with the Seychelles.

It should be stressed that this Agreement has been concluded in the spirit of the Third ACP-EEC Con-

vention, which itself is in close alignment with the results of the World Conference on Fisheries organized by the FAO.

Following the example of fisheries agreements with other developing countries of Africa or the Indian Ocean, the fisheries agreement with Madagascar takes account of the work of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In this connection, the Community takes a favourable view of all measures taken by a sovereign State to establish an effectual system of inspection within its exclusive economic zone in order to prevent the overexploitation of fish stocks by vessels of third countries. Here it must be pointed out that the Community is bound by Article 3 of the Agreement to ensure that its shipowners observe national regulations concerning fishing activities in the Madagascar fishing zone.

Enjoying, as it does, the support of Parliament, the Commission is prepared, as our interests become clearer, to consider the possibility of asking the Council for a brief to negotiate fisheries agreements with other developing countries of Africa or the Indian Ocean, agreements designed to preserve existing fishing rights, restore those that have lapsed and acquire new fishing rights.

Incidentally, this exercise will take on a new dimension after the accession of Spain and Portugal, since from that moment on the management of fisheries agreements concluded by these countries will be taken over by the Community by virtue of its proper functions in such matters. Moreover, some of these agreements will have to be rapidly integrated in those of the Community, whether in its present or in a renegotiated form.

President. — The debate is closed.

Explanation of vote

Mr Seligman (ED). — I voted in favour of this resolution, but I would also like to stress the importance of covering other islands and countries in that area including Mauritius and Réunion and the Coast of Africa. Having an agreement with Madagascar alone is inadequate, but as the Commissioner said, this is going to be done with other countries as well. On fishing you have to cover the whole region; it is no good just covering one area.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

4. Provisional twelfth

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A2-32/85) by Mr Fich, on behalf of the Committee on

President

Budgets, on the fifth decision authorizing additional provisional twelfths for the 1985 financial year (non-compulsory expenditure).

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Mr President, I can be very brief. As is known, we have no budget for 1985 and therefore we are using the system of provisional twelfths. Difficulties have been encountered here as regards food aid and programmes taking the place of food aid. The Commission has therefore asked for further twelfths in commitment appropriations to the tune of 84 million ECU. The Council of Ministers has already associated itself with this request, and in my report I ask Parliament also to associate itself with this request for further twelfths to ensure the normal implementation of Community food aid. No amendment has been tabled to my report. The report was unanimously adopted in the Committee on Budgets, and I hope that Parliament will also adopt it.

Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, I am grateful to you for having agreed to let me state very briefly the position of the Commission.

In January of this year, the budgetary authority authorized two additional twelfths in payment appropriations amounting to a total of 84.16 million ECU.

The present request concerns commitment appropriations for the payment of advances. An increase in the commitment appropriations available is proving necessary with effect from the month of May, for the provision of food aid has been marked in recent months by the frequent submission of requests for advances, and in order to meet the situation in May and in subsequent months, the Commission has asked the budgetary authority to authorize, under Chapter 92, two additional provisional twelfths in commitment appropriations.

The Council has already given its approval, and your Committee on Budgets proposes that Parliament take a positive decision. In this way, the Commission will be able to continue with the normal provision of food aid and the pace of this aid will not be jeopardized by the rejection of the budget.

These are the remarks that the Commission wished to make with regard to this request.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

5. *Animal feedingstuffs (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report (Doc. A 2-23/85) by Mr Mertens.¹

¹ See the previous day's debates.

Mr Elliot (S). — Mr President, this report is an important one, because it tackles, as we heard last night, an issue which is of concern to a great many people, namely, that of public health. There can be no question that it is necessary to tighten up on the implementation of the regulations on the control of the presence of aflatoxin in animal feedstuffs.

However, as I indicated last night, this is a complex matter. One of the major problems is that the existing regulations are not effectively implemented in many countries. Whilst it may be desirable to tighten up these regulations, there seems little point in having even tighter control if, in fact, the less restrictive control already in operation is not effectively implemented. I do think we need a proper implementation.

I think, too, that we need to tackle very carefully the technical aspects of the matter. It is certainly true that, because of the nature of this material which occurs from biological action, aflatoxin results from the presence of mould growth in animal feedstuffs and may occur in a very capricious manner in a substantial delivery of the materials that make up the feedstuffs and that are imported from other countries. In fact, you may find that the aflatoxin occurs in small pockets within these deliveries, and random checking is not always an effective method of establishing the presence or absence of this dangerous material. I think we need much more technical investigation of this whole question because, if we are really to get to the nub of the question, which is protecting the health of the people who are the ultimate consumers because they consume the dairy produce from the animals to which the feedstuffs are fed, we must tighten up on these things effectively and sensibly.

There is justified concern on the part of some Members about the effect that certain of the proposals may have on Third World countries that are the major exporters to the Community of the raw materials used in these animal feedstuffs. If these regulations are to be adopted and be effectively implemented, then we must have regard to that, possibly by assisting these Third World countries to adopt techniques of detoxification of their materials in advance. If we do not do so, their economies may be very seriously affected and, indeed, we may well find ourselves restricted in the sources from which we can obtain animal feedstuffs to, for example, the United States, in which case we should have a single source of supply but one that was expensive in relation to the cost of materials acquired from the Third World.

I think we would all agree on the basic objective of trying to ensure the maximum possible safety for consumers of milk and other dairy products and elimination of any materials which might be injurious to their health. But I believe it is fraught with technical complications, and, although I support the proposal and am in no way opposed to the object of this resolution, I do think it is essential that the Commission, if this is

Elliot

adopted, should give the most serious consideration to its implications for Third World economies and the effect, too, on the users of these animal feedstuffs in Community countries. Testing procedures, if they are to be adopted at the point of entry, must be genuinely effective and not a very sketchy, random form of checking, for this may well result in the rejection of large deliveries which only suffer from very slight localized contamination or, alternatively, to the acceptance of deliveries which have pockets of contamination. I think that needs to be very carefully examined. We need to look again at the help we may have to give to Third World countries on this whole question. We need, too, to ensure that the checks carried out in Community countries, whether at the port of entry or elsewhere, are genuinely and properly carried out and not in the half-hearted and unsatisfactory manner in which checks are currently carried out.

I personally feel that the maximum permitted level of 0.2 parts per million which is now being proposed in the resolution is a reasonable compromise between the difficulties of testing, the danger of reducing these levels to a point very difficult for the producers of the initial raw materials to achieve, and the need to ensure adequate safety for consumers. Some deliveries are uncontaminated, and it is therefore quite feasible to mix deliveries with a slightly higher level with those where the level is zero so that the resultant level is considerably lower than the maximum of 0.2 parts per million aflatoxin level suggested in the report. The blending processes which can be adopted should make it possible to take care of these situations. So it is not always absolutely necessary to reject a delivery because some small portions of it are contaminated.

It is important to ensure that the level of contamination in the feedstuffs actually consumed by the animals is sufficiently low to ensure that there is no real carry-through into the dairy products ultimately consumed by human beings. As I have said, this is a very complex technical issue, and a simplistic approach is liable to bring us into trouble. Let us set our goal on promoting the consumers's health and safety, but let us make sure that we do so rigorously, effectively and in a scientifically sensible manner so that we achieve our real object and do not merely indulge in a paper exercise of laying down regulations which, in practice, will not be properly implemented. We want a really satisfactory result and we want, too, not to cause serious harm to the economies of Third World countries in the course of obtaining it. If, it should appear that that might be the result, we must take action to ensure they are assisted in various ways.

I believe Parliament should adopt this report, but the Commission must carry out a most serious scrutiny of its implications in terms of the implementation.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN*President*

Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, first of all I should like to thank the various parliamentary committees whose task it has been to consider the proposals under discussion and, in particular, the rapporteur of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

The many amendments proposed by the Environment Committee in favour of stricter health regulations and those envisaged by the Commission and the rejection of all the proposals, for diametrically opposite reasons, by the Agriculture Committee and the Development and Cooperation Committee, all strengthen the Commission's conviction that the measures it proposes are reasonable.

The Commission continues to think that, for the most part, its proposals achieve a fair balance between the interests of public health protection and the economic interests of the Community.

The measures envisaged represent the only solution which provides the Community with the legal instruments as well as the means to guarantee the wholesomeness of its home-produced animal products, and thus the health of the consumer, to restore the trade patterns disturbed by the prohibitive rules adopted in various Member States in relation to raw materials such as ground-nuts, to lay down the same conditions of competition for all Community stock farmers and food manufacturers by ensuring them, but only on certain conditions, free access to raw materials and, finally, to maintain a certain diversification of our sources of supply and thus our commercial independence.

It is very important to point out that these measures have been the subject of much consultation both with the national authorities of the Member States and with economic circles. And whilst certain differences have emerged over the level of standards, I must stress that in the matter of principles there was a very large consensus on the need to regulate the presence of undesirable substances in raw materials and, in particular, the presence of aflatoxin in plant-based products, because of the highly toxic nature of this natural contaminant.

Both the European feedingstuff industry and the ACP States have recognized this necessity which they consider preferable to the chaos caused by national rules, which can range from an outright ban on the use of various raw materials such as ground-nuts to a standard three times higher than that proposed by the Commission.

As the studies carried out by the Commission demonstrate, and contrary to the opinions put forward, a

Mosar

solution based on a mere feedingstuff check cannot entirely solve the problem posed by contamination with aflatoxin of plant-based raw materials. What is needed is a check on all foods produced, not only in the factories but, most of all, on the farm. An operation of this kind is materially and economically beyond the resources of the official inspection services.

The fixing of standards for undesirable substances in raw materials, and notably for aflatoxin, is and will remain justified.

As to the more specific problem of labelling food for domestic animals, it should be noted that in the main the measures proposed seek to provide the purchaser with the information he needs on the composition of products. The labelling requirements for feedingstuff manufacturers are in direct line with the labelling governing foodstuffs for human consumption and should help the purchaser to make a better choice based on value for money.

It is worth pointing out that the labelling rules recommended do not represent a real innovation since various Member States are already applying similar rules to those envisaged by the Commission.

Undeniably the labelling proposed and the principles laid down will impose a further constraint on food manufacturers, but this is necessary to prevent possible abuses.

For the many reasons I have given, the Commission asks Parliament to look favourably on these proposals, which we consider both reasonable and balanced.

Mr Christopher Jackson (ED). — Mr President, I think there are considerable doubts in this House about the measures proposed by the Commission, and also a feeling that the matter requires further study. Therefore, under Rule 85(1) I request referral of the report back to committee.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, Mr Jackson's motion does, of course, take precedence. All we wanted to do was to have the vote held over until the Monday of the next part-session, because quite frankly we still have problems with the vote within our own political group. However, should that not be possible, we will be asking, when the vote comes, that a quorum be established. That will mean in any case that the vote will have to be postponed until the Monday.

President. — Referral to committee was proposed yesterday and rejected. A motion for referral back to committee cannot be tabled twice during the same debate. This is clear from Rule 85(5).

That being the case, I cannot put your request to the vote.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, I did not ask for referral back to committee but merely that the vote be postponed.

Mrs Daly (ED), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Development and Cooperation. — Mr President, I would like to support Mr Arndt's proposal that voting be deferred until the next part-session. In doing so, I would like to repeat my appeal to Mr Mertens, which I made last night, that he reconsider the whole matter. I find it extremely difficult to understand how the Commission can stand up here this morning and say that from listening to the debates they are more convinced than ever that they should go ahead. The majority of speakers — in fact I think we were unanimous — expressed grave doubts about it. Please let us refer it back.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, I am opposed to sending this matter back to committee and against deferring the vote, because I am not convinced by Mr Arndt's argument that there is still disagreement within his group. If we went by arguments like that, we should defer all the votes until the next part-session.

Mr Mertens (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, first of all I should like to say that I agree with your point that a vote has already been taken on a request for referral back to committee. As to Mr Arndt's request, I should like to support the view that has just been expressed by Mrs Lentz-Cornette.

(Parliament decided to postpone the vote to the next part-session)

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, attitudes to this matter in no less than three committees of this Parliament have changed within the last few weeks in a quite extraordinary and, in my experience, unprecedented way. Some of the parties originally most fervently opposed to these proposals have changed to the other side, and *vice versa*. There have been significant changes of position and direction, with two committees still giving opinions very strongly against.

This being so, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, Mrs Weber, if she could assure me that we will listen in the meantime to those members of the Committee on Development and Cooperation — and even those members of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food — if they could be invited to the next meeting of the Committee on the Environment.

President. — Yes, that is a suggestion that could be made to Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber (S), *chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection*. — (DE) Mr President, I feel that it was a wise decision to postpone the vote, because it is clear that a further discussion must be arranged between the Members who are particularly responsible for this matter in the various committees. I hope that the vote will go more smoothly the next time than it did today.

6. Whaling

President. — The next item is the second report (Doc. A 2-22/85) by Mr Muntingh, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the Community response to the failure of certain members of the International Whaling Commission to abide by the decision of the IWC to end commercial whaling.

Mr Muntingh (S), *rapporteur*. — (NL) Mr President, things are going very badly with the whales — that is generally recognized. This is also acknowledged internationally. In order to try to save these creatures at the eleventh hour, an international body has been set up, the International Whaling Convention, which seeks to take steps to protect whales from extinction. A good number of measures have already been taken which I shall not go into here; I will just mention the most important ones. In July 1982 the International Whaling Commission, the executive body, decided to introduce in 1986 a moratorium on the hunting of large whales. The moratorium would last until 1990, at the end of which it could be determined whether the four years had given the whales a breathing space and what new research findings had emerged.

Now whilst it is true that there are economic considerations involved in whale hunting, there are still countries and interests that say: 'Look here, if this has to happen we are not in the least concerned, because what we are doing is so insignificant that nobody need worry about it'. They forget, of course, that all these minor exceptions, taken together, represent something really quite considerable and they also forget that a precedent is thus created whereby others can say that, once exceptions have been made, the same can be done for them, and this means that in the end such a measure is rendered nugatory. As regards the moratorium on the hunting of large whales, this course has been followed by three large wealthy countries: Russia, Norway and Japan.

So much for the large species of whale. As regards the smaller species, which make up the majority, the situation is still more serious. They are not covered by any international body. In my report I deal with three countries that are interested in the smaller species. It is my opinion, and that of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as

well, that we should seek to bring these smaller species too within the ambit of the International Whaling Convention.

A moratorium on the hunting of large whales and measures in favour of smaller species are necessary for a number of reasons. The first is that we must try to protect whales from extinction. For this reason too Russia, Japan and Norway must stop their hunting of large whales. We have asked Greenland to cease hunting the humpback whale and we also feel that the hunting of sperm whales in the Azores must stop. We are asking the Faroes in future to stop hunting the fin whale, which in our opinion is taking place in the Faroe Islands under false pretences.

Second, we know next to nothing about the ecology of whales. We do not know how many whales there are, where they occur or how, for instance, they are or will be affected by the pollution of the oceans. An extremely careful policy is required, and this is why we are asking Greenland and the Faroes to have their small whales brought under the International Whaling Convention. Furthermore, we are appealing to the Commission to help these two countries with the necessary ecological research.

Third, we want an end to the cruelty practised on these animals. Gradually the European citizen has become highly sensitive in this respect, and for this reason we ask the Faroes in our report whether they cannot change or improve their method of hunting.

And, last, we feel that the senseless slaughter of animals to satisfy the Western craving for luxury must be stopped. This particularly applies to whale hunting in the Azores where the sperm whale is hunted purely for the lower jaw, since only the teeth are wanted, the creatures being thrown overboard.

It is not our intention to denounce particular countries. There are sometimes important considerations to be borne in mind, such as social and cultural factors in the Faroes, or the subsistence aspect of hunting in Greenland. Furthermore, these countries are certainly not unconscious of the need to protect nature. They have even taken commendable action. The same cannot be said of the larger countries mentioned earlier — quite the reverse. Japan, in particular, is ruthless in its exploitation of wildlife and uses all kinds of contemptible stratagems, such as undercover whale firms in the Philippines, to achieve its ends. In my opinion Japan is a threat to the natural world at this moment. Norway's methods are also reprehensible. Norway proposes bringing a third form of hunting under the International Whaling Convention, namely, small type whaling. If this were to be accepted, all those countries that practise hunting would have a sort of excuse and commercial hunting could go on as before. It is to be hoped that the International Whaling Convention will see through this and not be fooled. As for Russia, that cynical country is going its usual way. I shall waste no

Muntingh

more words on the matter and put out of mind my helplessness.

It seems then that the economic argument is of crucial importance in whale hunting as far as Russia, Norway and Japan are concerned. Moral and ethical arguments are of absolutely no account, but if they are amenable solely to the economic argument, I think we should make use of that argument. The United States have well understood this by including in their legislation provisions for applying economic sanctions so as to ensure the protection of whales. That the Reagan administration is again distorting things at the moment does not detract from this. Since the economic argument is obviously the only thing that matters, the Environment Committee considers that we should press this economic argument here in Europe, and we therefore urge the Commission to put diplomatic and economic pressure on Japan, Norway and, so far as possible, Russia to abandon their hostile attitude towards the natural world. There are many opportunities open to them. The Environment Committee would like to hear from the Commission before the year is out what action it intends to take.

Whales are not fish, they are mammals. They are warm-blooded creatures which give birth to their young alive, that communicate with one another, that have a high intelligence and throughout the world — with a few happy exceptions, I must say in all fairness to my friends in Denmark — are senselessly slaughtered. It is high time that we humans tried to save these wonderful mammals of the sea, that we did something practical, and that we took some action in the European Community to emulate the efforts now being made by our fellow Parliamentarians in the United States. I therefore urge the Commission once again to take practical action to improve the wretched plight of the whales.

(Applause)

Mrs Gredal (S). — *(DA)* Mr President, the final proposal we have to deal with today contains clear improvements as compared with what was proposed at the last part-session. I am pleased that Mr Muntingh was in Copenhagen so that we were able to secure amendments to many of the things which appeared in the first report. The requests now put forward are significantly less categorical and a whole series of misunderstandings have been ironed out. I must say in particular that the explanatory statement has been improved by several correctly formulated presentations of the problems and better-founded material. But I must say also that that certainly does not appear from the conclusions contained in the motion for a resolution. It has a very emotional quality throughout and uses a type of language which must be unfamiliar in international reports. Already in the outline of the report and in the order of the paragraphs in the motion for a resolution the various misunderstandings and instances

of lack of proportion emerge. The report is addressed to those countries which have joined the IWC and should according to the title alone be concerned with commercial whaling. Nevertheless, it begins with a vehement condemnation of whaling in Greenland and the Faroe Islands, which the rapporteur in his explanatory statement clearly acknowledges is not commercial. The almost minimal catch in these countries for use by the indigenous population and for scientific purposes is turned by means of its prominent placing into a hobby-horse that is ridden throughout the whole report, although in Part B it is also acknowledged as lawful according to the IWC rules. To complete this series of misunderstandings there then follows a denunciation of the centuries-old hunting of the Faroese small whale, the pilot whale, which is not even covered by the IWC nomenclature. Whaling in the Faroe Islands and Greenland at the present time thus quite clearly lies outside the actual title of this report. These points should therefore either be omitted completely or, as a minimum requirement — as I have suggested — be relegated to a less prominent position in the report. There is a vigorous attack on pilot whaling in the Faroes. But, as I said before, the pilot whale is a small whale which does not fall within the jurisdiction of the IWC and consequently should not appear in the report either. Thus there are good grounds for omitting recitals D and E. The centuries-old Faroese traditions of pilot whaling are depicted here in terms which seem to preclude any future dialogue with the Faroese authorities and seem likely only to alienate the Faroese Islanders from the EC. The normal objective and dignified language of international reports is totally lacking here; I therefore propose that recitals D and E be deleted. A justified request is made in the report for research into numbers of humpback whales off Greenland. Nevertheless, quite irrespective of that, there is a demand for a zero quota. We must ask ourselves what is the purpose of increasing research if not, in fact, to make quotas depend upon it. Pending such research, one cannot and should not rely on vague conjectures. However, even the IWC research findings up to the present regard a quota of eight whales as appropriate for Greenland. An attempt must moreover be made — as mentioned in my amendment — to ensure that any excesses are deducted from the next year's quota. I should like in parenthesis to impress upon you, ladies and gentlemen, that we are talking about eight whales! How many do you think the Soviet Union, Japan and Norway take in the course of a year? We are talking about eight whales for the indigenous population.

The whole matter raises a series of fundamental questions, since it is in fact those countries which we represent, amongst others, which have squandered the sea's natural resources. How can we justify prescribing to indigenous populations, who have always lived in harmony with nature, how should they conduct themselves? It might, not wholly unfairly, be regarded as a renewed attempt at Western European cultural imperialism. Total conservation, without any dispensation

Gredal

for the original inhabitants, cannot be accepted. A traditional source of food which is so rooted in a life-style and culture cannot be abolished in the European Parliament without further ado.

There is a completely new proposal in paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution which at the same time appears to change the basis of the IWC. It is clear from the organization's nomenclature that its powers extend only to larger whales, from lesser rorquals upwards. Now, according to the report this is suddenly to apply to small whales in the Faroe Islands and Greenland and in no other areas in the world. This is typical of the tendentiousness and distortion shown in the report; furthermore, the request for immediate control is more or less absurd since it presupposes a basis of knowledge which is simply not available. General research into trends in numbers of small whales is essential before there can be any question of supervision or monitoring. Small whales cannot simply be included in the jurisdiction of the IWC without altering the mandate of the member countries, and thus the whole basis of the IWC would have to be reconsidered. Whaling in the Faroe Islands and Greenland is not — as the report itself mentions — commercial and is neither covered by nor associated with the IWC provisions. We must ask ourselves whether the totally exaggerated condemnation of the very limited whale hunting by the local populations of the Faroe Islands and Greenland does not seriously weaken the report. The major culprits in this field are in fact Norway, Japan and the Soviet Union, just as we ourselves were a short time ago.

We can only speculate about the reaction of this distant local community if we now lay down for them a list of behaviour patterns after we ourselves have practically destroyed for them access to the natural resources of the sea. Let us at least not be hypocritical, but do it in a way which does not preclude a future dialogue. I think that Parliament should retain a sense of proportion and concentrate its powers on those areas where the real problems lie.

(Applause)

Mrs Peus (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, my group supports and welcomes the Muntingh report. There are, however, four further comments that I should like to make on it. The sanctions imposed by the USA — the embargo on imports of fishery products from the countries concerned and the limitation of catch quotas in United States waters — have worked. That is perfectly clear.

Under the pressure exerted by these measures Japan has recently stated that it will stop its commercial whaling, albeit somewhat later than originally planned. It is high time therefore, as EPP Group members have been urging in recent months in motions for resolutions, that we in Europe also begin to think about ways and means of imposing really effective sanctions.

The second question that suggests itself, as Mrs Gredal has already said, is the question of what is commercial whaling and what is non-commercial whaling. Whaling in the Azores can certainly not be described as commercial, because there they are still using the methods used in the days of *Moby Dick*, namely, sailing boats and harpoons.

Neither can sperm whales be eaten, however, so that in the case of the Azores we cannot speak of substantial whaling, that is to say, whaling that is needed in order to enable the population to survive. The experts have assured us that at its next meeting in July the International Whaling Commission will try to hammer out a precise definition of the terms 'commercial' and 'non-commercial' in regard to whaling.

My third point is that the problem of Portugal and the Azores is not as simple as it would seem from the few words devoted to it in the report and from what has been said about it again this morning. Petra Deimer, a member of the Scientific Committee of the IWC and a marine biologist, assures us that Madeira gave up commercial whaling in 1981 and that it is trying to make whaling completely unnecessary by means of a nature protection project, in other words, a nature park. Here sailing boats will continue to be built and harpoons to be made — not for whaling, however, but for the tourists. We have been assured that as soon as this project gets off the ground and proves itself a success, the people of the Azores will be prepared to embark on a project of their own along the same lines. The experts feel therefore that the problem of whaling in the Azores can be resolved in two to three years.

Before any attempt is made to establish some kind of link between Portugal's accession to the European Community and Portugal's accession to the IWC — this was proposed in the first draft of the report and there are faint echoes of it in the version that we have before us — I would ask very earnestly that the whole problem of Portugal and the Azores should be gone into once again. We have been reliably assured that it would on the whole be better if Portugal did not become a member of the IWC, since Portugal, which has been taking part for quite a long time now in the proceedings of the IWC as an observer, has shown that it is tending more and more to favour the idea of whaling. Thus the very fragile three-quarters majority which would be needed for a moratorium could be jeopardized by the accession of Portugal. As I have said, I should like the whole matter to be gone into, because I myself cannot figure out the eventual outcome of it.

My fourth and last point is that further surveys must be carried out, particularly in the case of the hump-back whales which are most in danger, because such estimates as we have are largely a matter of guesswork. According to the experts, such surveys do not seem to be particularly useful in the case of the fin whales, or at least only if they were to take in the entire North

Peus

Atlantic area, since otherwise they would only give rise to a kind of hit-and-miss estimates.

Any surveys that we do carry out should definitely involve the Scientific Committee of the IWC, where for years now the experts have been cooperating very effectively with limited financial resources. In this way we would avoid unnecessary duplication of research and duplication of financing.

(Applause)

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of the European Democratic Group I welcome Hemmo Muntingh's excellent report; we shall support it.

The threat to the world's whale population is a problem which we have long taken seriously. Some Members may recall that it was the United Kingdom which, back in 1979, took the initiative in calling for a Community-wide ban on the import of whale products. That initiative was supported by British Conservatives both in this House and in Westminster. And, by all accounts, the import ban has been successful. Mr Muntingh himself points this out.

A Community ban alone cannot remove the threat to this endangered species, so we must look to the wider international community and in particular to the International Whaling Commission, which, in response to the call of several countries including my own, decided in 1982 to bring commercial whaling to a complete halt by 1986. Two of the speakers before me have underlined, as I would like to now, this word 'commercial' whaling.

Failure of certain nations to respond to that call prompted a number of my colleagues to retable a motion for a resolution on the subject of the present report. I hope that this will help to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union, Norway and Japan. I am grateful for the reminders that have already been given of the temporary sanctions which the United States has threatened to use in some of these cases.

I was impressed by the observations of Mrs Gredal, who spoke with great sense and wisdom on a particular aspect, and my colleague Claus Toksvig, will be explaining the position of Danish members of my group. Though we have been concerned by some aspects, perhaps, of the Faroese whale hunt, the main thrust of our criticisms has never been directed against such small local communities, most notably in the Faroes and Greenland, which practise whaling for subsistence with no hint of commerce in their dealings. Neither is it directed against genuine research, but I will not enlarge upon that because quite sufficient has been said.

I commend Mr Muntingh's report to the House. It did receive unanimous support in the Committee on the

Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

Mr Toksvig (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, this is a classic example of a report whose intentions are good, which appears carefully prepared, which has taken account of all possible aspects in the preamble, which was subsequently adjusted in accordance with comments made and which has nevertheless completely overlooked the fact that there are points in the motion for a resolution which do not correspond to the preamble.

I am glad that Mr Muntingh took the trouble to speak to the Danish authorities on this matter. He attended a meeting in the Danish Foreign Ministry, he listened to the Greenlanders and Faroe Islanders and heard what they had to say. Nevertheless, he has included in his motion for a resolution expressions which are downright offensive and which can only cast doubt on the whole intention of the report. When, for example, in recital D on pilot whale hunts off the Faroes, which have involved roughly 1 700 kills on average per year over the past ten years, reference is made to 'irresponsible sporting entertainments characterized by mass slaughter', that can only be an affront to the Faroe Islanders and is a totally unacceptable expression in a parliamentary report of this type. There are points in the report which I am happy to see and which I welcome, for example, the request that Community resources be made available for further research to enable us to obtain data on surviving numbers. There are points in the report which I am very happy to support and which I know Mr Muntingh will follow up, since his report is motivated by a genuine interest in these matters. But there are also, as has been mentioned, totally and utterly unacceptable things. Mrs Gredal has already put forward her point of view, and I should like to say on behalf of the Danish Conservatives and also on behalf of Mrs Tove Nielsen that we feel compelled to vote for the amendment tabled by Mrs Gredal. If it is not adopted, we shall be compelled to vote against the report, simply because it is directed practically one-sidedly against two small local communities up in the North Atlantic — perhaps 80 000 people in all — who for centuries have carried out a traditional hunt and are still compelled to do so, in the Faroe Islands to meet more than half their food requirements and in Greenland since it constitutes an important component of the Greenlanders' food.

For me there is no doubt as to which view we must take. We very much hope that Parliament as a whole will follow us. I also very much hope that my British colleagues — having heard some of the arguments put forward from the Danish side — will think again as to whether they can support our point of view.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, this is a subject on which very strong

Cockfield

feelings are held as is very evident from the speeches we heard from Mr Muntingh and various other honourable Members. May I congratulate Mr Muntingh on the very detailed report that he has produced. But it is equally clear from the debate, and particularly from the speeches made by Mrs Gredal, Mrs Peus and Mr Toksvig, that when one comes to specific details there are areas of controversy. The Commission, and indeed the Community as a whole, shares the concern which has been expressed about the plight of the whales. This is clearly demonstrated by past Community action which resulted in a regulation prohibiting Community trade in primary whale products from 1 January 1982 and in a regulation on the implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna from 1 January 1984, which, with the exception of products from Greenland, prohibits commercial activities involving whales and whale products both in trade with third countries and in internal Community trade.

It should further be noted that the 1982 IWC decision to phase out commercial whaling was actively supported by the five Member States of the Community which are party to the Whaling Convention. The Commission is equally concerned at the fact that some of the most important whaling nations lodged an objection to the 1982 IWC decision, a move which might render that decision ineffective. It should be recognized, however, that the recent decision of the Japanese Government to give up whaling by 1988 is, although not fully in agreement with the IWC decision, of major importance for the conservation of the whale species concerned. The next meeting of the IWC to be held in July will be of decisive importance, as it will have to clarify the position not only of Japan, but also of Norway and the USSR. The Community as such is not a party to the International Whaling Convention for the regulation of whaling. The Commission will therefore, as in previous years, participate in the July IWC meeting as an observer only, but is prepared to inform Parliament of the outcome of that meeting at its earliest convenience.

With regard to the issues addressed in the motion for a resolution, I should like to make the following comments. It should be noted that most of the recommendations of the resolution of 16 October 1980 have either been implemented through the adoption of the Community regulations which I mentioned earlier or have been overtaken by later events such as the 1982 IWC decision. On the surveys proposed by Mr Muntingh, referred to in Amendment No 10, I would say that the Commission, unfortunately, does not have the funds necessary to carry out such research. The humpback and fin whales are a matter of concern to the IWC, and their conservation status is periodically reviewed by the IWC's scientific committee. That committee also makes recommendations about future research to be carried out by its members.

With regard to paragraph 8, I can confirm that regulations 348/81 and 3626/82 will apply to Spain and Por-

tugal from the date of their accession to the Community. The Commission services will, as soon as possible, inform the appropriate authorities in Spain and Portugal on the technicalities of the regulations concerned in order to facilitate their correct implementation. The Commission has no information on the reports referred to in paragraph 9, but if those making these allegations are prepared to be more specific, we would certainly be prepared to investigate them.

With regard to the implementation of the IWC decisions in relation to the USSR, Japan and Norway, may I say that in the first instance there are no relations between the Community as such and the USSR. Secondly, the whaling issue has been mentioned in the context of the structural bilateral meetings between environmental experts from the Commission and from Japan and Norway. Thirdly, to press the whaling question in the bilateral fisheries consultations with Norway could unnecessarily complicate the sensitive and unrelated consultations and could be counterproductive for Community fishermen, for whom fishing in Norwegian waters is of considerable importance.

With regard to the question of appropriate sanctions referred to in paragraph 14, it should be noted that, without prejudice to the question of whether or not the Community has competence to take such measures for such a purpose, the Community is not in a position to adopt commercial instruments comparable to the United States legislation on this matter. Moreover, nothing in the GATT rules indicates that it is permissible to raise barriers against imports of unrelated products in order to bring pressure on a country to respond to environmental concerns. In the light of these considerations, I am sure Parliament will appreciate why it would not be possible for the Commission to pursue the particular line of action set out in paragraphs 12 to 14 of the motion for a resolution.

The recommendation in paragraph 15 will be studied in the context of the preparation of the new preliminary draft budget. With regard to Amendments 1 to 9 and 11 to 14, these are matters which are essentially for the decision of Parliament and not for the Commission. While therefore, Mr President, I entirely appreciate the strength of the views expressed, I fear that the Commission can only act within the powers available to it. I am sure, nevertheless, that Mr Muntingh's pleas on behalf of the whale will not entirely fall on deaf ears.

President. — The debate is closed.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Gredal (S). — (DA) There has been a lot of talk recently about Parliament's dignity. In my first speech

Gredal

I also mentioned that it would be fitting for Parliament if Members used language which was acceptable and comprehensible to people throughout the world outside the EC. We have now come to a report containing a whole series of statements which are in our opinion absolutely undignified, and it is quite clear that we Danish Members shall vote against it. Naturally I can speak only for the Danish Social Democrats, but, quite apart from the voting here, I think that is a general Danish view. We do not accept language of that type, which is an embarrassment to our friends in the North.

Mr Møller (ED). — (DA) Mr President, I fully share Mrs Gredal's views, and I should like to urge my colleagues in Parliament to vote against the report in the final vote. It will not be understood at all by two small communities, one of which is Nordic and the other Eskimo — certainly not European. We accepted that they should leave the EC since they did not feel themselves European. But they are small communities, and it is very important for their livelihood, health and nourishment for them to be able to continue to live as they have lived hitherto for centuries. I would ask that we do not interfere in something which will upset many things for many people. Even though they are a small population, they must have the right to protection of their vital interests, just as nations have their national interests protected by the right of veto. I therefore ask that these vital interests of Greenland and the Faroe Islands be respected by the European Parliament and that we vote against the report.

Mr Muntingh (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, it appears from what the Danes say that they have not correctly understood the resolution and report, and I also feel that they have done me an injustice.

In the resolution and report there is nothing, as I see it, that is or might be disadvantageous to Greenland or the Faroe Islands. I am merely asking, in all decency, that in the one country five whales less per year be taken and, in the other, eight whales — and that is all. Other than that, I have simply asked that, if possible, the hunting of small whales be brought under the supervision and guidance of the International Whaling Convention. This is entirely voluntary and it does nothing to alter the situation, either in the Faroes or in Greenland. So it is certainly not true, as is now being said, that I wish to alter their cultural and social patterns. On the contrary, my report makes it abundantly clear that I consider this a good thing and am in no way opposed to it. I feel therefore that in this respect my colleagues are being unfair to my report.

Finally, I should like to address a remark to the Commissioner. I thank the Commissioner for his utterly meaningless, worthless answer. The thrust of my report is that measures should be taken against Japan, Norway and possibly Russia: to which the Commission responds, no, we can't do that, we don't have the

means. And why not? Because of the same economic arguments in favour of hunting that these countries have aduced. The Commission says: We shall take no action against Norway since this would harm our fishermen's economic interests. I find the Commissioner's answer totally unsatisfactory and I hereby promise him that I shall be returning to the matter.

(Applause)

Mrs Pery (S). — (FR) It is always very difficult to reconcile the defence of species with the defence of human populations who depend on non-industrial fishing, and so I shall abstain. It is not very brave of me perhaps, but I have had occasion to go to Greenland and I have seen the harm we have done to these Eskimo populations by the votes we had adopted on the subject of seals. So I prefer to reserve my position on a question on which I cannot make up my mind.

I will conclude by saying that with regard to paragraph 8 our Portuguese friends are not yet with us and I shall speak in their stead, because it seems to me very difficult to ask them to stop cachalot hunting immediately — it is this word 'immediately' that makes me hesitate. Of course we should like them to join the IWC, but I think that, on the Portuguese' behalf, I must express my reservations on the wording of paragraph 8.

(Applause)

Mrs Hammerich (ARC), in writing. — (DA) The European Community as a body is not a member of the International Whaling Commission and is therefore not qualified to meddle in the rules and regulations which the Whaling Commission lays down for the international community. The European Community should therefore hand over responsibility to the sovereign States which are members of the Whaling Commission. They can pursue whatever policy they think best *vis-à-vis* the Commission and manage their relations on whaling according to the rules adopted there. An attempt by our Community to meddle in the affairs of the Faroe Islands and Greenland, amongst others, with regard to whaling is therefore partly outside its mandate and partly interference in an area which is handled by an international organization.

European Community interference can only be viewed therefore as an attempt to play moral guardian to the rest of the world. That is all the more embarrassing since acid rain is pouring down over the Community countries and uranium pollution in the seas is flowing across Community borders — and both problems are far more injurious to plant and animal life than whale hunting. Furthermore, we are continually having to evade the issue of the disastrous plight of many animals within the European Community — for example, monk seals in the Mediterranean.

Hammerich

This report also discusses the Faroe Islands' thousand-year-old tradition of hunting pilot whales in terms bordering on an insult to the State. The author claims that this hunting is degenerating into irresponsible sporting entertainments. Nothing could be more incorrect, because this is commercial whaling which is regulated and monitored by the Faroese internal administration. Do not forget that neither the Faroes nor Greenland is a member of the European Community; the last thing they need is culturally imperialistic recommendations from the EEC. This report is harmful to the Community's good relationship with the countries mentioned and to its reputation throughout the Third and Fourth Worlds. We shall therefore vote against it.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC), in writing. — (NL) On more than one occasion international environmental organizations such as the World Wildlife Fund and Greenpeace have focused attention on the whale issue. And rightly so. Figures show that the whale population is in sharp decline. It is therefore the European Parliament's task to put an end to overfishing, especially as whale products can be replaced by other equivalent products. I have tabled an amendment to this effect. Furthermore, I think it necessary that diplomatic moves be made *vis-à-vis* the Soviet Union, given that the latter is taking no action to protect whales. In addition the European market should be completely closed against whale products and whale habitats brought under international control.

The Muntingh report is a step in the right direction and I shall therefore support it.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

7. Toxicology

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-26/85) by Mrs Schleicher, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-355/84 — COM(84) 284 final) for a draft resolution on a programme of action of the European Communities on toxicology for health protection.

Mrs Schleicher (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection welcomes the submission of an action programme on

toxicology in the European Community. This programme is of fundamental importance for research but also for legislation, since toxicological investigations are coming to play an increasingly vital part in ensuring the protection of health in the workplace. However, toxicology is also concerned with the products of the chemical, pharmaceutical and cosmetic industries, pesticides, food additives and animal feedingstuffs, to mention only a few areas.

We need to know more about the effects of dangerous substances, in particular their carcinogenic effects, possible damage to the genotype or the immune system and their allergenic potency. In these areas there is still a lack of qualified scientific personnel but also of well-coordinated cooperation within the European Community.

I should also like to draw attention to the report drawn up by our committee on animal experiments, which Parliament would like to see curtailed as much as possible. This can only be done in close cooperation with the toxicologists.

To come back to the matter in hand, I must say that at first my committee was disappointed at the excessively modest nature of the programme. However, we do realize, of course, why it made this impression. Failure to put meat on the bones of a programme of this kind is always bound up with the fact that the necessary finance has not been made available, because we are talking here about non-compulsory expenditure. Obviously therefore the Commission had too little money at its disposal.

I am very thankful therefore for the laudable cooperation we have had with the Commission. We did work constructively together. I am also grateful for the opinion of the Committee on Budgets, which proposed that this programme should still be brought in under the 1985 budget. I may also say that by its vote on Thursday Parliament did everything in its power to create the necessary conditions to enable this programme to be financed.

Now, however, comes my criticism of the Council. There has already been an informal meeting with the Health Ministers. As far as the matter itself is concerned, there is actually nothing to stop a decision being taken already in June. As far as the content of the programme is concerned, we all seem to be in favour of it, but everything depends on the financing. I would appeal therefore once again to the Finance Ministers of the European Community to enter these non-compulsory resources in the budget, because all the good work that has gone into this will have been useless if money is so scarce that everything has to go on compulsory expenditure and nothing remains for non-compulsory expenditure.

Our committee feels that there is a crying need for the implementation of such a programme as this. We have

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 8 to 10 and 13;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 4, 6, 7, 11 and 12.

Schleicher

therefore added two further points by way of spelling out what we agreed with the Commission was absolutely necessary. Furthermore, we should like to have a preliminary report every year, because we shall make our agreement to the budget conditional on the Commission being prepared to do this. If we then find that there is no cooperation in this area, we may very well block the appropriations, because we do not want to release them in order to have them juggled around in some kind of way. We really want this toxicology programme to be implemented. The committee is agreed upon this, and there were no dissenting voices whatsoever.

(Applause)

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — Mr President, the Commission's proposals and Mrs Schleicher's report on them are reasoned and understandable. It is perhaps inevitable that our own Community legislation has contributed to an increase in toxicity testing in many fields, including food additives, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics and industrial chemicals. But however necessary action may be to protect humans from the negative effects of our ever widening knowledge and manufacture of chemicals, it is but one side of the coin. At present virtually all toxicity testing involves the use of animals in experiments. So far not nearly enough attention has been paid to the exploitation of animals which has also increased.

There is an economic as well as an ethical reason for reducing the number of experiments necessary, and this can be achieved by sharing experience and scientific knowledge. No industrialist will carry out toxicity testing on animals unless he has to. For, apart from ethical considerations, these tests are expensive to conduct.

The proposal to set up data banks on the results of *in vitro* experiments and on toxicological information acquired therefrom will help avoid unnecessary duplication of experiments in all Member States. Setting common criteria for assessing the effects of harmful substance will enable experiments to be terminated once a conclusive level is reached, and so avoid unnecessary prolongation of experiments.

I therefore welcome the Commission's proposal to insist on much greater standardization of chemicals throughout the Community. There is no excuse for unnecessary variations of the same chemicals to be manufactured in different Member States either for the motive of protecting national markets or for individual industrial profit.

Likewise, it is highly important to ensure that the testing methods being carried out, particularly on animals, should be standardized. For this purpose the Commission is asked to have a form of scientific committee set up to ensure that this happens.

I am glad to see the Commission proposals for training of toxicologists. This will help to establish good practice among toxicologists carrying out animal experiments. I hope this will be a first step in the European-wide registering of laboratories for animal experimentation. Once registration is established in Member States with certain minimum criteria, then each country should be obliged to accept products tested by registered laboratories in another EEC Member State, as in currently the case in testing of technical standards.

Mr President, a new EEC directive on animal experimentation will, hopefully, lay down minimum standards for the well-being of laboratory animals. The Commission will see from my amendment that we are asking you to forward, as soon as possible and in any case before our July part-session, the draft of this directive. I should like to have the Commission's assurance of this point. If for any reason it is not possible, then I should like to have a precise date when this directive will come forward.

Now a word about alternatives. Wherever possible testing on live animals should be substituted. There is a crying case in point for abolishing L.D. 50 experiments and replacing them by alternative methods. I hope that the Commission will ensure that this takes place. I urge them also to include research into alternative means of toxicology in their action programme.

Finally, Mr President, I do urge the Commission to see that we do not in the European Community add unnecessarily to the burden of animal experimentation. We can progress quite logically, firmly and progressively both to the advantage of industry and human society and to that of the animal kingdom.

Mr Elliott (S). — Mr President, here again we have one of these very well-intended, and indeed very necessary, motions for resolutions debated at the tail-end of a part-session which is of a very complex technical nature and which it seems, unfortunately, not too many people are interested in hearing about. One of the problems we face in this Assembly is that there is a lack of interest in some of these very important but complex topics.

I do not want to take terribly long because I think we are more or less all agreed on the intention here. It is important that we re-examine critically the whole area of toxicology testing. It is extremely important that the right standards are maintained. We are all aware — even those people who are not technical specialists — that many substances which in the past were thought to be harmless are now recognized as being injurious to both human beings and animals. So we do need to be continuously on our guard. There is a need to ensure that no new materials are used in any applications involving human consumption without the most stringent testing and control.

Elliott

I can think of a number of examples of this. I am not a specialist in toxicology — I have had no direct dealings with it — but I have been a food chemist, and one can think of a number of examples. One of the most horrific that occurs to my mind is a food colour used freely in sweets given to children in the 1930s that is now known to be a serious carcinogenic agent. I do not particularly condemn those responsible in the 1930s — they acted in ignorance. But I think we must learn the lesson that we have to be extremely careful.

However, there is another danger that we do need to guard against. We have to ensure proper and adequate toxicological testing, but we must not fall into the trap of unnecessary proliferation of testing. I agree with all that Sir Jack Stewart-Clark has said about the question of animal testing. Those of us who are very keenly concerned about animal rights want so see the absolute maximum possible reduction in animal testing. We probably have not yet reached the stage where animal testing in every shape and form can be totally eliminated. But I believe there is a lot of unnecessary testing. A lot of testing is carried out in an inhumane way. It could be carried out more humanely, and the whole area needs to be critically evaluated. I entirely support Sir Jack's amendment calling on the Commission to accelerate the production of the new directive on animal testing.

Of course, one of the reasons for the proliferation of these tests on animals is the production of very large numbers of commercially different but chemically identical materials. I am very pleased that Sir Jack Stewart-Clark did, in fact, give his support to action to try to prevent the unnecessary proliferation of these different trade names for drugs which are, in fact, identical. We do not normally introduce political arguments into these kinds of things and I do not particularly want to, but I am pleased that at least on this issue it is recognized that we are in an area here where commercial activities are injurious to the common good. We do need to see that this particular aspect of the market economy — the unnecessary proliferation for commercial purposes of materials which are not necessary to production (they are only very slightly different, if at all, to others) — is brought to an end.

I support the whole idea of trying to reduce animal testing as much as we possibly can and, where we do have to use animals for experimental purposes connected with toxicology, that there should be very careful control of the conditions under which these animals are kept — as also, of course, the conditions in which the workers who do the tests have to operate.

This motion for a resolution is very necessary, very worthy and contains some very important points. I hope we will have unanimous support for it.

Lord Cockfield, *Vice-president of the Commission*. — Mr President, the Commission is grateful to Mrs

Schleicher, the rapporteur, and to Parliament for having given thorough and rapid consideration to this proposal. The Commission is pleased to accept Amendments Nos 2 and 5 — and I am referring, of course, to the amendments as they now are numbered — which set out the detailed aspects of the programme and which will be included as Annex I to the resolution.

In line with Amendment No 3, the Commission will forward its annual programme of work in this field to Parliament and will be happy to receive suggestions on its operation. Sir Jack Stewart-Clark raised the question of the evaluation of the reliability of approximate methods for the determination of LD 50 using fewer animals. That appears already in our programme as Item 1.5 and we will certainly do our best to press on with this work as rapidly as possible.

I now turn to Amendment No 4 in the name of Sir Jack Stewart-Clark. This is the amendment which calls for a directive on animal experimentations. We are sympathetic to rapid action being taken. The Council of Europe is about to adopt a convention on this subject. We hope this will now be adopted very shortly, and perhaps it would be more appropriate therefore for the Commission to await the adoption of the convention before transmitting a proposal for a directive.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (*DE*) Mr President, the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, has written a letter to this Parliament's inter-group working party on animal welfare in which he promised to forward to Parliament by the beginning of June at the latest a draft of the directive called for by Sir Jack Stewart-Clark in his amendment referred to just now. I know that on 2 May the Council of Europe did not complete the deliberations to which the Commissioner has referred but that they were postponed indefinitely. Can Parliament take it that the assurance given by the President of the Commission will be respected nonetheless?

Lord Cockfield, *Vice-President of the Commission*. — Mr President, I am, of course, aware of the letter that the President of the Commission has written and I have said that we were sympathetic to rapid action being taken. It is, of course, a pity that the Council of Europe has not moved as quickly as we would all have hoped. I think it would be wrong to say that the matter has been put on ice. On the contrary, we hope very much that the convention will be adopted in the very near future. But, clearly, this is one of the matters we do need to take into account in relation to a draft directive by the Commission.

President. — The debate is closed.

Explanations of vote

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — Mr President, we shall, of course, vote for this report. I would just like to come back, however, to what Lord Cockfield said about the Council of Europe and its draft convention. This is absolutely true, but I understand that there are Italians who believe that the proposed convention does not go far enough, while some other countries are saying that it goes too far. The Council of Europe has had a history of delay on this matter. I was told confidently that there would be agreement at the meeting earlier this month. There was not.

What I want to ask the Commission to reply to specifically is this: if the delay continues, does this mean that the Commission is going to be hamstrung by the Council of Europe? Surely it is possible to use the draft convention in its present form. Surely it is also possible to draw upon such documents as the White Paper currently being prepared by the Home Office in the United Kingdom and expected to be passed later on in the year. Really, I do not consider it acceptable to say that because the Council of Europe cannot conclude an agreement, this august body and the Commission are also to be completely held up.

I would like to have precise views upon this, please.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (DE) I shall be very happy to vote for this report and to support what Sir Jack Stewart-Clark had to say just now in his speech and in his explanation of vote. Once again I should like to urge the Commission to draw up the guidelines mentioned in this report and in the amendments, and not only to cut down on the tests to which we have been referring but above all to enact provisions that will have the effect of keeping countless animals from having to die a painful death for experimental purposes that are by no means guaranteed to ensure greater safety for us human beings.

As chairman of the European Parliament's inter-group working party on animal welfare, I urge the Commission to abide by the deadline that it set for itself in reply to our working party. We would not accept it as sufficient excuse if the Commission were to go back on its promise because of the Council of Europe.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC), in writing. — (DE) A programme on toxicology is absolutely essential. However, in view of the large number of doubtful and dangerous substances already circulating on the market, which must be investigated and whose long-term effects cannot yet be assessed, a programme of this kind makes sense only if it tries to get at the very roots of the problem. The mountain of dangerous substances must not be allowed to grow out of our reach. As long as substances that are already in circulation have not been investigated, we must stop new

substances from being continually heaped up on top of that mountain, thus causing the problem to escalate.

Furthermore, we must remember that it is more than doubtful whether animal experiments, which are one of the cornerstones of the science of toxicology, are at all valid for human beings and whether the conclusions drawn from them are applicable to human beings.

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) While we regard as positive the Schleicher report, which we will vote for, we should like to add that some points ought perhaps to be emphasized more strongly, such as:

1. The increased need to re-examine the units in which toxicity is expressed, especially in cases of the combined action of more than a single substance.
2. Continuous emphasis should be placed on the need for adaptation and modernization based on the most recent and substantiated scientific facts, the statutory directives of the Community's Member States that relate to maximum acceptable concentrations of various chemicals in workplaces and living quarters and the need for continuous monitoring of the enforcement of those directives. It should also be stressed that it is greatly preferable to ensure that workplaces operate under hygienic conditions as a matter of general policy rather than to persist with a policy of 'compensation for unhealthy working conditions'.
3. Finally, we consider it high time to state specific principles that will ensure that no products of toxicological research will be used for military purposes, though this does not imply any restriction on the freedom of scientific research.

We hope that the resolution will contribute positively to the construction of an effective framework for dealing with the complex problems of protecting the health and quality of life of our citizens, which are under such constant threat today.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC), in writing. — (NL) How often does it not happen that hours after an accident involving chemical substances in a factory there is still uncertainty as to the type of product, the manner in which accident victims should be treated and how best to deal with the consequences of the accident? The Bhopal disaster which occurred several months ago now was a classic example of ineffectuality.

Very often too chemical substances are not treated with the care they deserve. For this reason we are gratified by the Commission's initiative and fully support the Schleicher report.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendment No 4.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — I wonder, Mr President, if I could ask Lord Cockfield whether he could specifically answer the questions which I raised, if that would not be out order.

President. — No, Sir Jack, we have already had the vote.

8. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.¹

(The sitting was closed at 11.40 a.m.)

¹ *Written declarations entered in the register (Rule 49) — Forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting — Dates for next part-session: see Minutes.*

**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad

Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. 512 00 26
CCP/Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /
Europese Boekhandel**

Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

CREDOC

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34
Bte 11 / Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag

Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95
Girokonto 200 11 95

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger

Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0
Fernschreiber:
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA

International Bookstore
4 Nikis Street
Athens (126)
Tel. 322 63 23
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

Molho's Bookstore

The Business Bookshop
10 Tsimiski Street
Thessaloniki
Tel. 275 271
Telex 412885 LIMO

FRANCE

**Service de vente en France des publications
des Communautés européennes**

Journal officiel

26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office

Sun Alliance House
Molesworth Street
Dublin 2
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

Stationery Office

St Martin's House
Waterloo Road
Dublin 4
Tel. 68 90 66

ITALIA

Licosa Spa

Via Lamarmora, 45
Casella postale 552
50 121 Firenze
Tel. 57 97 51
Telex 570466 LICOSA I
CCP 343 509

Subagente:

Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU

Via Meravigli, 16
20 123 Milano
Tel. 80 76 79

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

**Office des publications officielles
des Communautés européennes**

5, rue du Commerce
L-2985 Luxembourg
Tél. 49 00 81 - 49 01 91
Télex PUBOF - Lu 1322
CCP 19190-81
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/200

Messageries Paul Kraus

11, rue Christophe Plantin
L-2339 Luxembourg
Tél. 48 21 31
Télex 2515
CCP 49242-63

NEDERLAND

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf

Christoffel Plantijnstraat
Postbus 20014
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage
Tel. (070) 78 99 11

UNITED KINGDOM

HM Stationery Office

HMSO Publications Centre
51 Nine Elms Lane
London SW8 5DR
Tel. 01-211 3935

Sub-agent:

Alan Armstrong & Associates Ltd

72 Park Road
London NW1 4SH
Tel. 01-723 3902
Telex 297635 AAALTD G

ESPAÑA

Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.

Castello 37
E-28001 Madrid
Tel. (91) 276 02 53 - 275 46 55
Telex 49370-MPLI-E

PORTUGAL

Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l.

Rua João de Deus
Venda Nova
Amadora
Tél. 97 45 71
Telex 12709-LITRAN-P

SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA

Librairie Payot

6, rue Grenus
1211 Genève
Tél. 31 89 50
CCP 12-236

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**European Community Information
Service**

2100 M Street, NW
Suite 707
Washington, DC 20037
Tel. (202) 862 9500

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd

61 Sparks Street (Mall)
Ottawa
Ontario K1P 5A6
Tel. Toll Free 1 (800) 267 4164
Ottawa Region (613) 238 8985-6

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

Annual subscription 1985-1986 ECU 63.90 BFR 2 900 IRL 38.20 UKL 31.25 USD 55

Single issue price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 19.62 BFR 900 IRL 14.40 UKL 11.70 USD 18



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg



AX-AA-85-003-EN-C