

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 2-328

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1985-1986 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 8 to 12 July 1985

Centre européen, Luxembourg

General contents

Sitting of Monday, 8 July 1985	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Approval of the minutes, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 1 — Deadline for tabling amendments, p. 5 — Articles 49 and 50 of the ECSC Treaty p. 6 — Hydrocarbons discharged at sea, p. 8	
Sitting of Tuesday, 9 July 1985	14
Approval of the minutes, p. 15 — Decision on urgency, p. 16 — Welcome, p. 16 — Preliminary draft budget 1986, p. 17 — International Youth Year 1985, p. 26 — Solidarity with Third World Children Week, p. 34 — European Council in Milan — European Union, p. 36 — Tribute, p. 69 — Votes, p. 69 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 77 — Annex, p. 81	
Sitting of Wednesday, 10 July 1985	87
Approval of the minutes, p. 88 — Agenda, p. 89 — Hooliganism and violence in sport, p. 89 — Relations EEC-Hong Kong, p. 101 — Trade cooperation between the EEC and the People's Republic of China, p. 104 — Customs debt, p. 108 — Import or export duties, p. 109 — Trade with Taiwan, p. 110 — Welcome, p. 112 — Luxembourg Presidency (Council statement), p. 113 — Question Time, p. 137 — Votes, p. 151	
Sitting of Thursday, 11 July 1985	157
Agenda, p. 158 — Question Time (contd), p. 159 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 167 — Income and equal treatment for men and women, p. 190 — Specific regional development measures (contd), p. 201 — Votes, p. 207 — Specific regional development measures (contd), p. 219 — Regional development programmes, p. 221 — Water resources, p. 227 — Appointing members of the Board of the European Foundation, p. 230 — Beef sector, p. 233 — Animal welfare policy, p. 237 — Dried grapes and dried figs, p. 240	

(Continued overleaf)

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.

Contents (continued)

Annex 'Question Time' of 11 July 1985 242

Sitting of Friday, 12 July 1985 281

Votes, p. 281 — Imports of motor vehicles into Portugal — Pre-accession protocol — EEC-Portuguese Republic, p. 287 — South Africa (Commission statement), p. 288 — Adjournment of the session, p. 288

SITTING OF MONDAY, 8 JULY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Resumption of the session</i>	1	5. <i>Articles 49 and 50 of the ECSC Treaty-Report (Doc. A 2-28/85) by Mr Wijsenbeek</i>	
2. <i>Approval of the Minutes</i> <i>Mr Ulburghs</i>	1	<i>Mr Wijsenbeek; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Mühlen; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission)</i>	6
3. <i>Agenda</i> <i>Mr Arndt; Mr Klepsch; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Ewing; Mr Ford; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mrs van den Hewel; Mr Patterson; Mr Griffiths; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Marshall; Mrs Viehoff; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Arndt; Mr Van der Lek; Mr Pranchère; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Arndt</i>	2	6. <i>Hydrocarbons discharged at sea-Report (Doc. A 2-51/85) by Mrs Squarcialupi</i> <i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Lambrias; Mrs Lemass; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission)</i>	8
4. <i>Deadline for tabling amendments</i> <i>Mr Alavanos; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Marshall; Mr Flanagan; Mr Ford</i>	5		

IN THE CHAIR : MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

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

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 14 June 1985.

2. *Approval of the Minutes*

President. — The Minutes of the sitting of Friday, 14 June have been distributed.

Are there any objections?

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) In connexion with the minutes of Thursday 13 June, a mistake occurred during the voting on Mr van Aerssen's report on Latin America. My colleague, Raf Chanterie, was not aware that Mr van Aerssen had asked me to withdraw my amendments to his report. Mr van Aerssen promised to inform the sitting of this agreement and to incorporate these amendments into his report. May I request that this comment be entered expressly in the minutes?

President. — Thank you, Mr Ulburghs, your comment has been noted.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)*¹

3. *Agenda*

President. — At its meeting of 11 June 1985 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has

¹ *Membership of the ACP-EEC Joint Assembly — Written declarations (Rule 49) — Petitions — Authorization to draw up reports — Referrals to committee — Written declarations (Rule 49) — Documents received — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council — Delegation of the power of a decision to a committee (Rule 33): see Minutes.*

President

been distributed.

At the meeting held this afternoon the chairmen of the political groups instructed me to propose the following changes.

Monday:

- the report by Mr Donnez, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on a request for a Member's parliamentary immunity to be waived, which is the first item on today's agenda, has not been adopted in committee and has therefore been withdrawn.

Mr Arndt has asked to speak on Tuesday's agenda.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, the Council's and Commission's statements and the Spinelli report on the Milan Summit are on the agenda for Tuesday's sitting. The deadline for tabling amendments to the Spinelli motion for a resolution has almost expired and we agree with some committee members who suggest voting on the Spinelli report immediately after the debate, not necessarily on the motions for resolutions on the statements about the Summit for which the deadline for tabling amendments should most likely be Tuesday evening. I agree wholeheartedly with Madame Veil's suggestion that an opinion should be given immediately after the debate on institutional questions because the European public also expects this from us.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* I agree, provided that the voting has been completed by 7 p.m.

President. — Mr Klepsch, I understand what you are saying. However, I feel that Mr Arndt's proposals will enable the vote to be taken at 5.30 p.m., before Question Time, without omitting anything.

(Parliament adopted the proposal)

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* We have the van den Heuvel report, to which there are 137 amendments, on Tuesday's agenda. The group chairmen discussed the various possibilities with a view to solving this problem. It is clear that under these circumstances the committee will have to consider the report again. I want, therefore, to propose to my group that the van den Heuvel report be replaced by the Gerontopoulos and Pantazi reports and that the former should be referred back to the Political Affairs Committee to deal with the 137 amendments. We did not wish to wait until tomorrow before putting forward this proposal so as not to upset the agenda.

In fact the Gerontopoulos and Pantazi reports on International Youth Year were scheduled to be dealt

with at the beginning of Thursday's sitting, but I am sure the House will be in favour of entering them on Tuesday's agenda instead.

(After Mr Klepsch's report was put to the vote, the President noted that it had not been voted for unanimously)

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Madam President, the issue I wanted to raise concerns the motions for resolutions tabled on the basis of the statements on the Milan Summit. There seems to be a new system creeping into this House. We now have a B series of motions for resolutions for which there is no foundation at all in our Rules of Procedure. Apart from the Spinelli report, which is, of course, in order, the rest of the motions for resolutions have been tabled under no rule of procedure at all. They come under a new nomenclature called Series B. It is entirely new, and I do suggest that the whole lot of them are out of order.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, I am also familiar with the order of business but we are faced with the following problem. If I table this motion at the beginning of the debate on the van den Heuvel report, the majority of the House will decide for referral back to committee. As the debate on the Milan Summit is scheduled to begin at 2 o'clock there would, therefore, be a gap in the order of business. This prompted me to move that the Gerontopoulos and Pantazi reports be substituted for the van den Heuvel report so that we could use these two hours to deal with the two resolutions on Youth Year, which we should otherwise have discussed on Thursday. I wanted to suggest this before tomorrow morning when the House can decide upon the referral without further ado, to give speakers from the political groups a chance to prepare for the debate and to ensure that business can proceed smoothly.

President. — Mr Klepsch, I am prepared for practical reasons to accept your request. Of course these requests should be presented one hour in advance to the Presidency. However, the President in the Chair should be able to accept a proposal.

Mr Ewing (RDE). — Madam President, I really believed that, as this is Youth Year, the major report on youth would have been given a slot on Tuesday or Wednesday. That did not seem to me to be an unreasonable demand. Indeed, I would say that if this House does not deal with this report on Tuesday or Wednesday, it is showing contempt for the youth of Europe. Mr Gerontopoulos is in his place and ready to go. We are ready to go. We have worked very hard, and I would ask this House to show the youth of Europe that we care by giving them a proper place on Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr Ford (S). — On a point of order, Madam President, under which Rule are you considering Mr Klepsch's proposals? In the past I have been refused the right to submit an amendment to the draft agenda because my proposal, with the necessary 21 signatures was not submitted one hour before the opening of the part-session . . .

President. — Mr Ford, I am obliged to interrupt you to put Mr Klepsch's request to the vote.

(Parliament approved Mr Klepsch's request)

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Madam President, I am sorry to insist, but the motions for resolutions to sum up after the statement by the Council are really not in order. I would like your ruling on this matter. They are not tabled under any rule of procedure. They are not intended to wind up an oral question with debate. They are under a new heading — Series B — which we have never met before. I do submit to you, Madam President, that the House should decide that they are out of order and should not be debated in this Chamber. We have a report by Mr Spinelli which is to be debated jointly with the President-in-Office's statement on the Milan Summit. These other resolutions make very interesting reading, but they are out of order.

Mrs van den Heuvel (S). — *(NL)* Madam President, I should like you to give me some information. I have a couple of questions on the place in the order of business of the debate on my report. First, I should like to ask on the basis of which of the Rules of Procedure you have called the vote on Mr Klepsch's proposal. Second, nobody spoke against this proposal. Mr Ford asked a question on procedure which you did not answer and then you informed us that nobody was against the proposal. That will not do at all. I now request formally that you call the vote again, but first tell me on the basis of which rule you could allow it to take place at this sitting.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Madam President, we seem to be debating two subjects simultaneously. I want to go back to the matter Sir James Scott-Hopkins has brought up, because you have now moved to the Wednesday agenda. I really do think that you have to rule now as to whether these resolutions on the Tuesday agenda are in order or not, because the agenda also refers to the deadline for tabling amendments to them. It is no use tabling amendments to motions which are out of order in the first place.

Mr Griffiths (S). — Madam President, I want to refer to the issue which Sir James Scott-Hopkins has brought up. As far as I am aware the use of Series A and Series B is just an administrative convenience. The

resolutions put before the House should also show itself on the document the actual rule under which they are laid down. Series A and Series B are used merely for the purposes of administration within the House and have nothing to do with the actual Rules. What should be indicated on the resolution is the rule it is tabled under.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — *(GR)* Madam President, does the result of the vote just mean that the van den Heuvel report is to be referred back to committee or also that its place on tomorrow's agenda is being taken by the report of Mrs Pantazi? Could you please clear this up.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, we can, if we wish, prolong the debate. We have in fact taken two votes on the matter. The solution of sending it back to committee was dictated by the excessive number of amendments tabled to it. I have made a number of formal comments on the matter which no one has objected to or supported.

Mr Klepsch has proposed the matter a second time. We have voted. The van den Heuvel question is therefore closed.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Madam President, you may have disposed of one problem but the problem raised by Sir James Scott-Hopkins and Mr Patterson you have not even tried to answer. Would it be in order for you to answer the question put to you by Sir James Scott-Hopkins and reiterated by my colleague, Mr Patterson?

Mrs Viehoff (S). — *(NL)* At the beginning of the sitting I attempted to draw your attention to the fact that my headphone was not working, thus preventing me from following the proceedings. I should surely have disagreed with your explanation of whole question of the order of business in relation to the referral back of Mrs van den Heuvel's report had it not been for the fact that I could only participate halfway through the discussion. I should indeed like to give my support to Mrs van den Heuvel's statement. Mr Ford did not speak against it but he asked you a question which you did not answer. I should like to ask again that the business once more be clarified and that the people present in the Chamber be given a clear explanation of exactly is going on. Again, I could not hear your explanation because my headphone was not functioning properly.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I take full responsibility for the vote and we cannot go back on it.

With regard to Sir James Scott-Hopkins' proposal, Parliament has always accepted that, at the end of a statement by the President-in-Office of the Council or

President

of the European Council, it can table and vote on one or more motions for resolutions on that declaration. The Rules of Procedure do not forbid consideration of these motions for resolutions. However, if a formal objection is made I shall put the question of the receiveability of the resolution in question to the House. In the absence of an explicit provision in the Rules of Procedure I can only submit the question to the House, pointing out that the principle of receiveability was accepted at 3 p.m. at the meeting of the chairmen of the political groups.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Madam President, in the past — and I have probably been here almost as long as you have — when Presidents-in-Office have made their statements there has been a short debate after the statement and that has been that. As far as I can remember there has very rarely been any report or motion for a resolution to follow. In this particular case we have a report which is being linked with the President-in-Office's report, and that is Mr Spinelli's report. Now, we may or may not agree with the latter and there may or may not be amendments to it, but it does cover the ground which is going to be covered by the President-in-Office in his report on the Milan Summit. The Spinelli report covers the whole field, and I submit to you that the other motions for resolutions, as you said yourself, are out of order and there is no question of the House voting on them. They are out of order because they are tabled under no rule of our procedure at all. Therefore, they should not be considered. But if you want to put the matter to the House, then I hope the House will accept the argument I am putting forward. They can do anything they want on the basis of the Spinelli report and put down their amendments to it.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) I consider this to be a very formal interpretation of the order of business, which does not reflect the original intention that the Council should make a statement on such matters followed by a debate and not by thirty minute of questions. Therefore, we shall actually be proceeding as if we had put a question to the Council on the Milan Summit. The agenda we have received, which was drawn up by the enlarged Bureau, simply states that Parliament may now table motions for resolutions. Parliament could refuse to make proposals on this matter but it is also at liberty to table motions for resolutions at the end of the debate. Although I normally welcome suggestions from my honourable colleague, Mr Scott-Hopkins, I think we should reject the suggestion he has just made.

(Parliament rejected Sir James Scott-Hopkins' request)

Mr Van der Lek (ARC). — (NL) Madam President, I have always held that a procedural motion should be dealt with first, and therefore, I asked to speak to request that all the resolutions except that by Mr Spinelli should be declared inadmissible. I have not much

more to add to what Mr Arndt has said and do not intend to repeat his comments. I should like to point out that since I became a Member of Parliament it has been customary to table motions for a resolution on debates and statements of the Council before the debate. I should also like to point out that all Members and groups may do so this time also, by including an item on the agenda.

President. — With regard to *Thursday*: I inform the House that Mr Lambrias' report, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on setting up health resorts in less-favoured regions, which was not adopted in committee, has been replaced by the Vandemeulebroucke report (Doc. A 2-69/85).

Also concerning *Thursday*, the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights has examined the amendments to the Rothley report (Doc. A 2-35/85 rev.) which was referred back to committee at the sitting of 14 June. The committee has retabled the report unchanged and has requested that it be put to the vote during this part-session. The vote will be taken at voting time on *Thursday*, 11 July and the deadline for tabling amendments has been fixed at 8 p.m. today.

Mr Chambeiron and nine others have tabled, under Rule 56, a request to include on the agenda an oral question by Mr Pranchère and others to the Commission on the drop in prices for cereals and rape.

Mr Pranchère (COM). — (FR) Madam President, the Council's failure to reach agreement on the price of cereals and colza should normally lead to the extension of the 1984-85 prices until such time as a decision might be taken.

The Commission, instead of proposing to extend the current prices, decided unilaterally to apply the proposed prices as a precautionary measure. This is a serious business both in substance and form.

As far as substance is concerned, the section of the Commission's preliminary draft budget dealing with agricultural expenditure illustrated the Commission's intention of pursuing a policy of price reduction which will continue in 1986. Instead of defending the interests of European agriculture, the Commission is laying down its arms in the face of an American commercial offensive. Not content with lowering prices, the Commission, abandoning its original proposals, also sees fit to abolish end-of-year allowances. These measures will result in a 5% fall in production prices and will have more serious consequences for the market. Businessmen will not find it profitable to store produce at the end of the year and will opt for intervention. Do we not also run the risk of having to import cereals during the summer? This decision presents some irregularities of form because the Commission is over-

Pranchère

stepping its rights and would seem to want to set a precedent before the European Council meeting in Milan.

For these reasons, I have put an oral question to the Commission and I ask for an explanation to be given to this House this week. It is my firm opinion that the Commission has other means at its disposal to weather the present crisis while taking account of the resolution which we voted on 14 March last and for which I was rapporteur.

Mr de Courcy Ling (ED). — Madam President, I would have wished to ask the Commission whether it will consider, yet again, synchronizing the timetable of the farm price review with the preliminary draft budget, because there again we are in the situation of still discussing the farm prices for 1985 to 1986 at the same time as the preliminary draft budget for one year later. When and if the Commission does come before this House, I should like to hear its views on this absurd situation which is very confusing for European farmers and makes it very difficult for this House to deliberate on the agricultural price review in relation to the budgetary procedure.

(Parliament rejected Mr Chambeiron's request, and approved the draft agenda as amended)¹

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Madam President, at the last meeting of the enlarged Bureau it was decided that a technology exhibition financed by Parliament would take place during the October part-session. Members of the committee responsible have informed me that practically all the funds earmarked for the information activity of the European Parliament have been spent on this exhibition. I should be grateful, therefore, if the enlarged Bureau would stipulate tomorrow the precise framework for this and indicate whether the final decision on the method of financing the exhibition was taken by Parliament and not the enlarged Bureau.

President. — Mr Arndt, the matter will be discussed tomorrow by the Bureau.

4. Deadline for tabling amendments

President. — The deadline for tabling amendments to the following reports has been extended to 8 p.m. today:

- Rothley report (Doc. A 2-35/85/rev.),
- Larive-Groenendaal report (Doc. A 2-70/85),

- Hindley report (Doc. A 2-74/85),
- Hutton report (Doc. A 2-72/85),
- Gerontopoulos report (Doc. A 2-71/85),
- Pantazi report (Doc. A 2-73/85).

For the other reports on the agenda the deadline for tabling amendments has been fixed at 12 noon on Tuesday, 9 July.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Madam President, I would like to ask for a clarification. It seems that Mrs van den Heuvel's report is not to be debated tomorrow. However, a question tabled by Mr Avgerinos and others on the violation of human rights in Turkey was to have been debated along with this report. In view of the fact that this question is not that closely related to Mrs van den Heuvel's topic I think it should be included in the agenda. But I would like to know the exact position.

President. — The whole matter has lapsed and with it the question.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — (GR) Madam President, I asked you this question earlier on as well, but you did not give me an answer. Has Mrs Pantazi's report been put down for debate tomorrow? I would like to take this opportunity to let you know that, from what I gather, Mrs Pantazi will not be able to be here tomorrow either. So I do not think this report can be debated tomorrow. I would ask you to note this fact and give me a clear answer.

President. — Mr Plaskovitis, the House decided, on Mr Klepsch's proposal, to enter the report by Mr Pantazi on tomorrow morning's agenda¹

Mr Marshall (ED). — Madam President, there is one matter which had been raised at the beginning of the part-session in April, May and June and to which no adequate answer has yet been given. That is the question of those Members who had not signed in but whose votes were recorded in the farm-price vote in March. Each month we are told that the inquiry moves forward very slowly. I was wondering whether you are yet in a position to tell the House whether those four Members have all replied to the letters and have explained whether they were in the House or whether some kind individual pressed a button on their behalf.

President. — Two Members are concerned. They are Mr Flanagan and Mr Smith who did not sign the

¹ *Amendments to Friday's agenda: see Minutes.*

¹ *Speaking time: see Minutes.*

President

attendance list for the sitting of 24 April 1985 but whose names figure on the list of Members who took part in the vote. The two Members in question have informed the President in writing that they were present at the sitting in question.

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — Madam President, since my name has now been used in response to this wretched creature here on my left, could I explain to this contemptible creature just one or two facts?

First of all, I was present at the voting on the agricultural matters on the occasion in question; secondly, I did not sign in that day — indeed, on many days I do not sign — because I objected in principle to doing so. However, as a result of a conference with the Quaestors, I did agree that in future I would do so. I still do not always do so. Even though somebody like Marshall with his typical Tory graspingness would not understand that attitude, I wish to repeat categorically to every Member of this House and in particular to that wretched person that I was present. I suspect that there are a lot of Members who do understand my point of view. I refuse, now that my name has been mentioned, to have my honour impugned by a member of his wretched group.

President. — Mr Flanagan, the matter is closed. My answer was clear.

Mr Ford (S). — Madam President, to come back to the point I raised earlier on the van den Heuvel report. What I did ask was under what procedure you took Mr Klepsch's amendment. You did not . . .

President. — The matter is closed. We shall continue with our business.

5. Articles 49 and 50 of the ECSC Treaty

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-28/85) by Mr Wijzenbeek, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on

the communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament (COM(84) 652 final — Doc. 2-1564/84) on a draft recommendation on the establishment of preferential treatment for debts in respect of the levies referred to in Articles 49 and 50 of the ECSC Treaty.

Mr Wijzenbeek (L), rapporteur. — (NL) Madam President, the report before us concerns a typical example of what I would call 'repair' legislation. The Commission is not obliged to ask the Parliament for an opinion on this matter, nevertheless it does so as a

matter of principle, and we appreciate this very much. I would remind Members that this concerns a recommendation according to the ECSC rules and that this is the same as in the EEC Treaty.

In the early fifties the drafters of the ECSC Treaty could not have foreseen that Community coal and steel undertakings should ever get into financial difficulties and thus not be able to satisfy their obligations.

Madam President, unfortunately this is indeed the case at present as a consequence of the economic crisis and in the meantime the Commission has the problem of trying to recover its 1.6 million ECU debt from bankrupt undertakings.

I am sure that you are well aware that they are levies referred to in Article 49 of the ECSC Treaty and elaborated in the first and second paragraphs of Article 50.

In these cases, Madam President, the Commission has tried every means to recover its money using claims for preferential treatment. Against that, an appeal was lodged by the Ferriere S. Anna SpA, and the Court of Justice ruled that in cases where legislation did not explicitly provide for the Community, in this case the High Authority, as a preferential creditor, it cannot act in this capacity. Consequently, the Court has entrusted the Community legislator — in this case the Commission — with the task of creating specific pre-fixed regulations.

It was on this very ruling from the European Court of Justice that the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights decided to table an amendment to the Commission's text. The Commission is being contradictory on that very point. As we understood it, the Commission would like to have the same position as, for example, the tax authorities of the Member States, drawing a parallel with the legislation on VAT revenue. However, the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights can in no case allow the Commission to have the status of preferential creditor with retroactive effect in respect of undertakings which have asked to go into liquidation. This is the problem. Whenever the Court of Justice asks for legislation to be introduced, one cannot introduce retrospective legislation granting the status of preferential creditors in the case of bankruptcies to those who have never had it.

This is why our committee tabled an amendment on this subject which we would like the Commission to accept, and we have the impression that it is ready to do so.

Madam President, I should like to point out to you that close comparison with legislation in Member States proves that such business as the intervention of other creditors is settled differently. In most Member States there is no question of retroactive legislation.

Wijsenbeek

Finally, I regret that Commissioner Christophersen is not here. I do not mean this to be a reflexion on the presence of Commissioner Clinton Davis as I am very pleased to see him here today. But I mentioned Mr Christophersen because in Danish legislation there is absolutely no preferential treatment for this special case for either the tax authorities or any other government body above creditors who themselves do not enjoy preferential treatment. In this respect, I should like on the basis of my own personal political and ideological convictions, and therefore not in my capacity as rapporteur, to state my preference this seemingly ideal system.

Madam President, we are fully in agreement with the amendments tabled by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy as well as with the opinion of the Committee on Budgetary Control. I earnestly recommend the House, therefore, also on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights to adopt this report, including the two amendments, both that of the Committee on Legal Affairs and that of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Mrs Vayssade (S). — (FR) Madam President, Mr Wijsenbeek has given a very clear explanation of the implications of this request for preferential treatment for ECSC debts. The fact that half of the revenue owing to the ECSC is obtained from levies on coal and steel undertakings will give you an idea of its importance in relation to loans.

We thought it a good idea to allow the ECSC to recover these debts from the undertakings. It is nevertheless true that the steel crisis and to some extent problems in the coal industry have led to an increasing number of undertakings defaulting on payments.

It was proposed, therefore, to extend to the ECSC the system which is common practice in many of the Member States of the Community, whereby the State is a preferential creditor in the event of a bankruptcy. This principle must be accepted to facilitate the task of collecting its revenue for a Community institution.

We in the Socialist Group also believe that this measure cannot be retroactive and that to apply it to bankruptcy proceedings already begun or not yet finished would result in a certain number of creditors being harmed, and here I am thinking of legislation in my own country where debts on salaries are also given preferential treatment.

Therefore, this is about decisions for the future. The Socialist Group will give its support to Mr Wijsenbeek's report.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

Mr Mühlen (PPE), draftsman of an opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. — (FR) Mr President, I could confine myself to making some remarks on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. I should like to begin by stating that the committee which appointed me draftsman of an opinion, subscribes fully to the proposals of the European Commission.

This proposal is designed to raise an ECSC levy on a preferential debt, as is the case for tax debts in all the Member States with the exception of Denmark.

While our committee realizes that the risks of insolvency arising from debts in relation to the ECSC levy are minimal, nevertheless it is no less convinced that it must be given the same preferential status as national tax debts. However, I must express the misgivings and concerns of our Committee on two particular fronts.

First, if the debts of other creditors, more particularly suppliers, sometimes consisting of small and medium-sized undertakings are to be protected, it would seem unreasonable to our committee to extend the duration of this preference beyond a reasonable period of time.

We are equally concerned about the prospect of not granting preferential treatment to debts which might seem somewhat dubious. Indeed, I was able to alert the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy to the efforts being made at present in Member States to publicize debts made payable by the State by having them registered. In my country, Mr President, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs deemed it necessary, in its resolution, to ask the European Commission to look briefly at the possibility of making the publication of preferential tax debts compulsory, for example by requiring them to be entered in a register. I am happy to say that the general rapporteur also agrees with this proposal.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I rise to answer this debate on behalf of President Delors who, owing to Commission duties, cannot be here himself this evening.

May I also say to Mr Wijsenbeek that I understand that he has to leave — he has explained his difficulties to me — but I would also like to say at the outset that as it is not part of Mr Christophersen's portfolio. I think it would have been a little unfair to have asked him to be present simply because he was going to raise the issue of Denmark. I do not know where we would be, as far as debates are concerned, if a Commissioner had to be present in anticipation of the country which

Clinton Davis

had supported his nomination being mentioned in the debate. Suffice it to say that I shall of course report this debate to President Delors.

The draft Coal and Steel Community recommendation on which the Commission is seeking the opinion of Parliament has been drawn up against the background of the worsening steel crisis, as a result of which many ECSC firms have been declared bankrupt. Accordingly, the question of whether debts due in respect of ECSC levies are to be treated as preferential or ordinary debts is hereby assuming considerable importance with regard to the scope for effectively recovering such amounts due to the Community which remain the main source of revenue for the ECSC operational budget. But the importance of the introduction of preferential treatment for claims arising from the application of levies should be seen not only in terms of the sums whose recovery is currently in jeopardy but also in terms of principle.

This is the first time that a Community tax instituted and levied directly by the Community is to be treated on a par with taxes enjoying equal rank and importance at national level. The Commission therefore expected that Parliament would welcome this initiative which is very much a Community measure. The report approved by the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens Rights explicitly recognizes the Community spirit of the draft recommendation drawn up by the Commission, which it calls, and I quote, 'an essential addition to Articles 49 and 50 of the ECSC Treaty giving the levies on the production of coal and steel the importance due to them as the main source of revenue for the ECSC operational budget'.

We can say immediately that in principle the Commission accepts the proposal made in the Wijsenbeek report for an amendment of the second paragraph of Article 4 of the draft. But having regard to the different legal systems which apply in the Community, we must be cautious about adopting a precise form of words to cover the principle which we are approving since otherwise we might create more problems than we seek to resolve. Accordingly, the Commission, while embracing the principles suggested in the report would wish to retain some flexibility when it comes to the drafting which has to be undertaken by the experts. I have, prior to this debate, explained that point of view to Mr Wijsenbeek and I think he in principle thought that it was a reasonable one.

But subject to that small reservation, we are pleased that Parliament has expressed its justifiable concern about this important issue.

I turn from that to Amendment No 2. We will certainly be prepared to examine the matter, but I do not think that Parliament would expect me to go further than that at this stage. It is a matter which is quite complicated and I think that it would be premature for

me to venture an opinion as to whether it is an appropriate procedure or not at this stage.

President. — The debate is closed.

We now come to the vote.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

6. *Hydrocarbons discharged at sea*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-51/85) by Mrs Squarcialuppi, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection,

on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 123 final — Doc. C 2-15/85) for a decision amending Decision 81/971/EEC establishing a Community information system for the control and reduction of pollution caused by hydrocarbons discharged at sea.

Mrs Squarcialuppi (COM), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, we all have some experience, direct or indirect, of the problems of pollution caused by hydrocarbons — substances which, because they are usually transported long distances and are in liquid form, more easily become widely diffused, so that once they have been discharged from tanks and ships it is difficult to control them.

We know too the profound distress caused by this problem to numerous peoples living in coastal areas, as well as the harm done to the public in general.

The Council and the Commission have not underestimated these problems. In fact, in the corpus of European legislation a whole series of decisions has been adopted: the three initial environmental action programmes; the Council resolution of 1978 which contained an action programme directed specifically at hydrocarbons; the Commission decision of 1980 setting up an Advisory Committee on hydrocarbons, followed by the Council decision of 1981 on the information system for hydrocarbons, which the present Commission proposal is intended to amend.

Since these early texts there has arisen a consensus in favour of the protection of the maritime environment and against pollution of the sea and hence a proposal for a decision on plans for emergency action. Subsequently the Community became a party to the international agreements such as the Barcelona Convention, the Bonn Agreement and the Caribbean Convention.

¹ The rapporteur spoke:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendment No 2.

Squarcialupi

However, all these decisions were adopted after the event, that is, in many cases, *after* our seas had suffered serious, tragic occurrences, after such incidents as the Torrey Canyon, the Amoco Cadiz, the North-Sea oil-rig and so on.

This proposal for a Council decision — to which we have provided an answer in record time, which explains too why only the text of the resolution of the Committee on the Environment has been prepared — amends Decision 81/971 on information for the control and reduction of pollution of the sea caused by hydrocarbons. We must also mention that this amendment results too from a very lively debate in November last in this Parliament following the wreck of the French ship *Mont Louis*, which was carrying radioactive materials.

That was why Parliament asked the Commission to supplement the rules by extending them to other harmful substances. It is an 'open' list so as to take account of the high level of transport by sea of substances and compounds, such as toxic and hazardous wastes, which have long been a matter of concern to our Parliament.

We were glad that the Commission — as may be seen from the communication — decided on the setting up of an interservice group to tackle this important and sensitive issue in all its aspects and naturally to make the decisions more effective.

I should like briefly to make two points. Above all there is the question of the solvents used in the event of spillage of hydrocarbons at sea. Sometimes their indiscriminate use is more harmful than the pollutants themselves. Research in this field must therefore be encouraged: We must seek solvents which are both effective and harmless, the more so as the research so far carried out by the Commission has not produced satisfactory results. Moreover, we must insist on biochemical substances, even though here too there is no completely satisfactory news up to the present.

The other point concerns what is to be done with the polluted mixtures recovered by mechanical means in the event of spillage. Such mixtures in general are composed of water and hydrocarbons or other harmful substances. We have considered the final disposal of these mixtures and whether current disposal methods are appropriate. We therefore recommend that the rules specified by the Community in the matter of toxic and hazardous wastes and industrial wastes should be observed for the treatment of these substances.

I should like to say a few words about the seven amendments submitted. Even though the Committee on the Environment has not had time to discuss them, I think they are all acceptable, so I can recommend the House to approve them.

I should like to finish, Mr President, by stressing that the sea is an environmental and economic asset of enormous importance. Our own existence and our own prosperity are linked to the life of the sea. Whenever the sea has failed to fulfil its function — as, for example, following the silting up of harbours or unacceptable levels of pollution, civilizations have died and prosperity has failed.

We must therefore seek with all the means at our disposal — technical, legislative, scientific and even cultural — to defend this asset which belongs to us all, which belongs to our civilization!

(*Applause*)

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, last August a French-owned cargo-ship was involved in a collision and sank in the Channel a few kilometres off the Belgian coast. Luckily, there was no oil spillage as the *Mont Louis* was not an oil-tanker. But it seems that the cargo of the *Mont Louis*, which was not disclosed at the time, consisted of containers of uranium waste and uranium hexafluoride. For months, countries on the North Sea coast feared the disastrous consequences such a collision would have for the sea water, marine fauna and flora. Now there are, of course, many regulations governing the transport of harmful substances: the transport code for dangerous goods of the IMO (International Maritime Organization); the transport code for radioactive materials of the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Organization). But in the light of the *Mont Louis* disaster these rules present quite a number of gaps.

First, they are concerned more with the safety of transport than with public and environmental safety, which should come first. Second, it appears possible to hide the exact nature of the cargo from the authorities of the country of origin and those of the country of destination as well as from coastal countries, thereby preventing them from taking any steps to ensure the safety of the population. And, although this is a product which reacts particularly to water, permission to transport it by sea was given without due consideration.

When we looked into the matter it appeared that the Seveso II guideline directive was not applicable because this guideline applies exclusively to waste and not to dangerous substances. As rapporteur I greatly deplore the fact that the directive does not apply to all dangerous substances.

That is why the Socialist Group is particularly pleased about the proposal from the Commission to the Council as well as with the proposals of the rapporteur and all the other amendments. We wish to give them all our full support; above all the extension of the existing information system on control and the limitation of the pollution of the sea by all dangerous substances and not just petroleum.

Van Hemeldonck

Furthermore, we tabled another amendment on the extension of the information system to request information about the most important producers and transporters of dangerous substances and the sea routes they use. In an urgent debate on the *Mont Louis* disaster it was said that the Channel and the North Sea were every bit as busy as the Champs-Élysées. If this is the case it is unthinkable that there is not better marking of these routes and that clear information is not given about the exact content of the cargo ships frequenting these seas. It would also seem to us especially important to prevent all sorts of doubtful ships flying the flag of convenience while carrying dangerous waste from using these routes.

Mr Lambrias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, I believe that the manifest unanimity of the political groups on this issue is a cry of anguish, an SOS about the degradation of the seas and even though, as the rapporteur has said, the measures proposed have shortcomings and also carry certain risks it is good to see a conscious realization of the need to widen protection, not just as far as hydrocarbons are concerned but also with regard to all the toxic substances and all the materials which are destroying the immense and vital resources of the sea.

In agreement with the previous speakers I should like to stress that the problem is still without a solution despite repeated effort and that, consequently, the three areas in which we need to make progress are information, control and the encouragement of new technology. Information is essential because the resources we have to protect are so extensive. Control, along with the institution of sanctions of an educational nature, because there are many industries involved in pollution which take no account of the long-term deterioration of this valuable asset. The encouragement of new technology to combat the danger because it has rightly been pointed out that in many cases we are faced with a vicious circle, with anti-pollution solvents in their turn destroying maritime flora and fauna and the healthy balance of the marine environment.

I should like to emphasize, Mr President, that the amendments which have been tabled strengthen and improve the report, and therefore, while stressing that we are moving in the right direction, I would add my voice towards endorsing them on behalf of my group. Much more will need to be done, and above all it will be necessary for political figures outside the European Parliament to recognize the need to save this life-giving resource.

Mrs Lemass (RDE). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mrs Squarcialupi, for the excellent presentation to Parliament of her report on how to deal with pollution of the sea caused by the dumping of oil and other harm-

ful substances. Mrs Squarcialupi's report includes a reference to a resolution which I and my colleague, Mr Andrews, tabled some time ago on the need to save Dublin Bay from deterioration.

Let me put the problems of Dublin Bay in context. Pollution of the sea by oil and other harmful substances, whether in the Mediterranean, the North Sea or the Irish Sea, is totally unacceptable. The sea is one of our greatest assets. Not only does it provide us with food and employment for our fishermen, but it is also a great natural environmental amenity and it must not be killed off. Many of Europe's cities are situated along the bays and estuaries of the Community's coastline. The waters of Dublin Bay are badly polluted, and what, in my opinion, is needed is remedial action and a model integrated resource management plan.

Dublin is one of the fastest-growing cities in Europe. One-third of Ireland's population lives in the Greater Dublin area and it is forecast that the population will increase to 2 million by the beginning of the next century. The prospect of such a population explosion in close proximity to the sea cannot be ignored.

The Commission's plan deals not only with pollution of the sea by oil, but also by other harmful substances. Raw sewage is being deposited at several points in Dublin Bay. A recent study suggests that Dublin Bay has reached the limit of its ability to assimilate the current waste loading.

I am deeply concerned about the future, not only from the point of view of health but from that of the quality of the environment in which we live. Coming generations have a right to expect that the natural environment around them, including the sea, bays and estuaries, is protected. I hope that the Members of this Parliament, who, I believe, have shown their deeply-felt concern for environmental issues in the past, will share my concern for the future.

The amendments which we have put forward and which we feel are desperately needed with regard to Dublin Bay can, I believe, be applied to similar situations throughout the Community. In particular, a model management plan could provide valuable information for other much-used bays and estuaries with high environmental and amenity value.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — (DE) Although the measures connected with the proposal before us are a step in the right direction, more emphasis should be placed on implementing restrictions than on providing information. We know enough already about what continues year after year to flow into the seas from rivers, dumping of toxic waste and dumping from tankers, for example, 400 000 tonnes of oil, 450 000 tonnes of heavy metal such as zinc, cadmium and quicksilver. In coastal areas, structural and econo-

Bloch von Blottnitz

mic policies have been carried out for decades which took no account of man or nature. However, worse still, today when we are faced with the consequences of this neglect, namely the poisoning of our seas, the environmental protection groups who have been alerting people to the frightening extent to which animals and plants are diseased and dying are portrayed as alarmists. Agreements were signed in London, Paris, Oslo, Barcelona, Bonn and Marpol, and there was a Council decision way back in 1978 on the control of oil pollution; there are committees and information systems. And what has been done? Absolutely nothing! The North Sea is dying as fast as the forests, showing that it is not enough just to promulgate national and international legislation. A much greater effort must be made to carry it through. This will only happen when international organizations are empowered to ensure the effective implementation of these laws.

Furthermore, we must demand the ratification of the Marpol annexes, as well as an extension of the Paris convention on atmospheric pollution, which Luxembourg and Ireland should finally be made to sign. Almost half of the heavy metals reaching the seas flow into them from our rivers.

On the basis of the Marpol declaration, the North Sea must be declared a special area, not only as far as oil pollution is concerned. The dumping of the 129 chemical waste products blacklisted by the European Commission must be prohibited in all waters, along with the dumping of titanium dioxide, for which there are enough alternative methods. We should not tolerate the dumping of radioactive waste from water cooling systems of nuclear power stations as well as from the Windscale and La Hague regeneration plants and the dumping of, low active waste just as we should not permit the release of heavily polluted harbour mud. The cleaning of tanks and their emissions must be made compulsory in all European ports. Environmental compatibility tests should be introduced and it should rest with the person responsible for damage to the environment to prove his innocence. Environmental protection groups should be given the right to plead their case before the International Court of Justice. The Commission should make greater use of its right to make public statements of its position on the breach of directives on water. This would have many governments on the trot who should have been at a gallop for along time.

As long as clauses such as 'economically justifiable' and 'relativity' continue to be used, there will be no improvement in environmental protection. We have an enormous responsibility towards present and future generations and can only come to terms with this responsibility if we give careful consideration to our different economic systems once and for all. Quantitative growth alone is not growth and it can only mean absolute impoverishment.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) There is an obvious link between public health and environmental protection.

Public health depends on the preservation and protection of our environment. We possess in Europe two valuable seas, the Mediterranean and the North Sea, which continue to play an important economic role. The cultural level and that of public health continue to be a link between our peoples.

Experts claim that these two seas are either dead or dying. Tests have shown that fish from the Mediterranean is becoming more and more unfit for human consumption, and this is threatening the health of the people living along its shores. Studies published show that an increasing number of beaches are polluted, thus posing a threat to the leisure and tourist industries. Therefore, we wish to press first for tougher health and environmental standards for shipping, for example, preventing them from dumping at sea. Second, for tougher measures to combat pollution of the seas through riverwater and groundwater, for example dumping in seas, rivers and reservoirs.

Third, we would urge that people be better informed and made more conscious of the protection of our seas. Fourth, suitable legislation for the protection of the sea, the choice of technology which is less harmful to the environment. Unfortunately, we have, been forced to recognize, for example, that the detergents used to combat pollution are themselves harmful to the environment. Therefore, I urge that tough and, more importantly, preventive measures be taken.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, this has been a short but valuable debate and the issues covered in the speeches of the honourable Members today are certainly significant. I believe that the points which have been made are undoubtedly recognized by the Commission.

May I congratulate Mrs Squarcialupi for once again characteristically, if I may say so, focusing our attention on a crucial aspect of environmental policy. Indeed, I am very pleased to note that our recent initiatives in the field of maritime pollution are applauded in the text of her resolution.

The threat posed to our seas and rivers by hydrocarbons and other forms of chemical pollution has frequently been raised by Members of this House, and I am glad that it should have been done.

Mrs Squarcialupi refers to recent resolutions about, for example, the pollution affecting the Dublin Bay area and the River Scheldt — a point underlined by Mrs Lemass. In May of this year we had a useful debate in Strasbourg about the precarious ecology of the Mediterranean region, when a number of issues under review today were then discussed.

I think it would be valuable, Mr President, to set this debate, as indeed Mrs Squarcialupi sought to do, in the context of the history of Community involvement

Clinton Davis

in the question of maritime pollution. Our activity began in 1978 after the wreck of the *Amoco Cadiz*. Of course, it is true that action began earlier following the *Torrey Canyon* and a number of other disasters. In the context in which we are debating the matter today, however, I think we began in the wake, so to speak, of the *Amoco Cadiz* disaster. The Council then adopted an action programme on the control and reduction of pollution caused by hydrocarbons discharged at sea. In fact this was interpreted by the Commission as a mandate to undertake studies and to make appropriate proposals in different fields, and a number of significant developments have resulted. In June 1980 the Commission set up an advisory committee on the control and reduction of pollution caused by hydrocarbons discharged at sea. This committee, consisting of highly qualified experts, gives the Commission invaluable advice on all subjects relating to oil pollution.

In December 1981 the Council adopted a decision which instituted the Community information system for the control and reduction of pollution caused by hydrocarbons discharged at sea. This system consists mainly of four components — an inventory of the means of combating pollution, a catalogue containing a short description of these means, a compendium of hydrocarbon properties and a compilation study on the different impacts of hydrocarbons on fauna and flora.

In 1982 a new item was introduced in the Community budget for the protection of the maritime environment, and the work realized within this framework has been particularly valuable. By the end of 1985 more than 50 studies and pilot projects for the development of means and techniques for combating marine pollution, involving an expenditure of some 2 million ECU, will have been completed.

Of course I perfectly well understand that the number of studies and the amounts spent mean nothing unless the studies are relevant and there is the political will to reap the benefits of that work in our future efforts. However, I remain optimistic on this score.

Furthermore, a research programme is also sponsored already by the Commission's Directorate-General for Research. This covers a wide range of studies from basic coastal and marine ecosystem processes to research concerning oil pollution specifically.

On 25 March this year the Commission submitted to the Council a communication with a view to extending its policy on combating pollution by oil to other harmful substances. To achieve this objective we established a plan comprising a legal framework, an action programme for 1985 and a training programme. May I comment briefly on the action programme.

Within the framework of the plan a series of projects will be started in 1985, the aim of which is to develop the intervention capability and to enhance coopera-

tion. Among the projects we envisage the development of what has become known as a response decision system which aims to give to the responsible authorities the appropriate guidelines for intervention action. Now, information is a critical aspect of this whole area of policy, as was pointed out by Mrs Van Hemeldonck in relation to the *Mont Louis* disaster. The existing information systems must be adapted for easy operational use and should be widely disseminated at the appropriate administrative levels. In addition it is obviously plain that an information system can only be effective if it is combined with an efficient human organization. In other words, it is now necessary to create both at an international and at a national level networks of responsibility for the utilization of these systems.

We are faced with a major technological challenge in the field of marine protection. So we must mobilize all the resources that we have available — human and material — to prevent pollution, to improve the present situation and to mitigate the effects of all possible maritime policies more satisfactorily than in the past. We must ensure that our contribution as a Community extends far beyond the confines of the Community as such and that we always use our best endeavours to support and stimulate wider interest in the work of the IMO and other international organizations. Pollution does not recognize frontiers or territorial limits, and in declaring war upon it we need to ensure that we extend our alliances so that our response to the challenges we face is both powerful and flexible.

Just a few words about some specific points that arose in the debate itself. I very much go along with the thinking of Mrs Van Hemeldonck, and indeed as far as Amendment No 7 is concerned, if the House decides to approve that amendment, I would certainly go along with that happily.

As far as flags of convenience are concerned, I have said a good deal in this House about that and in our shipping memorandum we question the whole philosophy of the flag of convenience. I have said before that it is a fact of life, but so is pneumonia and you don't actually go on encouraging more and more people to get pneumonia. I believe that one of the instruments that we are able to use effectively against unsafe and substandard shipping, is an effective port-State controlled system. We are holding an intergovernmental conference in November on that very issue to ensure that the most effective form of port-State control is being administered within the Community.

There has been suggestion by Mr Lambrias and I think by Mr Ulburghs that the processes that are used, the clean up, technology is itself defective and damages the flora and fauna. I think a great deal of progress has been made, nevertheless, in that respect since the days of the *Torrey Canyon*, and I think we ought to recognize it. Of course there is room for anxiety and for improvement. But I do not think we should dismiss the

Clinton Davis

element of progress that has been achieved in the way in which we deal with oil pollution and other matters of that kind.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz said that we should concentrate on what is happening to the sea rather than on information. I think, if I may say so, it would be utterly wrong to exclude the element of information which is a vital ingredient in being able successfully to attack pollution of the sea. To suggest as she did that nothing has happened in all these years is, I think, to damage her own argument. It is patently absurd to make that suggestion. A great deal has been accomplished. I am not suggesting for one moment that there is not room for further improvement, as I was just saying; but to dismiss the progress that has been made as cursorily as she did is neither fair nor acceptable.

Having said that, I welcome the debate. I believe it has been a constructive one. I am delighted that our gen-

eral approach has been supported, and as I have said, I am prepared to accept Mrs Van Hemeldonck's point contained in Amendment No 7 providing, of course, that the House does.

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now proceed to the vote.

I would point out before we vote that there is a corrigendum to the text of the motion for a resolution which has been duly circulated.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution)*¹

*(The sitting was closed at 6.50 p.m.)*²

¹ The rapporteur spoke:
— IN FAVOUR of all the amendments.

² *Agenda for next sitting*: see Minutes.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 9 JULY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes</i> <i>Mr Pannella; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Ford</i>	15	<i>Andrews; Mr Jospin; Mr Klepsch; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Cervetti; Mr Nord; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr de la Malène; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Romualdi; Mr Panella; Mr Formigoni; Mr Toksvig; Mr Wurtz; Mr Romeo; Mr Lalor; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Van der Waal; Mr Tognoli; Mr Beumer; Mr Penders; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Arndt; Mr Santer</i>	36
2. <i>Decision on urgency</i> <i>Mr Guermeur; Mr Provan; Dame Shelagh Roberts</i>	16		
3. <i>Welcome</i> <i>Mr Alavanos</i>	16		
4. <i>Preliminary draft budget 1986</i> <i>Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mr Christodoulou; Mr Fich; Mr Schön; Mr Taylor; Mrs Barbarella; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Pasty; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Pitt; Mr Mallet; Mr Pranchère; Mr Maher; Mr Bonde; Mr Clinton; Mr Alavanos; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Aigner; Mr Christophersen</i>	17	8. <i>Tribute</i>	69
5. <i>International Youth Year 1985 — Report (Doc. A 2-71/85) by Mr Gerontopoulos</i> <i>Mr Gerontopoulos; Mrs Pantazi; Mr McMahon; Mr Münch; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr McMillan-Scott; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mrs Lemass; Mr Ulburghs; Mrs Peus; Mr Brok; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission)</i>	26	9. <i>Votes</i> <i>Mr P. Beazley; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Arndt; Mr Spinelli; Mr Sutra; Mrs Veil; Mr Marshall; Mr Arndt; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Cryer; Mr Herman; Mr Nordmann; Mr Coste-Floret; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Verbeek; Mrs Thome-Patenôte; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Megahy; Mr Patterson; Mr Christiansen; Mr Cassidy; Mr Bonde; Mr Huckfield; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Prag; Mr Pearce; Mr C. Beazley; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Christensen; Mr Filinis; Mr Kolokotronis; Mr Marshall; Mr Turner</i>	69
6. <i>Solidarity with Third World Children Week — Report (Doc. A 2-73/85) by Mrs Pantazi</i> <i>Mrs Pantazi; Mrs Caroline Jackson; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission)</i>	34	10. <i>Action taken on the opinions of Parliament</i> <i>Mr Varfis (Commission); Mr Pranchère; Mr Varfis; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Varfis; Mr Wurtz; Mr Varfis; Mr Chanterie; Mr Varfis; Mr Cryer; Mr Natali (Commission); Mrs Dury; Mr Varfis; Mr Seligman; Mr Varfis; Mr Elliott; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Varfis; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Marshall; Mr Ducarme</i>	77
7. <i>European Council in Milan — European Union — Statements by the Council and the Commission and Report (Doc. A 2-77/85) by Mr Spinelli</i> <i>Mr Santer (Council); Mr Delors (Commission); Mr Spinelli; Mrs Banotti; Mr</i>		<i>Annex</i>	81

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

*Vice-President**(The sitting was opened at 9.00 a.m.)*1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(FR)* Mr President, Annex I lists the names of Members appointed to the ACP-EEC Joint Assembly. I should be grateful if you would confirm that the enlarged Bureau have decided that an official observer is to be given to the Non attached Members. We can then give you the name of the non-attached Member so that it can be included in the annex to our minutes.

President. — Mr Pannella, I can confirm that the Bureau has given the Non-attached Members the right to have an observer at the ACP-EEC Joint Assembly and your wish will be met.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — *(NL)* It took me some time to find precisely what I was looking for in these minutes, and as you know, I did not find them on my desk until this morning. We had a discussion here yesterday on the possible referral back to committee of my report on human rights in the world in 1984. We made repeated attempts to find out from the President in the chair under which Rule of Procedure she was putting the proposal for referral back to committee to the vote. I now see from the minutes that we were informed yesterday that this was done under Rule 85 of the Rules of Procedure, which reads:

A request for referral back to committee may be made at any time during the debate before the final voting begins . . .

Well, there was no debate on my report yesterday, and the time for final voting had certainly not been reached. I am therefore surprised that the President felt she could comply with Mr Klepsch's request under Rule 85, and I wish to protest against this decision in the strongest possible terms. I say again what I said yesterday: the President in the chair did not call on anyone opposed to the referral back to committee to speak during the discussion. She thus contravened the Rules of Procedure in two respects.

President. — Mrs Van den Heuvel, what happened yesterday was that when Mr Klepsch made the request

for the change to be made, the President in the Chair, by putting Mr Klepsch's request to the vote, took over as President his request for a change in the agenda. It is true that no one had the opportunity to speak against that request. The President in the Chair put it to the vote as a change in the agenda, and it was on that basis that the House voted.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — *(NL)* I appreciate that you want to defend your predecessor in the Chair. That is commendable, but what you say is just not right. The minutes say that the President put Mr Klepsch's request to the vote pursuant to Rule 85. But she cannot have done so pursuant to Rule 85, and in any case, Rule 85 does not concern changes in the agenda but the referral of reports back to committees. So either the procedure was wrong, which is what I maintain, or the minutes are wrong, and there is no disputing that: the Secretariat has obviously tried to fill in the background to the President's action. But, I repeat, this action was completely in conflict with the Rules of Procedure, and I would like that to be mentioned in tomorrow's minutes.

President. — Mrs Van den Heuvel, I have made a note of what you said. I am sure there will be a reference to it in the Minutes tomorrow. That is the way I have had to rule this morning.

Mr Ford (S). — On the same issue we were told yesterday by the President in the Chair that Mr Klepsch was proposing an amendment to the agenda but that he had not given the necessary one hour's notice. Are you now telling us that whoever is in that Chair can accept from any Member of the House a proposal for an amendment to the agenda without the hour's notice specified in Rule 56(1)? If that is the case, it is rather worrying, because, depending on who is in the Chair and the political group to which he belongs, we are going to have a lot of agenda changes which ignore the rules of this Parliament.

I would like that issue to be raised as well, because I do not see under what rule the President in the Chair can usurp the right of this Parliament under Rule 56(1) to amend its agenda.

President. — Mr Ford, thank you for that statement. It will be noted and taken up by the Bureau.

(Parliament approved the minutes)¹

¹ *Documents received — Topical and urgent debate (Announcement):* See Minutes.

2. *Decision on urgency*

Proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-54/85 — COM(84) 569 final) for a regulation concerning the conclusion of the Agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and Spain on the granting of specific financial aid to facilitate and accelerate the adjustment of fishing capacity in Spain.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, I wish to protest at the Council's treatment of Parliament in connection with the proposal on which you are inviting us to vote. I would point out that this proposal dates from 19 October 1984 and was forwarded by the Council, for consultation, on 26 June 1985. Nine months have therefore elapsed between publication of the proposal and the request for urgent procedure. Parliament has been left with only 13 days for this procedure, whereas 9 months have been lost.

Now this is a very important matter, Mr President, since it involves an amount of 28.5 million ECU and the action to be financed with these funds is far from inconsiderable: it entails nothing short of the restructuring of the Spanish fishing fleet, so that it has extremely important implications for the fishing industry in the Community of Ten.

I would make the further point, Mr President, that there is no justification for urgent procedure, in my view, since Article 7 of the Annex to this Proposal containing the exchange of letters stipulates that the Spanish Government must advise their programme within a maximum of 5 months of the date of accession. Since the date of accession will not be before 1st January 1986, the procedure does not have to be concluded before the end of May 1986.

In the circumstances I call upon the House to reject this request for urgent procedure, for which there is no justification whatsoever. This will impress upon the Council that Parliament is not prepared to accept whatever procedure is proposed to it.

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, I wonder if we could actually have a statement from the Commission on this. I agree entirely with what Mr Guermeur has just said.

(Parliament rejected urgent procedure)

*
* *

Mr Provan (ED). — I would like to have been able to support the Commission in the circumstances, but I felt that I could not do so. Perhaps in the future it would be a good idea for the Commission to come and

put a case to Parliament if something is really urgent as far as they are concerned. It does seem quite intolerable that certain issues which they believe and we believe have a longer-term implication should just be bounced through this House on a rubber stamp basis. I think they should come and give us an explanation in future as to why some of these matters have to be treated urgently.

President. — Mr Provan, in fact it was the Council that requested urgency and therefore it is the Council that should be here to support its case.

*
* *

Pre-accession Protocol to the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Portuguese Republic and the Protocol between the European Economic Community and the Portuguese Republic concerning the arrangements for the progressive liberalization of imports of motor vehicles into Portugal from the Community (Doc. C 2-56/85)

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations. — Mr President, I believe that urgency can be justified in this case because the agreement deals with the preaccession period and ought therefore to be dealt with as quickly as possible. I would like to add, however, that I shall be somewhat disappointed if there is no member of the Council present who could answer any queries which Members might wish to raise. However, the Committee on External Economic Relations has no objection to urgency being granted.

(Parliament approved urgent procedure)

President. — I propose that this item be included on Friday's agenda.¹

3. *Welcome*

President. — Before I move on to the next item, I wish to extend a very warm welcome to a delegation of parliamentarians from the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Organization who are seated in the Official Gallery. The 15 members of the delegation come from five of the six ASEAN countries; Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. They are in Luxembourg for the 5th meeting of the Delegations from the European Parliament and the ASEAN Inter-

¹ *Deliberations of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions concerning petitions: see Minutes.*

President

Parliamentary Organization. These interparliamentary exchanges represent a valuable adjunct to the other ties which bind the European Community and the ASEAN countries, ties which were cemented five years ago with the signing of the EEC/ASEAN cooperation agreement.

On behalf of the entire House I wish the members of the visiting delegation a very pleasant stay and successful discussions here in Luxembourg.

(Applause)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, I understand the importance of the welcome you have just extended to the representatives of the ASEAN countries, but think it right to remind you that in a recent part-session the European Parliament adopted a decision to condemn the execution of Communists in Indonesia. That is something the delegation from the so-called Indonesian Parliament ought to hear.

4. Preliminary draft budget 1986

President. — The next item is the presentation by the Commission of the preliminary draft budget for the 1986 financial year.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DA)* Mr President, with the adoption of the 1985 budget during the last part-session of Parliament, the Community returned to a normal budgetary situation. It was thus possible for the Commission the day after Parliament had adopted the budget for 1985 to adopt its preliminary draft budget for 1986, and I take this opportunity to comment further on the remarks to the Commission's draft budget which we forwarded to the budgetary authority nearly a month ago. I am glad to have this opportunity since, on the one hand, the draft budget for 1986 reflects a number of important decisions of principle for the coming years and, on the other hand, reveals the restrictions on our freedom of choice which flow from a number of individual decisions which have already been taken.

Having referred to the principles underlying the formulation of the draft budget for 1986, I should like to add a few brief remarks on the medium-term budget projections, which provide the framework for the Commission's proposal, and some comments on the Commission's position with regard to the formulation of the budgetary discipline resolution and the Council's deliberations on the so-called frame of reference for the 1986 budget, which the Council sees as part of its budgetary discipline.

The basic principles guiding the preparation of the draft budget for 1986 consist essentially of the follow-

ing four problems, each of which in its way sets limits for choice in our budgetary planning.

To begin with the new 1.4% VAT ceiling sets an upper limit on the Community's resources. This new VAT ceiling is of course a substantial increase in relation to the present 1% ceiling, but the increase is far from being as large as it looks at first sight. To start with, the intergovernmental agreements of both 1984 and 1985 meant that this year already 0.15% of the VAT basis has been used up over and above the one per cent laid down in the existing arrangement. Thus in 1985 we have in fact already used not 1% but 1.15%. In addition the British compensation mechanism means that the Member States which contribute most to the British arrangement pay 0.1% more in VAT than the average. Altogether therefore this means that we are up to a VAT rate of 1.25% this year already or, in other words, there is only 0.15% left in the 1986 budget before we are up to the 1.4% VAT ceiling. This, then, is the first major limitation on our freedom of choice.

The second critical limit to our freedom of choice are of course the appropriations for payment which inevitably flow in later years from the commitments entered into by the Community. The sharp rise in appropriations for commitment, compared with appropriations for payment, which the budgetary authority has so far been willing to accept means that the Community is now burdened by a very large build-up of outstanding commitments which will have to be honoured in 1986.

I can inform you that at the start of 1986 these commitments will amount to 12.4 billion ECU, but of course not all the commitments will fall due for payment in the same year. Nevertheless they constitute a significant burden on next year's budget.

The fact that we have these commitments of course in itself gives no reason for concern: they are a natural consequence of the multiannual appropriation system. When we speak of new programmes, such as the integrated Mediterranean programmes, it is quite logical that commitments should be larger at the outset than payments. What is disquieting in the development which has taken place is that commitments have each year been completely out of phase with payments; there has therefore been an accumulation of commitments which must now be honoured. Better balance can only be achieved between commitments and payments if we apply a more stringent allocation of budgetary priorities.

The third limit to our freedom of choice I would mention is the policy which already exists and must be continued, and that in itself accounts for the bulk of the 1986 budget. It is of course neither desirable nor possible to make radical switches in budgetary policy from one year to the next, but this also means that the scope for new initiatives is limited.

Christoffersen

Finally there is the fourth limitation: that new policy adopted by the Community must be financed within the existing framework. This means that, even with the modest resources at our disposal, we have to find room for such things as the integrated Mediterranean programmes and a greater effort of research, and that compels us to be critical with regard to existing commitments and to allocate priorities.

I thought it important to draw special attention to these principles, and I should like now to comment on the four main criteria the Commission has applied to the drafting of the 1986 budget.

To begin with the Commission decided to keep the expenditure on agriculture within the agricultural policy guidelines which the previous Commission had proposed as part of its plan for budgetary discipline in the spring of 1984. This means quite a low rise in overall agricultural expenditure, ie 2.4%, and that does *not* take account of the enlargement of the Community, for it is clear that enlargement will require a higher rise than 2.4%.

I would moreover emphasize that this very modest 2.4% increase includes an amount of 423 million ECU, which has been set aside for the depreciation of the intervention stocks. In other words this money has not been earmarked for a marketing operation but to depreciate stocks. Thus we shall have greater freedom to realize our stocks at appropriate times, because we have already made allowance for the loss.

I can also inform you that, in calculating the agricultural expenditure, we have assumed a further drop in the rate of the American dollar. Whereas in the current year we based our budgeting on a dollar/ECU ratio of 1 : 1.3, in 1986 we are going down to a ratio of 1 : 1.2, in other words we assume a further 8-10% drop in the value of the dollar in relation to the currencies which make up the European currency system.

I should also like to emphasize, following on from what I said about the stock policy, that we must have a more consistent stock policy in the Community. It is the Commission's view that the writing down of stock values to realistic prices and the physical reduction of stocks should be emphasized in preference to abolishing the burden that the intervention stores represent for the Community. I can, for example, inform you that at the end of the current year we estimate that our stocks will have a total value of at least 9 billion ECU. It is a very considerable sum. Indeed it is of such a size that, if we wish to run down a significant proportion of these stocks, we shall be unable to do so with the present budgetary method of dealing with the stocks problem.

It is therefore important to alter the method of budgeting by which we now deal with the stock policy in such a way that we achieve a constant depreciation in stock values, which in reality already become losses

when the stocks accumulate. Compared with the very high value of the stocks, clearly the proposals we present regarding the appropriations for stock depreciation are modest, but we wanted to secure the adoption of a principle and the approval of the budgetary authority for the policy this year, so that we can build upon it in future years.

The second fundamental question I wish to raise concerns the structural funds. It is in this field that appropriations for commitment have risen particularly sharply in recent years, whereas appropriations for payment have been held at a relatively low level. It was of course important to place the structural funds in a position to make a contribution, in particular, to solving the growing social problems. There was general agreement that youth unemployment should be combated, for example, by increased appropriations to the Community's Social Fund, but it is equally clear that we have chosen the easy way out of the problems. We have been content to increase appropriations for commitment and have refused to take the consequences in the shape of an increase in appropriations for payment. And that is the problem with which we are now faced. The Community is now in the uncomfortable and unusual situation that appropriations for payment in 1986 will automatically show a fairly sharp rise — solely as a result of commitments entered into in the past. Another way of putting it is that, if the budgetary authority opted merely to use the maximum rate of increase for increasing appropriations for payment, there would simply be no room for new appropriations for commitment in 1986. Thus we could use all the appropriations for payment, if they were only to rise by 7.1%, merely to liquidate commitments entered into in the past. These are the reasons why in our draft budget we have given a clear statement of these problems, which have arisen as a consequence of the inadequate balance between appropriations for payment and appropriations for commitment. We have done so by entering special reserve items for each of the structural funds the sole purpose of which will be to cover commitments from the past. I call on both the Council and Parliament not to shirk this responsibility. For, if the problem is not solved now, it may eventually take on such proportions that we shall be forced to adopt far more drastic financial solutions to get the situation under any kind of control.

These are also the reasons why the Commission has at the same time chosen to limit the rise in new appropriations for commitment. The Commission is not proposing the maximum rate of increase here, but only an increase of 5% in 1986. After a number of years during which we have experienced steep rises in commitments and woefully inadequate increases in appropriations for payment, a period is needed in which we should go in the opposite direction. Otherwise we shall not return to a sound position of equilibrium, which means — I realize this — that the real increase in new commitments will be very modest. These are

Christoffersen

the consequences of the sins of the past which we must now bear.

The third principle I would mention is the setting up of a reserve for unforeseen expenditure. This reserve, for which 400 million ECU have been earmarked, is primarily intended to cover unforeseen expenditure in connection with food aid and to allow for uncertainties regarding the enlargement of the Community. With regard to food aid, I think we must expect to face new disaster situations in 1986. I think it wise for the Community already now to show its readiness to play its part in solving the problems. With regard to enlargement, the reason for holding funds in reserve is quite simply that it is still unclear what the final budgetary consequences will be. It is not that the Commission's departments cannot add up — the Council of Ministers can also do its sums. Our uncertainty has to do with the fact that it is still unclear in respect of the two new Member States to what extent we shall be able in the first year of membership to derive full benefit from the facilities afforded by the Community. To what extent will they be able to make use of the structural funds, for example, already in 1986? To what extent will they be able to draw upon the common agricultural policy? There is still uncertainty regarding these matters, and that is the reason for this reserve item. Moreover it is clear that enlargement itself takes up much of the draft budget, and I would remind you that the agreement between the Community and the two new Member States is based in budgetary terms on the following considerations: budgetary integration must proceed in step with integration into the Community's other policies. During the transitional period which has been agreed for the integration of the two new Member States into the various common policies, therefore, there will be a gradual upward adjustment of their total contribution to the Community budget. In purely technical terms the arrangement is that they will receive the repayment of a declining proportion of their VAT contribution and, when the transitional period for policy integration has elapsed, the budgetary transitional period will also be at an end. They will then be making their full contribution through their VAT payments. Thus they will be consistently observing the principle of own resources.

The fourth main point in the proposal itself is that we are endeavouring to create a basis for the financing of new policies, on which decisions have been taken but which have not yet been implemented. There are two things I would mention here: to begin with the financing of the integrated Mediterranean programmes, which are expected to take full effect already in 1986, and secondly a number of appropriations for research and transport. The result of the budgetary principles in conjunction with a very critical review of the individual budget items for 1986 is that appropriations for payment will rise altogether by 16.5% next year, while appropriations for commitment will only rise by 12.5% in relation to the current year. The fact that we get up to those rates of increase at all is of course due

to the enlargement of the Community. If we disregard enlargement, if we consider only the ten existing Member States, the rate of increase in appropriations for commitment will only be 4.6%, which exactly matches the expected rate of inflation — it is in fact the most restrictive proposal on the commitment side which has been presented for a number of years. On the other hand we are proposing an increase in appropriations for payment for the ten existing Member States of 12%, and that reflects the need to restore the balance between commitments and payments.

The VAT percentage which follows from the preliminary draft budget for 1986 has been calculated at 1.35% for the Member States which pay the highest rate. For the United Kingdom the percentage will be considerably lower because of the compensation mechanism, ie 0.82%. The Federal Republic of Germany, whose contribution to the British arrangement is reduced by a third, gets a VAT rate of 1.31%. This means that the ceiling of 1.4% is a fiction — the real ceiling is lower; it also means that there are only 750 million ECU left before we reach the 1.4% ceiling. In fact we are left with only 2% of the total budget in the form of resources for free commitment. It is therefore clear that already in 1986 we shall once again find ourselves facing a very tight budgetary situation.

A few words on the multiannual budget estimates: when the budget is published in full — and that should be within the next few days — we shall be able to see, presumably at the start of next week, that the Commission has produced the usual three-year financial estimates. But it should not be assumed from this that the Commission is making any statement of principle on the subject of medium-range budgetary planning. The three-year multiannual budget estimates simply show what form the automatic development of commitments may take. Neither does the Commission make any pronouncement on when it will present a proposal for an increase in the present 1.4% VAT ceiling. Clearly there is a need for such statements of principle, and I have already proposed to Parliament's Committee on Budgets that we should get together on an informal basis, perhaps by holding a seminar or some meeting to review possible medium-range budget scenarios, in order to discuss ways in which a multiannual system of budgeting could be developed under different preconditions. I should like to reiterate this proposal: the Commission considers it to be vitally important that in the future we try to devise a system of a medium-range budgetary planning, and I shall come back to Parliament, hopefully in the autumn, and report on how we view the concrete content of such a medium-term budgetary policy.

Now, Mr President, I should like to say something about budgetary discipline. On 14 June the Commission sent some figures to the two arms of the budgetary authority, the Council and Parliament, for whatever use they wished to make of them. Far be it from

Christophersen

the Commission to dictate what use the Council and Parliament should make of the figures, but we all know why these figures were produced: the Council's decision of 4 December 1984 on budgetary discipline.

The Council's discussions in the intervening period, and most recently yesterday at the meeting of the Economic and Financial Council, have in the Commission's view been difficult. That goes without saying, if on the one hand you want to establish a mechanical framework and on the other hand be able to deal with specific budgetary problems. It is a well known fact that living organisms cannot develop and unfold naturally within frames and other geometric figures. In an effort to be helpful, therefore, the Commission pointed out to the Economic and Financial Council the problems which might arise with the adoption of excessively abstract and rigid formulations.

It is the Commission's hope that the final decision of the Economic and Financial Council may be of a sufficiently flexible and adaptable nature not to create difficulties in the cooperation between the two arms of the budgetary authority. I can say that it does not involve any particular problem for the Commission if the decision is not sufficiently flexible. It will be a problem for the budgetary authority itself if the budgetary discipline is formulated in such a way that it is too rectangular, too triangular or too decagonal in its formulation. The advice the Commission gave to the Economic and Financial Council in its discussions was thus: don't make difficulties for yourselves!

I have presented it in this form because it is important, if such a version of the budgetary discipline is to be introduced, that it should also be credible and that we should not have to acknowledge publicly at some later stage that it was unworkable. This would undermine respect for the budgetary discipline.

Clearly the Commission has a different opinion of what budgetary discipline should be; this opinion is reflected in the preliminary draft budget. We take the view that budgetary discipline must be maintained by allocating budgetary priorities, by making a concrete and rigorous appraisal of the resources available and of how they are to be used. That is our opinion of what budgetary discipline should be, and the proposal we have presented, I think, puts it to the test. It shows restraint, it is prudent and it aims to restore budgetary balance between commitments and payments. That is the Commission's version of budgetary discipline. All we need now is Parliament's version and, finally, a strenuous effort to bring the three interpretations into convergence.

(Applause)

President. — Under Rule 40 there will now be 30 minutes for Members to ask questions. I would remind Members that the rule requires them to put brief and

concise questions so that any points made by the Commission can be clarified.

Mr Christodoulou (PPE). — (GR) On behalf of the Committee on Budgets, I thank the Commissioner for his analytic presentation and would like to ask a number of questions, which summarise the attitude of the Committee on Budgets.

I shall first mention the reserves held in the structural funds, which the Commissioner referred to. The Commission has justified tying up this capital on the view that it corresponds to commitments accumulated from the past. Since the utilisation of available capital for those funds has been delayed considerably in the past, we would like to know what assurances the Commission offers that this year the estimated sums will be made available *in full*, and in the event that any sums are not made available, will the Commission please inform us how it is proposed to make use of any reserves withheld. All this, because in essence the reserves in questions correspond to commitments referred to in specific budgetary items.

Secondly, as the Commissioner himself said, the system for giving rebates to some Member States creates anomalies in the proportions of VAT payments. The Commission is asked to say whether mechanisms and procedures have been envisaged such that in two years the rebates to Germany, Great Britain, and any other Member State in the same category will come from the payments, as Parliament has asked? Also, which budgetary items are to cover the rebate of 87% of the VAT paid by Spain and Portugal?

Concerning the matter of agricultural reserves, an impression is current in Parliament that the amount held back from those reserves is much greater than the Commission has estimated. Since, however, the estimated sum is considerable, we would like to be informed: Firstly, what proportion of the reserves already accumulated is to be liquidated by the end of the year? Secondly, who are likely to be the 'customers' who will benefit from this liquidification? And thirdly, if the dollar-ECU relation mentioned by the Commissioner does not turn out as anticipated, what will happen to the financial reserve created?

Concerning the matter of the IMP's, on the basis of Council's decision the related expenditure will not affect the progressive and steady increase of expenditure by the ERDF. This is known as the principle of additivity. Since the available figures in the draft budget indicate something of the sort, we would like to know whether the sums estimated for this will ultimately fully cover the additional needs envisaged by the Commission.

On the subject of technological and new investment programmes, especially relating to the development of research and technology, we ask the Commission to

Christodoulou

tell us whether allowance has been made for the Community to participate in international programmes such as Eureka and other, similar ones. The Committee on Budget's opinion is that the Community should indeed participate in such programmes.

Concerning the increase of commitment appropriations for the structural funds by 5%, does the Commission agree that this restriction of the increase shall apply for one year only? And this, because as we all know, if it were to become established as a principle, the consequences for the Community's new policies would go against Parliament's wishes.

Finally, concerning food aid, under which items of the budget is it proposed to cover the cost of distributing food aid, because so far as we can see, the problem is not sending out the aid, but distributing it to all who need it.

Mr Fich (S). — *(DA)* Mr President, I have three questions.

First: with regard to the Regional and Social Funds the Commission proposes a 5% rise in commitments. In a time of inflation therefore, does that not mean less action in the fight against unemployment through the two funds in the coming years?

Question No 2: what commitments does the Commission envisage for Turkey under the third financial protocol, the fourth financial protocol and the special aid? I would remind you that Parliament has declared its opposition to any commitments at all under the three headings in question.

Third question: I read that the appropriations for commitment for development and cooperation are to be reduced by 15.4%. I should like to know in what areas of development and cooperation this drastic cut-back is to be made.

Mr Schön (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to ask two questions. I do not agree with Mr Fich that the Social Fund could be an effective weapon against unemployment in the Community. I think actually that both the Social Fund and the Regional Fund are often misused to grab a bit of money for the odd project here and there. Rather like someone with a watering can looking for a flower pot here and there — and then finding a nice little Community pot labelled 'Fund'.

How does the Commission propose to use these funds in its regional and social policy to finance more Community endeavours to underline the Community nature of these projects?

And secondly: what consequences does the Commission draw from the judgment of the European Court

of Justice following the European Parliament's suit against the Council for its failure to act on transport policy? I am thinking above all here, to quote an example, of important plans and projects such as the Germany-Austria-Italy-Greece link.

Mr Taylor (ED). — Mr President, firstly, I hope this preliminary draft budget does include provision for renewal of the financial protocol with Turkey in the forthcoming year.

My second point relates to the relation between the ECU and the dollar. If the present exchange rate between the ECU and the dollar remains the same next year, does that mean that this budget is not sufficient? Secondly, if the dollar actually falls in value in relation to the ECU next year, does that mean once again that this budget is not sufficient? If these two statements are correct, does that not mean that the 1.35% VAT limit will be exceeded and we shall probably reach 1.4% next year?

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, with reference to what the Commissioner has said to us on the question of commitments, I think it is possible to detect a fact of great significance as far as the future development of the Community's structural policies are concerned. Now, I have complete confidence in the Commissioner; however, I am very concerned regarding this increase of only 5% in commitments, and I wonder how it comes about that this problem — which is a very old one, as the Commissioner himself said — blew up suddenly last year and now becomes extremely acute.

We cannot simply change the subject; we must instead try to understand what caused this situation of imbalance between commitments and payments, and I would therefore like to ask the Commissioner to give us the necessary information, so that we can tackle the situation in the 1986 budget. By this I mean that we cannot brush the problem to one side, simply saying that it is a heritage of the past. We ought also to understand the reason for this accumulation. In particular I should like to know whether the slowing down that took place in regard to commitments last year, which was decided on with the agreement of the Commission, has perhaps, for example, been more than offset by a speeding up towards the end of the year that has increased those commitments.

My question therefore concerns this precise point — the reasons, that is, which have caused this situation of imbalance — so that we can deal with the question of the 1986 budget in full possession of the facts.

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

Mrs Scrivener (L). — *(FR)* I should like to ask the following question: how do you, as a Member of the

Scrivener

Commission, envisage the financing of new technologies? We hear talk of new technologies everywhere, in all our newspapers, on the radio, on television. Every aspect is discussed, except finance. However, as we know only too well, no progress will be made without finance.

Do you have any thoughts on this subject? I am sure that you have.

My second question is concerned with the fact that certain amounts are not being used. As rapporteur for the 1984 discharge, I find, on close inspection, that amounts which have been sanctioned and voted by Parliament for various types of action are not being spent, and this is happening year in and year out. There is something seriously wrong with the system here. How are you going to try to improve the situation, to end the annual disappointment of our hopes for action which can never be put into practice — for lack, you will tell me, of the necessary legal basis? Is this not an aspect of the budget where improvements could be made? I shall be grateful for your answers on these points.

Mr Pasty (RDE). — (*FR*) I have two questions on agricultural expenditure. The first is this: we find, for the first time, a reserve for depreciation of stocks. How was the figure of 400 million ECU arrived at? Is it commensurate with the stocks accumulated, which are going to have to be cleared one day if the agricultural market is to be restored to a sound footing?

My second question is about the trend in farmers' incomes. What provision has been made in this draft budget for 1986 to sustain farmers' incomes, to comply with the obligation laid upon the Community institutions by Article 39 of the Treaty of Rome? We have now reached the stage at which prices can no longer be the means of sustaining incomes. Something else has to be found.

Has the Commission provided a reserve for this purpose in the preliminary draft budget for 1986? Otherwise — and this would be a very serious matter — are the Commission and the Council disregarding Article 39 of the Treaty and leaving the Member States to make their own arrangements for supporting their farmers' incomes, which is something that we have already seen? Parliament has taken the strongest exception to this state of affairs in connection with the sorry business of VAT reimbursements to German farmers.

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — (*FR*) Madam President, Mr Commissioner, I should like to put two questions, the first of which concerns cooperation in development, where we see that the commitment appropriations for food aid are up by 7.4% but that those for cooperation in development as such are

down by 15.4%, while part of the reserve consisting of food aid in the form of cereals is roughly 500 000 tonnes, as you yourself said at a meeting of the Committee on Budgets. I should like to know what your thinking was in making provision for a reduction in aid as expressed by commitment appropriations for cooperation in development.

Secondly, I note that the 'miscellaneous' heading represents 13.4% of commitments and 12.7% of payments. What does this heading correspond to? Does it include the 'environment' chapter, apart from the special line of 10 million ECU for 1987, and what is the percentage allocated to the environment in this 1986 budget?

Mr Pitt (S). — Would the Commission comment on my view that this budget is completely lacking in transparency? There are two sub-questions to indicate my fears.

Last year some £ 76 million — over 100 million ECU — from the 1983 budget was lost to the European Social Fund and European Regional Development Fund owing to a lack of projects or lack of implementation. In view of that, what confidence does the Commission have that it can possibly implement a proposed increase of 45% and 59% respectively in the payment appropriations for these two funds? I suggest that the real reason for this money being proposed is that the Commission knows that those two sums will lapse on 1 January 1988.

My second sub-question to indicate my fear of lack of transparency relates to the reserves. Once again, why precisely is the Commission proposing this year to tax the people of Europe to the tune of £ 1 200 million — 2 billion ECU — if for any other reason than to have the money stored for a future year when they will be dumping and paying above the new ceiling of 1.4%?

My real fear, Madam President — and this is the focus of my question — is that the purpose of the budget, as indicated by my first two questions, is, in my view, to overtax in 1986 in order that in 1987 and 1988, when the Commission knows that we shall be spending above the 1.4% ceiling, we shall have available the money needed to avoid going back to national parliaments for a 1.6% ceiling before national parliaments have to face crucial national elections.

I would suggest, Madam President, that if the Commission has no clear answer to my two points, that means that this budget is a smokescreen in order to overtax the people of Europe and collect money next year in order to delay for national political reasons the inevitable new need for a 1.6% ceiling due to its failure to control the agricultural side of spending.

Mr Mallet (PPE). — (*FR*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as rapporteur for the opinion of the

Mallet

Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on the 1986 budget, I should like to put two questions to the Commission: in its action programme, in its subsequent proposals, in all the statements made by its President, it has stressed the high priority that it attaches to Community policy on research and promotion of new technologies. The Commissioner responsible, Mr Narjes, has even stated specifically that his aim is to increase the share of the Community budget devoted to research from its present 3% — although the true figure is really only 2.5% — to 6% by 1989. Are these good intentions reflected in the preliminary draft budget for 1986?

Looking no further than the figure for research, we do in fact find a 14.7% increase in payments, which is well above the average increase in expenditure. This is a small step in the right direction, therefore, but is this enough of an effort? Was not a change of gear required, as the President, Mr Jacques Delors, was saying? Should not the increase in appropriations for research have been much more substantial — something in the order of 50% — so as to demonstrate determination to mount a common response to the technological challenge which Europe must meet without delay, even if this meant having to sort out other priorities in the allocation of non-compulsory expenditure?

My second question is this: while the Community policy on research is being left to vegetate, even though it has demonstrated its worth, projects on a much larger scale are being set up in a non-Community context. Does the Commission share our conviction that it is necessary to add a Community dimension, if only with variable geometry, to the project which has been given the name Eureka? Does it approve the excellent suggestion made to this end by my colleague Mr Christodoulou, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, in which he has proposed a new budget line earmarking a certain amount for a financial contribution by the Community to the costs of carrying out these projects? Do you share our wish to see the Community taking an active part in all new developments? Do you share our rejection of a Community which does not build on its achievements to date? If so, this should be translated into budgetary terms.

Mr Pranchère (COM). — (FR) Madam President, my question to the Commissioner concerns the appropriations envisaged in the budget for the EAGGF Guarantee Section. There is an increase of 5.1% for the twelve countries, taking account of the enlargement envisaged, but the increase for the ten countries is only 2.4%. These figures speak for themselves, I think. The Commission is presenting a draft budget which proposes a continuation of the freeze on farm prices, but it is clear that for the vast majority of family holdings in our countries, France in particular, the decisions which have been taken on the prices for

1985/86 are going to mean a reduction in farmers' incomes, and that is in contradiction with the intentions set out in Article 39 of the Treaty of Rome.

You are applying budgetary discipline to agriculture, Mr Commissioner, but I see that you are applying it to agriculture alone, without taking account of enlargement and its cost, which is turning out to be very high. My question, then, is this: with this preliminary draft budget for 1986, what sort of a policy on agricultural prices do you have in mind?

Mr Maher (L). — Commissioner Christophersen said earlier that the Commission was going to be pragmatic and realistic and operate within the financial bounds permitted to it. I hope I am quoting him correctly.

Is this a decision in principle by the Commission for the future? That is to say, will the Commission, regardless of what member governments might do about the provision of financial resources, meekly carry on and operate within those bounds, or will it indicate more clearly what the real needs of European development are, including new technologies?

Mr Bonde (ARC). — (DA) Madam President, my question can be answered by two figures. I should like to ask the Vice-President of the Commission what the Danish contribution to the Community budget will be in 1986 and request an estimate of payments to Denmark under the EAGGF.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — Madam President, the Commissioner rightly described the increase of 2.4% in agricultural expenditure as a very small increase. If I understood him correctly, he went on to explain that this figure of 2.4% included an amount to cover the depreciation of the exceptional stocks of agricultural products. Again, if I understood him correctly, he said there would be 400 million ECU for unforeseen aid. Does this also come out of the 2.4%?

Taking inflation into the picture, could I ask the Commissioner what amount is likely to go to support farmers' incomes? Will there be any increase in farmers' incomes or will there be a decrease?

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Madam President, I would like to ask a question which is justified by the vagueness of the Regulation concerning the IMP's. As we know, appropriations for the IMP's over the next seven years are intended to be covered to the extent of about 40% by special financing provisions, and about 60% by the ERDF. I would like to ask: Am I right in assuming that the sum of 260 million ECU referred to in this document of the Commission's is fully covered by the special budgetary item? If this is so, can we assume that approximately 60% of finance for the IMP's is to come from special payments by the ERDF?

Alavanos

And if that, too, is the case can we be certain that this finance will not be provided at the cost of finance already enjoyed by the three countries benefiting from the Mediterranean Programmes, nor at the cost of finance provided for other countries which, while not participating in the IMP's, derive benefit from a whole range of programmes by the ERDF? This is indeed a conundrum, and I am curious how the Commission proposes to solve it.

A second point relates to the view expressed by Mr Taylor — his own personal view, I think — and I would like to ask to what extent the Commission, in its draft budget for 1986, intends to respect the decision that has repeatedly commanded a majority in the European Parliament, namely that finance to Turkey be frozen; a decision unfortunately not respected by the Council of Ministers.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) I did not hear the Commissioner refer to what is known as 'substitute policies' in his statement. These are policies which, by their nature, are better implemented by the Community than individual Member States, research and innovation being two examples. Would the Commissioner state his views on 'substitute policies'? In the further elaboration of the Community's budget, will the Commission give priority to these substitute policies? How can the surely very sharp reduction in commitment appropriations for research and innovation in 1986 be justified in this context?

Mr Aigner (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. — (DE) Madam President, in the preliminary discussions with the Council the Vice-President has in fact already opened the debate on the need for a more marked delimitation, clearer definition of the various responsibilities incumbent on the Community on the one hand and the Member States on the other hand. In view of the limited funds available to us today, such a discussion is now more important than ever.

Secondly, we are repeatedly in conflict with the Council because it blocks our budgetary powers by insisting on its own legislative powers. In the event of any conflict this year is the Commission prepared to consider the budget itself as a legal basis, even if the Council thinks — primarily in respect of the new policies, non-compulsory expenditure — that it can block our budgetary powers by omitting, as the legislative body, to act?

Thirdly and finally, the difference between implementation and approval of the budget is so great that in the end there is only very little of the approved budget still to be found. Is the Commission therefore prepared to hold in check the hundreds of administrative committees, advisory groups, the combined weight of ten and very shortly twelve national bureaucracies? As you

know, we have drastically curtailed the funds earmarked for the advisory committees in the Community budget. Is the Commission prepared to put further proposals to us so that we can continue to resist the pressure of the ten national bureaucracies? We still have more than 500 working parties and committees and administrative committees whose members are appointed by the Member States. This impedes implementation of the budget, and above all it undermines the responsibility of the Commission and thus the legal position of Parliament.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Madam President, I am happy to note that Parliament would be grateful for some answers. Perhaps it will also be grateful if the answers are not too long. This will be rather difficult, in view of the large number of questions put. I hope you will bear with me if I do not answer them all, as some of them are covered by what I have already said and some are questions we shall be returning to. I have of course noted all the questions, and I shall come back to some of them here.

One problem which was raised by a number of speakers was the question of the structural funds. To begin with, on the subject of the proposal the Commission has presented for the rise in appropriations for commitment to the structural funds, I should like to say that it is indeed 5%, but this figure on which the Commission has based its budgetary provision is higher than the rate of inflation. There will thus be a real rise in appropriations for commitment to the structural funds, but a very modest real rise. We have proposed it because it is easy to see that we may otherwise get into a situation in which activities have to be wound down. So you may ask: why have we got into this situation? That is what Mrs Barbarella asked. I have said it before, and I will repeat: it is because the budgetary authority found it convenient over the years. Being generous with appropriations for commitment while at the same time exercising restraint in payments did not create so many political problems.

Take the Social Fund: in 1984 the appropriations for commitment to the Social Fund were increased by 250 million ECU and appropriations for payment were reduced by 100 million ECU. This was the easy course to adopt; it was the budgetary authority which failed in its duty — to put it bluntly — and thus got us into this situation.

There were questions on this from others, such as Mr Pitt, who seemed to be accusing the Commission of some kind of conspiracy — an attitude which I find it difficult to understand. But I shall not speculate on the inspiration for Mr Pitt's remarks. At all events the Commission's ideas are not concerned with how we can get the money together. But, if we now increase the appropriations for payment, can they be used? On that point I can only say that we have used as a basis

Christophersen

for our budgetary planning the experience gained by the Commission's departments in assessing the extent to which appropriations for commitment are converted into requirements for payment. It is on the basis of this experience going back many years that our estimate of the payment requirement was determined. I do not think we need fear that the Commission is making a hidden saving. The idea is appealing but far-removed from reality.

Some have asked another question regarding the structural funds. It is: if we increase the appropriations for payment, how can we be sure that the Commission will use the money? If an extraordinary increase is applied on a purely political basis, how can we be sure of it? It is important to remember here that it is to a large extent the Member States which determine what happens to appropriations for commitment and when appropriations for payment fall due for payment. It is not the Commission which decides these things; it is not the Commission's administration which is dilatory. There are Member States which received appropriations for commitment ten years ago and have still not implemented the projects in question. That goes some way to explaining why we have such high levels of outstanding commitments.

A number of questions have also been asked regarding the agricultural policy. One or two speakers expressed concern over the modest rise of 2.4% in the expenditure under the EAGGF guarantee section. I would stress that this is without the enlargement of the Community. When we add the two new Member States, the percentage is of course considerably higher. It is a very modest rise and it follows the line laid down in the price proposal which the Commission presented last January: the discussion of this proposal is almost concluded, but the grain prices still remain to be fixed. This is the budgetary consequence of the Commission's farm price policy, which is reflected in the proposal for 1986, but I would add that this does not mean that the Commission has finalized the prices it will propose next spring. The Commission has thus not committed itself to the principle of budget neutrality in its price proposal for the spring of 1986. We have simply not yet considered this question, and it will depend amongst other things on the discussions which will take place in the coming months on the future of the common agricultural policy. But the draft budget itself reflects our price policy for the current production year.

On the other hand I should like to stress that we are making substantial progress, for example, in the field of agricultural structure policy. Here, there will be a considerable increase in appropriations in 1986, i.e., an effort in the structural field. Moreover the Council adopted a Directive two months ago which will make this possible. It was important for the Commission to achieve a balance between the restrictive price policy and a more forward-looking structural policy. On the other hand there are no elements of income support in

the draft budget we have presented. Someone asked whether the Commission would leave it to the Member States or take it upon itself. We think that income support on a national basis is wrong. We regret that it exists, but we have not included any amount in our draft budget for common income support.

A third important question is that concerning the role of expenditure on research and innovation. Clearly the Commission takes the view that undoubtedly the best procedure would be to establish a common research and technology policy in a Community framework and to make provision for its financing by the Community. This constitutes the best possible use of the resources we have at our disposal.

That was also the reason why the President of the Commission, at the last meeting of the European Council, on behalf of the Commission presented a concrete proposal on how a technological Community of this kind could be established. It can also be financed. In the medium-range budget scenarios we have tried to draw up, it can be seen that there is in fact scope for a trebling of our annual payment appropriations for research and technological development over the next 3-4 years. Also, we have secured the inclusion in the agreement on new own resources of a provision making it possible, within the budget and outside own resources, to finance research projects under arrangements similar to those already applied within the Euratom framework.

Thus it can be done within the Community. The problem is of course that a number of Member States think that it can be done more effectively outside the Community, and the Commission regrets this, particularly at a time when a number of countries are pressing for the Community to be strengthened. But, as you know, a first discussion is due to take place in Paris next week on the basis for such technological cooperation. The Commission has been invited and will be taking part. There is no doubt that there will be a Community element in it and that our present expenditure on research will continue.

One Member was surprised that the appropriations for commitment to research have dropped for 1986. That is correct, but it merely shows that the programmes launched some years ago have now gone beyond the commitment stage and that we shall see a rise in appropriations for payment in the coming years. A doubling or trebling of our effort in the coming years presupposes that new concrete programmes will be mooted: a continuation of the Esprit programme, for example, the Superesprit programme, or other research projects. But in terms of appropriations the Community is able to take on this activity.

Mr Christodoulou asked me about various accounting matters. What procedures are to be applied in the administration of accounts in respect of research and the repayments to Spain and Portugal? If you permit

Christophersen

me, I shall return to these matters. I cannot give an answer now, they are problems of a more technical nature.

There were various questions concerning the policy on stocks, and I can say that it is unsatisfactory today mainly because it does not give us sufficient freedom of action. It is difficult to wind down stocks effectively with a system in which, in budgetary terms, we only pay for the accumulation of the stocks when they are liquidated. This means that we can be prevented by budgetary considerations from taking appropriate measures at the right time.

An example of this is the old butter which still remains in storage. If we have difficulty in getting rid of it, that is because at the time we sell it we have to treat it as an accounting loss and, if we have no provision for that in the budget, the butter will stay where it is and continue to age. It makes better sense to depreciate these stocks as we go along, so that we can finally sell it at its current asset value, if I may use the accounting term.

There were many other questions. Mr Taylor asked, for example, what would happen if the dollar fell, not by the 8% we expect from this year to next year, but by 16%, so that the Community would reach the 1.4% VAT ceiling. Conversely, it may happen that the dollar rate we have had in recent months is more advantageous to the 1985 budget than we expected. But this may change. All that can be said on the matter is that life is dangerous. We have to live with uncertainty — in the budgetary sense too.

Finally Mr Maher put an important question, which I will now try to answer: will the Commission continue to operate within the financial bounds? You cannot be sure of that. The Commission will only remain within the limits which the Member States in the Council or which Parliament consider appropriate. The Commission has its right of initiative, but our freedom of choice is limited since we do not stand to receive more than 1.4%. We have not taken any decision on when we shall present a proposal for an increase in the 1.4% limit. It may be as early as 1987 or at the start of 1988 — it depends on what policy proposals are adopted. If it is decided to make a substantial increase in the resources devoted to research, or if the American dollar falls sharply, we shall have to present proposals on the budgetary measures needed to deal with such developments.

Mr Bonde put a specific question on Denmark's contribution to the Community and payments to Denmark. This is not covered by the draft budget of the Community, but by the Danish national budget. When it is published on 16 August, Mr Bonde will be able to find the two figures in question in the draft budget of the Danish Government.

Mr Cornelissen put a question on the so-called substitution policy, which is of crucial importance because

clearly there are areas in which developments are easier to finance on a Community basis simply by transferring national expenditures to the Community. I would mention a single figure: the University of Nancy has carried out a study for the Commission on the industrial subsidies paid by Member States. These national industrial subsidies in the Member States are now running at about 45 billion ECU per year, ie more than double the amount used for the common agricultural policy. If part of that amount could be transferred to the Community and used to finance a Community policy, we should be witnessing a momentous development.

I think I have tried to answer some of the questions concerned essentially with matters of principle. It will be a few more months before the budget has been finalized, so I am sure that I shall have plenty of opportunities at a later date to answer the questions I have not been able to deal with today.

5. *International Youth Year 1985*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-71/85) by Mr Gerontopoulos, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on International Youth Year 1985.

Mr Gerontopoulos (PPE), rapporteur. — (GR) Madam President, it is a great honour for me to present Parliament with the report on the International Youth Year declared by the UNO in 1985. Colleagues, this is an opportunity for our Parliament — perhaps one of the last — to regain the trust of young people in our European institutions; a trust which had begun to waver in recent years. How is this to be done? By not allowing 1985 to slip by unexploited, like so many other years. Let us concern ourselves with the problems of the new generation which represents Europe's tomorrow. Let us really try to understand the things that young people are concerned about, and propose solutions that are realistic, effective, and acceptable by the great majority of young people in Europe. The young are tired of hearing great speeches devoid of substance. They are fed up with international organizations that pass resolutions which, however, remain on the shelf. They have been disappointed by governments which flatter their merits in pre-election campaigns to gain their votes, and then promptly forget them. We must understand that the young are not content with voluminous declarations. International Youth Year should not pass us by in a welter of speeches and festivals, like an anniversary party instituted by some who wish to still their conscience by seeming to have done something for the young. We should go into the matter in depth, and enlist the help of the young to provide solutions to the problems that preoccupy them. During the coming years it is essential to adopt a specific policy of institu-

Gerontopoulos

tional measures aiming to improve, in every sense, the social and economic position of young people within the European Communities. That policy must be based on guidelines which will govern the whole complex of institutional measures. What, however, are the principles upon which we are to base our institutionalising?

We consider one such principle to be the faith of the young on our continent in the ideals of freedom, democracy and peace, which are a characteristic feature of European civilisation and a guarantee of a better and safer future. Unfortunately, those ideals are not a reality for many peoples in Europe and the rest of the world. In addition, we believe in the need for a European consciousness as an essential prerequisite for the creation of a united Europe within which young people are to play a definitive role. We recognise that the problems of the societies in which young people live today stem from many profound sources related to numerous social, economic, political and cultural matters, the most important among which is youth unemployment.

We believe that most young people in Europe condemn the suppression of human rights, all forms of violence, integrationalism and racism, drug abuse, and the destruction of the natural environment, though we are also conscious of the fact that some young people are in danger of falling victim to negative influences. A factor of paramount importance is the desire of the young for unimpeded and full awareness and information. A desire whose respect in any given society provides us with a yardstick of the level of democracy prevailing in it. Unrestricted access to the facts and objective presentation and commentary on them is a fundamental condition of democratic society. In our times, with the enormous development of the informative media, it is easy to perceive the vital importance of free access for all to the facts and the news. Pluralism of information, as indeed of the expression of attitudes and views, is a basic ingredient of democracy since by ensuring social cohesion and continuity, it allows modernization and renewal. Information should not be a one-way street. If we consider the young to be not a monolithic whole, but an age group with multiple interests and differential needs, if we regard them as true citizens and not as individuals who just receive social aid, we must listen to what they have to say, and consequently provide them with the means to express it. We must give them access to the communication media, support for publications, organizations and demonstrations of their own.

But what are the problems faced by the new generation in its own field of activity? The most important, of course, as has already been mentioned, is unemployment. It must be understood that youth unemployment cannot be fought by granting aid, but by giving the young a chance to become fully developed, and this effort must be combined with a further effort to restructure Europe's economy. The problem must be dealt with at a Community level, with long-term

perspectives offering decisive solutions and giving new impetus to Europe's economy with a view to achieving and maintaining full employment.

It is also necessary for the Community's countries to establish and implement suitable educational and training programmes that will take account of the new technologies, so that young people will gain expertise in applying them and awareness of their social consequences. We must promote the teaching of foreign languages from the earliest years of primary schooling. This measure satisfies social, cultural, but also economic needs.

I believe that, as has already been called for by the Council of Europe at Fontainebleau, there is a need to establish a general system to ensure equivalence between university degrees, so that the right of free settlement within the Community can become a reality. Moreover, the Community's Member States should adopt a uniform and coordinated policy with shared costs, to create a suitable infrastructure to serve the aim of fighting illiteracy.

The EEC's Member States must also improve and reorganize the authorities responsible for preventing and suppressing drug abuse, always with the necessary respect for the persons of addicts. State supervision and severity in the enforcement of the law should be implacable in the case of those who deal in drugs. Beyond that, however, the disquieting spread of this social phenomenon is a challenge to Europe itself, because the denial of fundamental ideals and the existence of models of antisocial behaviour deprive the individual of the spiritual support he needs to overcome certain difficult situations. Member States should take care to monitor conformity with existing social imperatives of workers' rights, and where necessary update them, to avoid threatening the rights of young working people, especially in these times of economic crisis.

Integrated implementation of the institutionalized equality between the sexes, and the assurance of equal opportunities for young women and young men, are essential. Measures must be adopted to deal with handicapped children, to provide them with suitable professional orientation and teach them a recognized and certificated skill, and to prepare them psychologically so that they may be absorbed into the social whole as painlessly as possible.

The provision of additional finance for improving the juvenile rehabilitation system and the updating of penal legislation relating to young offenders could bring about a more hopeful and beneficial outcome. We must support measures for the education and training of the young in accordance with European ideals, particularly by improving the qualification of the teaching profession and promoting collaboration between schools, organizing visits by young people to

Gerontopoulos

the European institutional organs, and supporting the Community's programme for youth exchanges.

Colleagues, the problems mentioned above are by no means the only ones. They are, however, so important for the European Community's Member States, and so intimately connected with the Community's social and economic development, that their prompt and satisfactory solution is urgent.

I would like to end by thanking Mrs Ewing, the Chairwoman of our Committee, for the help she has given me. I also thank my colleagues on the Youth Committee, and the members of the secretariat.

(Applause)

Mrs Pantazi (S), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Womens' Rights*. — (GR) 1985 is not only International Youth Year, it is also the last year in Womens' Decade, a fact that focuses attention particularly upon the problems of young women and on the possibilities that this year could open up for them. Present-day realities in the Community's countries have a profound influence on the situation of young girls and boys. Unemployment, discrimination, and irrational armament are the daily experience of millions of young men and women, and that indeed is why they feature as topical items on the agendas of youth organizations. All young people, both boys and girls, have legitimate hopes and ambitions for a better quality of life, for work, for freedom and for peace. Yet the chasm between their aspirations and the realities of life seems to broaden day by day. The problems are still more acute for young women. Besides the problems faced by young people in general, problems already pinpointed by my colleague Mr Gerontopoulos, young women are in parallel subject to all the unfair discrimination that arises because of their sex. And while in theory girls and boys have equal opportunities in education and professional training, girls rarely take advantage of them because sexist discrimination, both overt and covert, are built into educational and training systems in the mentalities of the teachers, the parents, friends, and in the final analysis the girls themselves, with the result that very many girls choose a limited number of stereotyped, supposedly sensible subjects, and so fail to exploit to the full the opportunities that are opening up both in higher education and in the labour market. Besides, the intensified reaction in recent years against working married women, combined with the difficulties associated with training and finding employment, compels young women to choose not to participate in production. What can we say about the tragic fate of young women from immigrant families, who are often the victims of prejudice and racism with the result that they are pushed to the fringes of society to wither away? The problems of young women in disadvantaged regions are more acute since very often, owing to the special socioeconomic circumstances, they are

blocked even from taking part in any form of professional training. The Committee on Womens' Rights is fully aware that despite the existing Common policies, a great deal still remains to be done before young women will be able to play an integrated part in economic, social and cultural life. Despite directives on equality young women at work continue to face the problem of indirect discrimination, which is difficult to define and prove. Moreover, there is discrimination in social security and in taxation systems, especially against married women. It is time for the Council of Ministers to demonstrate the essential political will and proceed with the adoption of measures to ensure equality, not only on paper but in practice as well. For this reason we call upon the responsible Committee and its rapporteur to include in the proposed resolution the proposals by the Committee on Womens' Rights, which we have tabled in the form of amendments.

(Applause from the left)

Mr McMahon (S). — Madam President, this is International Youth Year and we are now more than halfway through it in the month of July. The European Parliament has finally got round to discussing the problems of youth and the year is almost finished. Likewise, we find with our legislators in many Member States that they are in many ways selling our youth short, because in many of the policies which they adopt as governments they are really hitting young people very hard indeed. Nowhere is that more apparent than in the policies dealing with unemployment — or rather, the lack of policies dealing with unemployment, in particular youth unemployment.

Of the 12 million unemployed in the Community over 40% are young people. As regards the opportunities for those under 25, we see from the recent statistics which Eurostat has provided — and I obtained them this morning — that in Italy, for example, 80% of all males under 25 have had no form of work experience and in the Community generally round about 50% of young men under 25 have had no form of work experience. So we as a Community and also our Member States are in many ways with our policies selling our young people short. It is important when we come to this Assembly to put forward the view that while it is alright to debate International Youth Year on one occasion, to have a jazzy festival or something like that, really we do more for our youth if we have legislation, if we have policies which get to the real root of the problems that our young people are facing.

The main problem, I said, is unemployment, but the other one, which has been touched upon by the United Nations, is that of world peace. This is a tremendous problem for many young people and is particularly serious in my own country, in the region known as Northern Ireland. Many youngsters there have a very, very difficult existence — psychologists

McMahon

have said that because of the bombing, the need for security and so on, many of them will be scarred for life — and I think it is important that we as legislators look at the political problems that are creating that atmosphere for youngsters such as these.

A third problem is that of participation and development. These are two other themes which the United Nations have dealt with. We have to listen to our young people, not preach at them in some paternalistic way and tell them that we have the answers. We must meet with them, discuss with them and maintain a dialogue with them so that we can ask them what their problems are. We know what many of their problems are, and in a cooperative spirit we may hope to reach a solution.

I am very glad to put forward these thoughts on the youth report. A great deal of work went into this report in our committee, and I think the rapporteur is to be congratulated on the depth of research which he undertook when compiling this report. So it is important to think of International Youth Year not just today but in all our government policies throughout 1985 and the years which follow.

Mr Münch (PPE). — (*DE*) Madam President, as spokesman for my Group I should like to begin by heartily congratulating the rapporteur on this excellent report. I think that both his report and today's debate are of considerable significance not only for youth, but also for the future of Europe. I agree with Mr McMahon that this debate comes extraordinarily late in the day, especially as it can now have no financial effect at all on the 1985 budget. But I hope that in the light of these very facts there will be an even greater willingness to make good in 1986 the omissions of 1985. It would thus be a good thing if Parliament were to concentrate today on obtaining a broad consensus and not get bogged down in a small number of peripheral questions. I think it is a good thing for our image that the European Parliament should stand today and plead the case for youth.

When discussing this International Youth Year we should perhaps begin by remembering the following sobering statistic: there are currently 857 million young people in the world and most of them, 665 million, live in the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. I think this should give us pause to think today not only about European youth but also about those young people whose circumstances are marked in many parts of the world by hunger and oppression. If we realize this, this is justification enough for an 'International Youth Year' and for drawing public attention to the problem of these young people. I agree with previous speakers that we must not go in for spectacle or showy gestures here; we must find and implement solutions which will endure beyond 1985. In short, 'International Youth Year' is a reason not to celebrate but to act!

I should perhaps point out to the Commission and Council that a large number of surveys in the last two years have yielded something very gratifying and positive: the vast majority of young people do not regard Europe merely as an economic community, but attach higher ideals to the concept of a free Europe. I think this is a good, encouraging sign, and it is up to us to find ways and means of interesting the young people of Europe in this development and involving them in it. It is our job as politicians to set the framework for this, and I call on the Commission here. In the last few years the European Parliament has prepared initiatives enough; it has put forward concrete proposals on youth based on a large number of resolutions and it has submitted a programme for action. We now urge the Council to implement this action programme.

I believe there is an urgent need to strengthen and coordinate youth policy at European level, for what we have to date is a list of shortcomings and omissions rather than a list of achievements.

Previous speakers have already indicated the areas on which our efforts should concentrate. I will not restate them. But a one-year programme to reduce youth unemployment is certainly the most pressing need, for hopelessness and the lack of any prospects, together with the feeling of not being needed in society must be one of the worst possible things there can be for a young person. No sum invested here is wasted, for youth will play a decisive role in the creation of a United Europe!

But I would also make a few appeals to young people, regarding the relationship between politicians and youth, because I regard this willingness to provide 'political education' as important. Most important of all is certainly our support for young people in their commitment to democracy. We must be ready to remind young people that they have obligations as well as rights. Opposition on principle is no kind of political basis, and in a democratic Europe I think we can point out that truth or awareness against the majority is a poor alternative. We must also point out that yearning for Utopia is just as bad as invoking the apocalypse.

I believe we adults, we politicians have a duty not to defend possessions and offer round clichés but to offer young people hope, for in objective terms it is not the future which is a disaster, but the reluctance of many members of our society to adapt to a changed future!

Let me end by recalling the writer Henrik Ibsen who says that problems and sorrows are usually coped with alone, but joy has to be shared. This debate should provide an opportunity of sharing our joy at a free Europe with young people. Then our investment will have been worthwhile!

IN THE CHAIR: MR FANTI

Vice-President

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I am speaking in place of Mr Novelli, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, and I wish to say first of all that, where these three subjects are concerned, the adult world must feel guilty, because it is handing on to the young a world in the worst possible condition, with a degraded environment, unbridled consumerism, and public health threatened by systems of production and other factors that do not always take the welfare of the individual into account.

As it has done in the past, our Committee therefore assumes a solemn commitment against drugs, above all so that our Parliament can institute, as soon as possible, effective action — thanks also to the work of the Commission of Inquiry into drugs — and can thus speak in the great international debate, and contribute to the great international effort, in an attempt to reduce, if not actually eliminate, this great scourge on our society. This commitment also concerns a health protection policy, since ageing, whilst it commences with one's first contact with work, is also accentuated — and primarily so — by the polluted environment. Our health protection regulations, therefore — especially concerning occupational health — must be strict, and must take into account the obligation that is upon us to give the young every guarantee to enable them to live their adult life and their old age in the best conditions possible.

I should like to conclude by emphasising the relationship which must continue to exist between the young and the institutions, and particularly — if I may be allowed to say this — between the young and the Committee on the Environment. We have in fact been repeatedly urged by the young to take action on thorny matters such as, for example, the export of dangerous pesticides to the Third World. It is in fact due to the intervention of the young, and to their commitment, that we have found the courage to look for the best solutions that would lead in the direction of progress and the welfare of the public. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection hopes, therefore, that this relationship will continue, especially with the young — who, unlike the adult world, are not yet involved with certain interests — because we have to believe very firmly in the young, and have confidence in them.

Mr McMillan-Scott (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of the European Democratic Group I should like to support the report of Mr Gerontopoulos and to congratulate him on the work he has put into it. Like him and Mr McMahon and Mr Münch we regret the

timing of this report, coming before Parliament in the middle of International Youth Year.

In one year recently the European Parliament produced 748 reports, and it would be interesting to survey what practical effect they have had on the European Community. But I think this one is an important one because we all recognize the problems of youth today and would like to do something about them. In my short two-minute speech I would like to make a recommendation to Parliament. We have 23 committees, and I would propose that each committee takes one youth item for this year and pursues it rigorously through the Commission and the Council. For example, the report makes recommendations about youth exchanges. This is something which the Youth Committee itself should be responsible for. The report recommends the development of a European peace corps — in other words, working with developing countries. Young people going abroad. This is something the Development Committee could take on board and make sure it begins to happen this year. Youth unemployment is a principal concern of the Social Affairs Committee, and I would suggest that the Social Affairs Committee concentrates on that one topic for this year, so that by the end of the year we can at least begin to see some activity within the Community on behalf of youth. As we have heard from speakers before, this is a growing problem — the alienation of youth and the increasing levels of youth unemployment. So it is something I believe that we should take on board and during this year mark our interest by our efforts.

(Applause from the right)

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my group will also be voting for the report. Our thanks to the rapporteur. Six years ago, in 1979, the General Assembly of the United Nations proclaimed 1985 International Youth Year. The youth of Europe went to work enthusiastically, and what has the European Parliament, representing 48 million young Europeans, done? As many speakers have already said, we produce a report in the second half of 1985, too late to be of any use. And the same goes for the Commission. On 1 July we receive a six-page memorandum full of the same old stuff.

Be that as it may, we are celebrating International Youth Year. But what in fact do we have to celebrate? That one in four young people was unemployed at the end of 1984, that the unemployment rate among young people is three times as high as the rate among adults? What most of the millions of young Europeans have in common are certain expectations and anxieties, and what the majority want above all else is work. Is it surprising that some of them become rebellious or passive? The human and economic cost of this waste of young human potential cannot be expressed in figures, and we do therefore need a European or

Larive-Groenendaal

International Youth Year to tell us that the fine words must at last give way to deeds.

I will name a few areas in which the European Community should take action. Firstly, it should focus on the new technologies. The European Social Fund must combat the new illiteracy of the information society by including the new technologies in every curriculum. Secondly, there must be a quantitative and qualitative improvement in training courses. Why are only 25% of young people aged 20 to 24 in the Community in higher education compared to almost 60% in the United States? Thirdly, private initiative, young businessmen and local employment initiatives must be supported. Fourthly, the transition from school to working life must be facilitated with programmes of close cooperation between schools, universities and industry. Fifthly, mobility should be increased through exchanges of students, teachers, young workers, through the recognition of diplomas, through employment in firms in other countries and, of course, through the teaching of foreign languages. Sixthly, action must be taken in favour of girls. Or did the Council not approve a recommendation to this effect in December 1984?

I also consider it scandalous that the European Parliament's call for the resources to be shared equally among boys and girls is not reflected in the new European Social Fund guidelines. I will conclude with a few words on the 3.5 million young people of foreign origin. They can enrich the European Community economically, socially and culturally, just as earlier generations of migrants to the United States did, if we acknowledge the cultural variety of the Community and regard it as an advantage rather than a problem, as we so often do, and if we bear migrants' special needs in mind and take a very resolute stand against racism.

Only if these and other measures are actually taken, can we look the young people of Europe in the eye and perhaps celebrate a real International Youth Year in ten years' time.

Mrs Lemass (RDE). — Mr President, as has already been stated, the single most important aspect of our concern for youth must be the unemployment situation. Every hour, week and, indeed, year that passes without their being employed represents a major setback for their future and a waste of the financial resources made available for their education. The extent of the problem is well-documented. According to the Eurostat figures almost one-quarter of the 13 million unemployed people in the Community are aged between 20 and 24. 27% of unemployed women fall within this age group. Alarming, for those between 14 to 19 years of age, which is the youngest age group, unemployment rates have reached 25% of the Community total.

Of course, there are other serious situations which must be tackled. The criminal activities of the drug barons who prey like vultures on young people must be stopped. The Community has a moral responsibility to take action to stop the growing trade in death. Many resolutions have been tabled, actions have been well mapped out and the Community must implement them as a matter of extreme urgency.

However, not all the news is bad. In Ireland a major event for young people — a special Olympics for the mentally handicapped — has just ended. It was the biggest sporting event ever held in Ireland. Young athletes from all over Europe took part. The efforts of those young people to demonstrate their ability to compete and to participate together in a major sporting event won the hearts of the Irish people. I would like to ask the Commission if they were aware of this event, if they contributed to it in any way and if they will show their genuine interest and concern for young people who are mentally or physically handicapped by supporting the holding of such Olympics in the years ahead.

Autistic children are in a category of their own. Unfortunately, funds are not generally available for the specialized help which they need and which I believe would greatly improve the quality of their lives. I am asking the Commission to take this point into consideration. We must listen to our young people. The European Community has to listen to its young people and to its own platform, the Youth Forum.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, this being International Youth Year, I should like to draw attention to a group of young people of all nationalities with whom I have been working for many years in an area with a high immigrant population in the Belgian town of Genk. There is nothing at all for these young people, who are vulnerable to drugs and wander around in shopping centres, no work, no suitable schools. They are the most neglected section of Europe's thirteenth nation, the thirteen million migrants. For and with them we have set up youth clubs in various districts. I therefore ask you to pay particular attention to my amendments on young migrants. If they can help to build a united Europe, it will be a Europe of solidarity.

Mrs Peus (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, a survey conducted some years ago in one German city revealed that most young people had never heard of International Youth Year. Those who had said simply that at best it would mean hot air from the politicians. For young people nothing would change.

This pessimistic attitude on the part of our young people must now change, and the change must be brought about by us the European Parliament, the elected representatives of 270 million citizens, actually doing

Peus

something. I thus urge the Member States, the Council and the Commission to lose no time in implementing the programme giving equal opportunities to boys and girls which was agreed on by the education ministers some time ago.

There is nothing new in this programme. Both inside and outside this House we have repeatedly called for an end to role stereotyping in schools, urging that girls should be encouraged in educational and careers guidance to opt in greater numbers for scientific and technical subjects, with a fairer balance between the sexes in the numbers of teaching staff particularly in higher education, for the number of female students has risen considerably, whilst women teachers in higher education are still on average only 5% of university teachers and 17% of scientific workers.

But, as my colleagues have said time and time again, the situation on the labour market is far more disturbing. Unemployment among young women under 25 is currently 54% in the Netherlands and Luxembourg, and 27% in the Federal Republic of Germany. According to OECD estimates at least half of all those employed in 1990 will need to be versed in the new technologies, particularly data processing.

Young women must face up to this challenge if they want to avoid being cast into employment limbo. All the many model tests involving girls in trade and industry have shown that their initial fear of computers swiftly disappeared, that women enjoyed their training, were just as skilled at using computers as their male colleagues and yielded equally good results.

Difficulties were encountered only by women trained in large-scale concerns or outside, when it came to later integration into their professions. Many potential training principals are sceptical about the employment of women. Women come up against attitudes in their male colleagues which hinder their social integration. Such prejudices must be done away with, and soon.

An important area is training in the professions, where many girls are trained as doctors' or lawyers' assistants. I should like to conclude by appealing to those businesses which do not at present offer any training to do so over and above their own needs, and not to leave young people in the dole queue simply because they could not guarantee them a job on completion of their training.

(Applause)

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Our debate on International Youth Year and the position of youth has clearly highlighted the problem of youth unemployment, and I welcome the fact.

I shall therefore concentrate on another point, the question of contacts between young people in Europe.

Our budget already contains a line for international youth organizations, but no funds. We have spent small amounts on European youth exchanges, but in recent years we have not been able to make these a reality. If we want to show, at the end of this Youth Year, that the European Community has not just talked but taken concrete measures, we ought to set clear goals for these two areas in the budget negotiations. For if Europe's youth can get together, no government in this world will ever be able to manoeuvre them into shooting at each other; young people who know each other will not allow any government to push them into war. For this reason youth work of this kind is a major step towards guaranteeing peace and freedom.

We should also regard European youth exchanges of this kind as a chance for young people in central and eastern Europe to get to know us and enable youth in both blocs to cross the political divide between them. In my view we could help this process by placing clearer emphasis on our education policy and our communal life on the principle of tolerance, which takes account of human imperfections.

Since none of us, politician, party or government, can be perfect, no one has a monopoly on absolute truth, and this being so we must acknowledge the right of others to think differently. If youth can be brought to accept this principle there is nothing any radical elements can do to threaten freedom on this continent. If I young people can coexist in this spirit, living by the precept of tolerance, and if they can avoid being organized to death by the state, then a better future awaits the younger generation in Europe.

For the benefit of those in politics who often place a premium on planning, let me say the following: let us consider what awaits a child born in 1985 as things are at present. I shall exaggerate to make my point. After spending its first few years growing and thriving on biologically pure, medically tested baby foods and furthering its early development with safe and educationally beneficial toys, its chances in life are then promoted by fulltime kindergarten and schools with 2000 to 3000 pupils, central canteen, language laboratory and scientifically tested teaching aids. At the end it is told that it has no job prospects, and any danger of boredom in its free time is prevented thanks to a new lot of social workers, street workers and leisure organizers.

I think that young people who are organized to death are denied the satisfaction of deciding their own future, and so we should allow youth more opportunities of finding its own way.

(Applause)

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I am, of course, speaking on behalf of

Clinton Davis

Commissioner Sutherland in this debate, but I do give an undertaking to the House today that I will certainly report to him the deep concern and compassion which has been expressed on all sides of this Chamber in what has undoubtedly been a valuable and wide-ranging debate full of sensitivity to the issues embraced in the report.

May I say at the very beginning that the Commission proposes to accept Amendments Nos 2 to 10, 18, 19 and 24 but is unable to accept Amendments Nos 1, 20 and 21. As far as the latter is concerned, however, we are prepared to look favourably on the points raised in that particular amendment.

May I also say to Mrs Lemass that, concerning the points she has raised in relation to disablement and, in particular, to the sporting event to which she drew attention, I will ask Commissioner Sutherland to write to her.

Mr President, the Commission welcomes this resolution — coming as it does at the centre of International Youth Year with its themes of participation, development and peace — as an opportunity to stand back and reflect on the position of young people in the Community and on what the Community itself can and should do for young people. The wide range of subjects covered by the resolution is itself an indication of the interest which Parliament — notably through its Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport — has consistently taken in matters affecting young people. The fact that it reflects so much of what is already done shows just how far the Commission shares Parliament's views.

The Commission's views on International Youth Year are summarized in a recently produced memorandum bearing that title. This memorandum, which Parliament will be receiving shortly, underlines the importance of the link between employment on the one hand and education and training on the other. It also looks at the whole question of the participation of young people in matters which affect their lives. The cold truth is, as a number of Members have asserted during the debate, that within the Community today more than 5 million young people are unemployed. Think on it, Mr President, 5 million young people between the ages of 15 and 25 who do not work! Many have been unemployed for a year or more, and in some pockets of the Community youth unemployment exceeds 40%. What a devastating neglect of essential resources of mankind! Now it may be true that some 18 million youngsters have a job, but many of these have little or no choice about the sort of job to accept and they will be working far below their full potential.

Within these overall statistics it remains true, as a number of Honourable Members have said, that young women are hit harder than young men. It is also true that young blacks are hit even harder than young whites. It is the conviction of the Delors Commission

that the attack on this social cancer that is mass unemployment among young people has to remain a top priority. If we fail in this area, whatever other successes may be achieved, they will seem positively self-indulgent.

It is clear that job-creating economic growth is the only key to a sustained and substantial improvement in the situation of young Europeans. However, one essential element in that must be the development of the human resources of the Community, and in particular among its young people. Europe needs young people capable of constructing their own future, our future, Europe's future. It needs qualified young people with an education and training suited to their own potential and their own desires, young people capable of participating in the decisions affecting their lives. The element of participation, of providing young people with an environment in which they can pursue their personal development at their own pace in their own way, is absolutely crucial.

Out of the many areas covered by the resolution and by the different action programmes suggested, three elements seem particularly important to us. First is the whole area of advice and information. Ignorance is undoubtedly the main barrier to participation, just as information is the key. Over the next twelve months the Commission will be looking into the provision of educational and vocational guidance for young people within the Community, putting particular emphasis on the ways in which young people themselves are able to help to provide the information and advice services they need.

We shall also be looking at the role of the new information technologies in this area. Indeed, the Commission is holding a conference in November in conjunction with the Luxembourg Presidency to examine with young people and representatives of Member States the whole question of information and the participation of young people. We intend to make further and more detailed proposals for action in this field in due course.

The second problem area lies in the fact that often programmes intended for young people seem both complex and remote. All Member States have found it difficult to coordinate policies for young people in the face of the rapid deterioration of their employment prospects. However, it is time to reconsider the structures of the education, training and employment programmes currently on offer to young people. The Commission plans to submit various proposals for discussion later in the year. These will be based on Community and Member States' programmes where successful decentralization, bringing programmes to individual people rather than aiming them at young people as a whole, has been achieved.

Thirdly, the Commission believes that for some young people a major barrier to their participation lies in the

Clinton Davis

whole question of social status and income. Some Member States are already seeing debate on the issue of a generalized minimum wage or on the incomes of young people on and after training programmes. The Commission undertook a comparative inquiry last year and will be discussing the subject with interested parties at Community level.

A debate such as this one on International Youth Year also provides an occasion for reflection on the Community's relations with young people as a whole. Parliament is, of course, the Community's representative body for all its citizens, young and old, but the Youth Forum, drawn from the national youth councils of Member States and from the international non-governmental youth organizations, has been playing an increasing role in relaying the views of young people into the debates and discussions at Community level. The Commission welcomes this trend. We will encourage it. The view of young people are an essential component of any strategy relating to education, training and employment, to say nothing of the wider interests they hold. The Youth Forum has earned the right to be heard.

As to the resolution, may I pay my tribute to the rapporteur not only for his report but for his speech. Specifically — as far as the resolution is concerned — its many proposals and its three substantial action programmes are important. There is much here that the Community already does, but there is much it cannot do. Action programmes are all very well, but without the human and financial resources necessary to run them they will remain paper and ink, never to be translated into flesh and blood. Parliament is undoubtedly right to discuss International Youth Year and the issues it raises, but in these days the mere expression of goodwill is not enough. So if Parliament really believes in the action programmes set out here — and I am sure that it does — then it must provide the means necessary to bring them to life.

So, I end on this note, Mr President, I share the concern that has been expressed by so many Honourable Members. It is indeed a paradox that while so much needs to be done in our society, done by trained and dedicated young people, so many of them find themselves in a hopeless cul-de-sac of lost opportunity, without hope and unable to contribute to these vital tasks. How many vital tasks there are! In our inner cities, our housing, our transport systems, our environment. The essential infrastructure of our towns and cities is simply being allowed in so many cases to rot away. Therefore the task of training future generations to develop and apply the new technologies which are capable of revolutionizing our lifestyle and of improving the quality of life is being neglected. We cannot afford to allow this to go on.

(*Applause*)

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote on the motion for a resolution will be taken tomorrow, 10 July, at 6 p.m.

6. *Solidarity with Third World Children Week*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-73/85) by Mrs Pantazi, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on instituting a Solidarity with Third World Children Week.

Mrs Pantazi (S), rapporteur. — (*GR*) Mr President, I would first like to stress that the fact that the report by the Committee for Development and Cooperation on the organization of a week to demonstrate solidarity with Third World children is being debated today alongside the report by Mr Gerontopoulos on International Youth Year, is a practical proof that children and young people in Africa and the Third World have not been forgotten and abandoned to their fate, but that their subsistence, health and life are valued just as highly as those of children and young people in Europe. It is a reminder to all Europe's peoples that children and young people in Africa and the Third World have rights which must be protected. It also proves that relations between Europe and the Third World, besides their commercial and technical character, extend into a different dimension, that of humanitarianism.

Mr President, this is not the first time that the Committee for Development and Cooperation has been involved with the matter of informing and modifying public opinion on vital problems of Africa and the Third World. The lives and fates of children and the young in Africa and the Third World are a very important and burning issue. If young people carry the hopes of the world, what hope is there for the children in Ethiopia and the Sudan without our help, without the solidarity and care of young people in Europe? On the opportunity of International Youth Year, and on the basis of Mr Avgerinos' resolution, which is governed by the same spirit, our Committee decided to appeal to the House for its approval for the organization of a Solidarity with Third World Children Week. A common week of publicity about the situation in developing countries, directed at all the Community's citizens but especially at young people and children in Europe. A publicity campaign of that kind should go far beyond the clearly emotional level, and deal with the essential problems, their structural causes, the links that exist between the common or national policies, and the true situation in the developing countries in Africa and the Third World.

The first aim will be to inform and to contribute so as to convey awareness of realities that up to now have often been masked by misleading and sketchy oversimplifications. The sensitisation of young Europeans to the plight of young people of their own age who do

Pantazi

not live in the same geographical area, the same neighbourhood or the same school, is extremely important as a means of instilling, at this impressionable age, the ideal of solidarity with all mankind, so creating a foundation for mutual understanding between peoples and the elimination of xenophobia and the racist spirit. For today's young people will become tomorrow's European citizens, who will undertake cooperation with the developing countries of the Third World and will promote the development of better and fairer relations between North and South, in the interests of both solidarity between peoples, and world peace.

The report makes clear proposals about all the initiatives that will be required from the Commission, in collaboration with the Governments of Member States and non-governmental organizations, if such a publicity campaign is to succeed. As for the finance, we are fully aware of the existing budgetary restrictions. We believe, however, that some resources could be released from the 6th European Development Fund within the scope of activities of cultural and social cooperation, and that economic participation could be secured both from the Governments of Member States, and from non-governmental bodies already involved in similar activities aiming to sensitise public opinion. Always provided that the political will for such an act exists.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would like to express the wish that today's debate may be the spark that will kindle the successful integration of this effort.

(Applause)

Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I want to congratulate the rapporteur on her report. We agree with her on the need to inform young Europeans about the Third World and also feel that by restricting itself to health matters the Avgerinos motion doesn't go far enough.

We would want to go further than the report because we feel that it is not enough just to have a week of solidarity with the Third World. What we would like to see — and I think this is much more difficult than what Mrs Pantazi is proposing — is sufficient changes made in the education and examination syllabuses within the European Community to permit more teaching about the Third World as a natural part of the school courses of children in the European Community. That, apart from anything else, would not actually put as much pressure on European Community development funds as I suspect the idea of organizing a week of solidarity might cause. However, we support the report.

One of the reasons why I wanted to speak was to draw attention to a specific instance of the sort of education cooperation which the rapporteur mentioned in paragraph 4 of the report and which exists within my own

European constituency in Great Britain. There is a scheme run by private individuals in the town of Marlborough in Wiltshire who have organized themselves into something called the Brandt Group after the Brandt Report to foster educational links with the town of Gunjur in Gambia. There is at the moment in the sixth form of a local school in Marlborough a boy from Gunjur who has been at school there, paid for by local people, for several terms now, and this summer a team of youngsters from the town of Marlborough is going out to Gambia to build a school in Gunjur. I think one of the things which the Commission might like to consider is actually acting as a source of information for this sort of link. I have never heard whether such a link exists in other European Community countries. I would be interested to know whether it does. I suspect that it does. It is a link which is not funded by public funds in any way; it is entirely locally funded. I suspect that there would be other groups of people in other Community towns who would be interested in setting up this sort of educational link if they knew how to start. I think that is something that the Commission could help with.

On paragraph 3, where we are calling on non-governmental organizations, I think that the rapporteur might like to consider this a bit more. I agree that non-governmental organizations can help a lot and do have a useful role to perform, but we need to examine the shift of emphasis that we are suggesting from government funding to non-governmental funding. I think that there is a danger that we may be overloading the non-governmental organizations that do so much good work in the Third World.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I am of course speaking in this debate on behalf of my colleague, Vice-President Natali. I found both the report and its presentation quite outstanding. May I say to Mrs Jackson that the point she made on information concerning the sort of venture she described in the United Kingdom will be drawn, I assure her, to the attention of Vice-President Natali.

This debate takes place against a tragic backcloth of thousands of children starving and dying in the drought-stricken countries of Africa. We see it presented to us, before our very eyes, on our television screens almost daily. It is a devastating and appalling picture of famine in Africa which has had one immensely positive response in engendering an immense movement of solidarity in Europe. It is a sentiment that in effect asserts that we have got to seek to influence history and not merely be passive observers of it. Europe has proved to be the most active and responsive in launching and organizing relief in all the drought-stricken countries, due in no small measure to the way in which this public consciousness has been aroused. But there is a danger that after a while public opinion can so easily forget about a drama to which it has become accustomed. Then support stops at the

Clinton Davis

most critical moment. So, a longer-term action aimed at specific targets and using the most appropriate channels does seem to me to be very important lest we diminish our help to those still most in need.

So the Commission welcomes this report. It welcomes its purpose. Of course it has to be recognized that there are growing tendencies in the Member States, and one has to say this with great regret, towards racist and xenophobic attitudes which are bad in themselves but are also damaging for the Community's image in the world and indeed for its own future. It follows from this that the first reaction of the Commission, if a solidarity campaign is to be launched, would be to focus it on children of migrant workers in Europe. Now I understand that this was also the view of the members of the Committee on Development and Cooperation when the subject was discussed. The obvious channel for such a campaign must be the schools, particularly if it is focused on migrant children. It is also important to ensure that such a campaign is linked with wider international approaches. We must take into account the fact that Unicef, for example, is already conducting campaigns to similar effect.

As far as financing is concerned and as far as the Commission's role in that respect is concerned, I would suggest that, as requested by the resolution, we should use funds available in the budget for cofinancing NGO actions. This would seem to be the best means of making a real impact on public opinion in the Community, since there can be no doubt that NGOs have already proved their immense value for that kind of venture.

The resolution also mentions the possibility of twinning arrangements, exchanges and so on under Article 119 of Lomé III. If ACP countries request Community support for these objectives of this resolution, the Commission will certainly make the best use of this opportunity. But the Commission must lay stress on the fact that, given the responsibilities in the field of education within the Community, most of the tasks will probably have to be undertaken by Member States authorities and in their schools. The Commission would further wish to underline that the preparation of a solidarity campaign and the necessary coordination of all bodies concerned as well as its actual implementation would certainly take a considerable amount of time, and therefore the target set for this resolution — 1985 — really does seem impossible of fulfilment.

Moreover, it might also be opportune to consider whether such a single and short-lived campaign would have the envisaged lasting effects on young Europeans, especially when compared with the larger forthcoming campaign of the Council of Europe and bearing in mind also the size and effectiveness of the financial and administrative resources that will probably have to be committed. So for all these reasons, Mr

President, the Commission feels that this project still needs the most careful consideration. But having said that, the Commission most certainly welcomes the report. May I say that all of us would do well to note a declaration of the United Nations which summarized the position so well, and I quote: 'Mankind owes the child the best it has to give'. Surely, that sums it all up.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote on the motion for a resolution will be taken tomorrow, 10 July, at 6 p.m.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

7. European Council in Milan — European Union

President. — The next item is the joint debate

— on the statements by the Council and the Commission concerning the results of the European Council meeting of 28/29 June 1985 in Milan

and

— on the report (Doc. A 2-77/85) by Mr Spinelli, on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, on the follow-up to the Milan Summit as regards European Union.

I should like to extend a sincere and warm welcome to the President-in-Office of the European Council, Mr Santer, who has been a distinguished Member of our Parliament and is well-known to all of us for his commitment to the ideal of European Union and to the advancement of the European Institutions, particularly the European Parliament. As Prime Minister of Luxembourg, he has already given proof of his loyalty and dedication to this cause.

We feel sure that he will show the same dedication and commitment in steering the European Council through the coming six months, a time that is likely to make or break the very future of our Community.

(Applause)

Mr Santer, President-in-Office of the European Council. — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is purely thanks to the rota system for determining the Presidency of the Council that I have the honour to submit and explain to your Assembly the conclusions

Santer

reached by the European Council meeting in Milan on 28 and 29 June 1985.

Mr Craxi and Mr Andreotti should, in all fairness, have been given this opportunity since it is seldom that the work of a presidency has been so intensive, and so effective, as that accomplished by the Italian Presidency.

The exemplary conduct of our debates in Milan made it possible to reach a number of positive conclusions, even if, as is undoubtedly inevitable in the European Council, some of these conclusions were not as clearly defined or developed as they might have been. I shall endeavour to correct this to some extent, but any explanations and comments I make which go beyond the agreed text are no more than the observations, I hope objective, of one of the participants at the meeting.

There was also a particular feature of the European Council meeting in Milan which distinguishes it from most of the previous meetings — *for the first time in a number of years*, the meeting of Heads of State or Government did not act as a court of appeal of the Council of Ministers, nor as a decision-making body for dealing with questions which could not be settled within the institutions normally responsible.

In the past, this tendency to use the European Council as a court of appeal or a breakdown service was regarded by many people, and indeed by many of you, as a distortion of its true role, which is to define the medium- and long-term policy of the Community. From this point of view, it must be taken as a positive sign that for two days in Milan the Heads of State or Government spent most of the time available to them considering and discussing a number of *questions relating to the future of Europe*.

I intend to describe briefly the conclusions of the European Council relating in particular to questions of the future, before discussing at somewhat greater length a subject which, I believe, merits more detailed comments in this House, if only because your Parliament has devoted considerable thought and attention to the future of the Community Institutions and has on a number of occasions acted as a forum for a political discussion which undoubtedly touches upon some of the most fundamental aspects of our joint undertaking.

One of the most notable aspects of the European Council meeting in Milan was undoubtedly the determination shown by the Heads of State or Government to bring about, by 1992, the implementation of the ambitious programme for a genuine internal market proposed by the Commission in its White Paper.

The opening up of markets as provided for in the Treaty of Rome has not led to the creation of a genuine internal market and will not do so until it is

accompanied by a series of other measures. It is now obvious, and generally recognized, that the achievement of a genuine single market is dependent on a great deal more than just tariff reductions and the establishment of a Common Customs Tariff.

Economic circumstances have changed considerably since 1958. It is now recognized that new problems, which did not seem crucial at the time when the present treaties were drawn up, urgently require solutions at Community level.

The Commission performed a remarkable task in preparing the White Paper which you have already examined and which, indeed, you had been calling for so relentlessly.

The quality of the Commission's work as well as the expectations of the economic and social sectors were major contributory factors in bringing about a prompt and clear response from the European Council.

While the European Council does not have direct responsibility for the preparation and adoption of the measures necessary for the achievement of a single market, the Community is nonetheless dependent on the authority of the Heads of State or Government to ensure that this major plan can be implemented with the solid and lasting support of the national governments.

Although the Member States for the most part entrust the institutions of the Community with the responsibility and powers for achieving the internal market, the national political forces can still exercise considerable braking power.

The discussions at the Milan summit give good reason to suppose that the governments will ensure, at the highest political level, that national authorities also give their vital support to this work.

Nor can there be any doubt as to Parliament's role in this operation.

There remains the problem of decision-making power, and above all the exercise of this power in the Community. This remark leads us inevitably to the institutional question, about which I shall have a number of comments to make in due course. I would simply point out at this stage that it seems to me misguided to hope to achieve such a difficult goal if those who are responsible for bringing it about do not have the necessary decision-making instruments or if they do not have the support of the European citizens, whom you represent, at the most crucial moments.

As has been pointed out many times, achievement of a single market is an essential prerequisite for the development of Community cooperation in the area of technology and, to an even greater extent, for the adoption of a Community policy on technology.

Santer

The Commission is clearly aware of this link. It has demonstrated it in a number of ways and it has also submitted proposals to achieve Community and institutional cohesion as part of an approach which, by comparison with our original system, clearly involves some innovations and new constraints, but also offers possibilities previously undreamt of.

The European Council has given its unqualified support to the French Eureka project, which is consistent with an overall approach and does not exclude other Community initiatives which may prove useful or necessary.

I welcome the initiative taken by the French Government to hold a meeting of the Foreign Ministers and Ministers for Research next week to begin the implementation of the Eureka project. This initiative is in itself an illustration of the determination to give continuing high priority to the development and management of future European programmes. Whatever the procedures used, it is now recognized that a Community basis is essential if we wish to avoid introducing new divisions into a Community which already has more than enough of them.

I also welcome the fact that the Eureka project, as well, I am sure, as other initiatives, is to be open to European countries and businesses in European countries which are not members of the Community. This is a very clear way of demonstrating that the Community does not claim to be the whole of Europe.

The European Council also discussed the question of the day-to-day reality of Europe.

You will remember that at Fontainebleau the Heads of State or Government, on the initiative of President Mitterrand, solemnly and strongly urged those striving for the unification of Europe and the enhancement of its status to *give serious attention, at long last, to the more immediate concerns of European citizens.*

Particular efforts were called for to provide citizens with information on the many real advantages offered by the mere existence of the European Community. We all know, and are made aware in our day-to-day lives, that things are far from perfect. The best intentions of our leaders, and this applies also at Community level, often result in measures which bring advantages of which the citizen is scarcely aware. How many commendable efforts made by the European authorities have been ineffective simply because the citizens are unaware of them? How many measures, commendable in themselves, finally lose their impact when they are implemented through administrative procedures which reflect insufficiently, if at all, the positive and progressive aspect of European aspirations and initial achievements?

The many suggestions put forward by the committee chaired by Mr Adonnino constitute in themselves an

impressive list of what national governments and Community institutions could, between them, achieve with a little more determination, if it was finally recognized that the construction of Europe is designed first of all to benefit our citizens and not only to permit the implementation of economic, industrial and technological strategies, the benefits of which, if all goes well, will be felt by our children and grandchildren rather than by those for whom we are working today.

With this in mind, the President of the French Republic submitted to the European Council an additional memorandum underlining, among other things, the importance of cooperation in the cultural sphere in the widest sense of the term.

I feel sure that this communication will also be supported in the European Parliament in view of the significance and innovative nature of certain aspects.

But the day-to-day reality of Europe is also characterized by the serious problems which continue to affect many regions, industrial sectors and groups of citizens throughout the Community. Among the latter, we cannot for a moment forget those women and men who are at present deprived of the possibility of carrying out the work for which they are qualified or earning a decent living.

Although this problem was not discussed at great length by the European Council on this occasion, there can be no doubt that all the Heads of State or Government are determined to work together to take all possible measures at Community level to combat and reduce unemployment, particularly structural unemployment and youth unemployment.

The President of the 'General Affairs' Council will comment in greater detail tomorrow on the conclusions of the European Council concerning the economic and social situation. I would take this opportunity to emphasize the importance which the European Council attached to economic convergence in the Community, and the fact that it is constantly at pains to point out that the development of the European Monetary System, including the role of the ECU, is a vital aspect of our work towards the creation of a genuine single market.

Lastly, with regard to those in need, the European Council could not fail to touch upon the tragic situation of the still large numbers of men, women and children in the world who are undernourished. It is inconceivable that the European Community, which will shortly consist of twelve countries which are in the fortunate position of being able to satisfy all the food requirements of their population, should not take resolute and unrelenting action to eradicate the scourge of hunger from the world.

Your Parliament, which expresses the solidarity felt by the citizens of our countries, has, on many occasions,

Santer

prompted the governments and institutions to take action. The European Council in Milan also showed its determination to respond to this need. The work which has begun will be continued and stepped up. This is a fundamental responsibility: we cannot claim to represent a part of the world which aims to rise to the major challenges of our time without accepting our share of the responsibility for alleviating the misery and suffering remaining in the world.

Before moving on to consider institutional questions as such, I should like to make a special mention of the initiatives taken with a view to achieving a more structured organization of political cooperation between the Ten, soon to be Twelve.

Even if it does not hit the headlines, political cooperation is one of the Community's great achievements. For centuries our varied interests have been settled by differences in our foreign policies. It is the area in which nationalism has reigned supreme.

Nevertheless, the Ten have succeeded in developing common positions on most major international problems, together with an information and consultation system which has had remarkable effects and which is undoubtedly seen more clearly from outside the Community than within it.

The British Government, whose initiative was followed by proposals from the French and German Governments, took the view that the time had come to consolidate this achievement and formalize the organization of our cooperation on foreign policy, the operating rules and principles of which could be enshrined either in a treaty or in a solemn agreement.

At the same time a permanent secretariat could be established with the task of gradually becoming the conscience and memory of European cooperation with regard to foreign policy.

While the implications of such a development for joint action by the Twelve in the field of security policy are still under discussion, a substantial majority of the members of the European Council came out in favour of a clearer and more rational definition and organization of cooperation in the field of foreign policy.

The various ideas will be debated in more detail at the intergovernmental conference that I shall discuss in a few moments, with the aim of seeking agreement on the terms of certain procedural undertakings which will be more specific, and perhaps more binding, than those currently in operation.

It goes without saying that this area, which directly concerns national sovereignty and, in the final analysis, also concerns the question of European cooperation on security policy, must be handled with great tact.

However, the very fact that there is not only a willingness but also a desire to improve what we call European political cooperation is symptomatic and sheds light on the comments that I shall now make about institutional questions.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it was not possible for the European Council to adopt an ambitious programme to implement the common market or to decide to add a new technological dimension to the Community without at least asking itself if it is possible to do this purely by applying the rules and methods which are currently in force.

The European Communities are founded on a complex of provisions anchored in the Treaties, which carefully define the powers of the various institutions and organs. In conjunction with the provisions defining the powers delegated to the institutions *vis-à-vis* the powers retained by the States, this complex of provisions, which is called the 'Community system', constitutes our charter or common basic law. This creates a careful balance, which is sometimes difficult for the outside world to grasp and which underpins the operating rules and procedures.

This 'Community system', however, is also the nerve-centre of the unique entity that is the Community. Any significant change inevitably poses fundamental questions. It is therefore not unjustifiable to put both Member States and the institutions on guard against any badly thought-out or hasty steps intended to change this balance.

Conversely, however, it is just as dangerous to conclude from the complexity of a system originally designed for a Community of six Member States that it would be better to make no changes at all. Such an attitude would lead to — already has led to — an increasing part of our decision-making process being transferred to a kind of no man's land, and to a gradual decline in the authority of the institutions and in concern to respect the rules.

Finally, the increase in the Community's responsibilities, both internal and external, and the extension of its activities into areas which were not originally covered by the treaties, logically leads to the question of whether the political instruments constituted by our institutions, as they operate at present, will continue to be capable of assuming new responsibilities and pursuing new activities.

This debate has been going on since the Community was founded, and shows no signs of stopping.

Over the years its topicality has been reflected in a number of initiatives, few of which have had concrete results, for a variety of reasons. Of the political changes which have taken place over the past 25 years, the most important is undoubtedly the election of the Members of your Parliament by universal suffrage.

Santer

This vitally important political development was not accompanied by changes in the operating rules. There is no doubt that at least some of our problems have been caused by this omission.

The European Council is obviously not the appropriate forum to debate this matter in detail. Aware, however, of the importance of the smooth operation of 'the Community system', it took the initial step, in Stuttgart in 1983, of drawing up and defining in a Solemn Declaration those measures which it felt could be taken, within the current framework of the Treaties, in the interests of progress in Europe.

A year later, in Fontainebleau, the European Council took another step by giving a committee consisting of the personal representatives of the Heads of State or Government the task of making

- suggestions for the improvement of the operation of European cooperation in both the Community field and that of political, or any other, cooperation.

Moreover, your Parliament had meanwhile adopted a draft treaty establishing a European Union in order to honour a promise made long ago at the Paris Summit, which decided in October 1972 that 'the Member States of the Community, the driving force of European construction, affirm their intention to transform before the end of the present decade the whole complex of their relations into a European Union'.

As you will have found, the report drawn up by the Dooge Committee responds in its own way to this invitation.

Following very active discussions which have been going on for nearly a year, the many and varied suggestions have been crystallized, for the purposes of discussion within the European Council, into five themes:

- improved decision-making in the Council,
- an enhanced role for the European Parliament,
- the Commission's executive responsibilities,
- the extension of Community activities into new areas,
- strengthening of political cooperation.

These five themes have been the subject of a serious and exciting — sometimes even impassioned — debate, which reached a provisional conclusion in Milan.

It is hardly surprising that these five points have prompted different responses from the Heads of State or Government; the considerable efforts made by the President-in-Office, Mr Craxi, were not enough to

achieve the impossible, i.e. overall agreement on all these questions and on the procedural steps to be taken in connection with such a political agreement.

It is not for me either to question or support the merits of the positions taken by the various parties. Not only would I be failing in my present duty if I did so, but I would certainly be disloyal to all those concerned.

What I wish to point out, in the clearest possible terms, is that within the European Council there is no Head of State or Government, there is no Foreign Minister, who does not acknowledge that the rules and operating methods of the Community's institutions must be *improved*.

Improved so as to eliminate a number of abuses, such as the well-established practice of ignoring the undisputed opportunities for Council decisions to be based on majority voting;

improved to ensure that the ambitious programme to achieve a genuine internal market does not remain a list of good intentions, partly because the institutions are unable or have forgotten how to act with the authority and speed needed to implement such a major project;

improved as regards the implementation of common action programmes in the field of technology and research, where everyone acknowledges that we face a real dilemma when it comes to deciding whether the traditional rules and procedures are adequate, or whether flexibility and efficiency should be sought outside the Community context.

Even when reduced to these five key points, the debate is of the kind which cannot be concluded in the time available to any European Council meeting. It seems to me, however, that it is not being unjustifiably optimistic to conclude from our deliberations that, *whatever anyone may say, something is happening*.

Starting from that assumption, one could discourse at length on the question of whether the reforms considered necessary can be achieved by making better use of existing structures, mainly in terms of greater political motivation on the part of the governments or whether the time has come simply to 'make a new start'. Everyone will react to this type of question according to concepts which are strongly influenced by different historical, political or cultural attitudes.

It is important to note, and to repeat, that there is no real difference of opinion in the European Council as regards the problems to be solved; any differences of opinion relate to the methods to be used.

The Heads of State or Government of seven Member States have clearly expressed their determination to convene an intergovernmental conference to discuss the reform of the institutions and of the Rules of Pro-

Santer

cedure. Three Heads of Government took the view that it is either not essential or is inappropriate to use the procedure for amending the Treaties.

The outcome of these deliberations, nevertheless, is that the Presidency has been entrusted with the task of taking the necessary steps to convene an intergovernmental conference. The Government of Luxembourg intends to fulfil this task with equanimity, without excessive haste and also without undue delay. The procedural steps are already under way, and we hope that they can be completed at the forthcoming meeting of the Council on 22 and 23 July. One important condition is that your Parliament should express a favourable opinion.

The Presidency proposes that at the same time the Council should continue the discussions started in Milan on several proposals (particularly from the British Government) to achieve tangible improvements in the way the institutions work, within the existing framework of the Treaties.

This contribution — and perhaps others — provides an illustration, if one were still needed, of the concern which is broadly shared by all the Heads of State or Government to make the Community's institutions capable of tackling the difficult tasks that await them.

The most remarkable result of our joint deliberations could, and in my view should, be that at the end of them, and if possible at the next European Council, it will be seen that the various ideas complement each other perfectly. If this were the result of our efforts, not only would our Community have achieved a step forward which could be described as 'historic' but the imposing display of unanimity that would have made it possible would strengthen our Community's internal and external cohesion and represent a major step towards the final objective of a European Union.

With regard to the intergovernmental conference, the clear reference to Article 236 of the EEC Treaty — and to the corresponding articles of the Treaties establishing the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community — has a very specific purpose that I should like to summarize as follows: the procedure, which is described as an 'institutional revision procedure', may be started by the Council which, after consulting the European Parliament and the Commission, will in turn deliver an opinion. This opinion may be based on a majority vote.

Any decisions reached by such a conference, on the other hand, require unanimous approval by all the Member States. Their entry into force is subject to ratification by the national parliaments in all the Member States.

Looking at it more closely, we can see that Article 236 has unsuspected virtues. The debate — even if it takes

the more solemn form of a conference — can be started on the initiative of some Member States, who then have to convince the others. This is the task that we shall now tackle with resolution, and even enthusiasm. This development should not be seen as a conspiracy or attempt to exert pressure — as some have claimed it is — on the part notably of the founder Members of the Community. But nor can we exempt those States, thanks to whose courageous and clear-sighted initiative the Community now exists, from the consequences of their initial commitment, the purpose of which they clearly set out in the preamble to the Treaty.

There are not two categories of Member States, nor should there be two or more categories. The interests of Europe, properly understood, prohibit this. It is understandable, however, that there are some States who also wish to express their political and economic commitment by strengthening the authority and powers of the institutions beyond the provisions of the original Treaties. This is also legitimate.

We are thus in a situation which is not new and is not disagreeable for anyone, and in which there is a single shared objective: that of strengthening our Community and developing our common interests in the direction of increasing unity. Any contributions which can be made towards achieving this objective — whether they entail modifying the treaties or not — are, ultimately, complementary. Measures to strengthen political cooperation are also complementary, although they involve different considerations; in the final analysis, however, they still pose the same question.

This is a major objective of the Luxembourg Presidency. Are we up to mastering it, or equipped to achieve it? At all events we shall do our best, if we cannot achieve the impossible. This Presidency's only ambition is to provide loyal and committed service. To this end, it also needs the support of your Parliament. May I express the hope that we may receive and retain such support throughout the next six months.

(Loud applause)

Mr Delors, President of the Commission. — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Presidency-in-Office has its constraints, the Commission has others. The Presidency-in-Office has great responsibilities; the Commission has lesser responsibilities, but important ones too. You will therefore appreciate that I shall be speaking from a different standpoint. Since you treated the statement that I made at the beginning of January as an investiture speech, it now falls to me, six months later, to give you an account of our stewardship, and although I shall be concentrating on the themes of the Milan European Council, since you would be disappointed if I did otherwise, these will not be the only topics that I shall be discussing, because the mistake is too often made of

Delors

giving the public the impression that the three meetings of the European Council held each year are all that ever happens in the life of the Community.

(Applause)

In giving this account, I shall not, believe me, be showing undue pessimism, but nor shall I be trying to hide from you the difficulties and ambiguities of the present situation. I regard it as part of my duty to keep you properly informed. I can mention in passing that the Commission believes that it has played an important role in the success of enlargement, in the presentation of the integrated Mediterranean programmes, with the invaluable support of Parliament in finding a solution to the problem of exhaust emissions, and, finally, I myself have taken discreet steps with regard to the strengthening, albeit a slight strengthening, of the European Monetary System. However, to justify this median position between pessimism and optimism, I would say to you that the current situation in Europe can be understood only if one accepts that there are not seven countries on one side and three on the other, but four main schools of thought, with some countries straddling two of them. I shall briefly run through these four schools of thought, since I hope that this will give you a better understanding of the situation.

At one extreme there are the countries which adhere strictly to the spirit of the Treaty of Rome and want to see the continuation of complete economic and social integration, with a single, unified set of institutions. At the opposite extreme there are those who want to reduce the common market to a free-trade area with political cooperation as an external adjunct — and they make no secret of this, however guarded they may be in their public pronouncements. However, two other schools of thought, or tendencies, have emerged between the two extremes. One, whose development has been seen mainly since the two enlargements, looks for the process of economic and social integration to be limited so that what will be a two-speed Europe in all but name can be created. On the other hand, there are those who have suddenly succumbed to the attractions of the intergovernmental process, because the Community has, it seems, become too bureaucratic. I shall return to this point in due course.

You will concede, ladies and gentlemen, that it is difficult to foster a spirit of cooperation under these circumstances, although I sincerely hope — and my colleagues share my sentiments — that the intergovernmental conference will intensify the degree of shared resolve. But it is in the light of the existence of these four schools of thought that the six months leading up to the Milan European Council and the prospects for the future must both be assessed.

I expect that I have probably shocked certain members of government by making this review of the schools of thought, for they themselves are sometimes reluctant

to admit to themselves what their true feelings about the Community are. But it was something that I had to do.

(Applause)

These same considerations also explain why it was that, of the four main subjects offering potential for regeneration of the Community, apart from institutional questions, the Commission chose to concentrate on the large internal market and technological cooperation, and not, for the time being, on economic convergence and efforts to strengthen the European Monetary System. On these last two issues, whatever may have been stated in communiqués, believe me, bearing in mind what I have just said, the differences were too great and remain too great for progress to be possible. The Commission would be misleading you if it were to present you today with documents announcing early progress on economic convergence or monetary cooperation.

We therefore concentrated on the other two subjects, and this calls for some explanation, in view of the reference made by President Santer. I should explain, for the benefit of certain honourable Members, that our presentation of the completion of the large internal market was made in pure, intransigent terms, and this is why the White Paper contains no analysis or substantial parameter relating to policies on mechanisms to correct imbalances on the internal market or to the management/labour dialogue. These omissions drew justified criticisms from the European Trade Union Confederation. But I explained to the trade union leaders why the Commission had adopted this approach. It was because it wanted to call the bluff of governments which had constantly proclaimed that they were in favour of liberalism and the enlarged market.

And sure enough, at the Milan Summit two countries expressed the deepest reservations about part of the Commission's proposal, as though it had not been an integrated package but a sort of buffet at which everyone was free to pick and choose. No, our intention was to present a complete package which meant that each country would have to forgo a few of its traditions and customs for the common good of Europe. That is what we were trying to do.

(Applause)

The second subject on which we concentrated our efforts was technological cooperation. This is quite obviously of vital importance. For the March Summit we had already prepared a five-page paper limited to discussion of what the Community could do under present circumstances. This paper was not examined, for reasons already explained in this Chamber. We had developed this theme in the interim, working flat out to make the most of the favourable climate, much of the credit for which, it has to be said, must go to the

Delors

Eureka project. I felt it necessary to remind you of this background before explaining what the Commission's aims were when it presented itself to the European Council in Milan, since questions have been raised as to its motives. First, it asked to be given 10 minutes in which to present each of its projects, on the internal market and technological cooperation. You will perhaps be surprised to learn that we were not allowed these 20 minutes. That in itself is fairly symptomatic of the present state of the Community.

On the style of the European Council there was no disagreement. The European Council is there to review the state of the Union, it is there to provide the driving force for future developments; it should not blind people to the fact that, as I was saying, the Community deals with a multitude of problems day by day, and that this too is part of the life of Europe.

The Commission arrived in Milan with the fundamental idea that the institutional issue could not be circumvented, that it had to be tackled, and hence the need, in our view, for an intergovernmental conference at which the following reference documents would be used: the European Parliament's draft, the reports by the two *ad hoc* committees, the Committee for Institutional Affairs and the Committee on a People's Europe, and the proposals made during the meeting by the Commission. We also arrived in Milan with the idea of an extension of Community areas of competence, strictly in line with the proposals made in the European Parliament's draft treaty and in the Dooge report.

We arrived in Milan with the idea that it was necessary to improve decision-making processes. As President Santer has stated, no-one disputed that. The discussion centred, I believe, on ways and means, not on the principles.

And then we arrived in Milan with the idea of maintaining the unity of the institutions; hence our hostility to any political secretariat outside the existing Community institutions.

(Applause)

Why? Not out of any petty jealousy of our prerogatives but simply because it was necessary to avoid two risks in future: the first is the possibility of a clash between two institutions which had to draw a line, on what basis I know not, between, on the one hand, economic and social matters and, on the other hand, political issues; the second risk is that one day, if agreement could not be reached on how the Community should be developed, some States might be tempted — as they already have been — to opt for political cooperation instead of dealing with the real problems of the Community.

(Applause)

Finally, we arrived in Milan for the European Council with the idea that our two important projects could be adopted. First, the White Paper on completing the internal market, in which a timetable had been set out. We asked for a solemn undertaking from the Heads of State or Government to accept the whole package: removal of physical barriers, abolition of technical barriers, approximation of indirect taxes and excise duties. We asked to do this together, we asked for each Member State to make concessions, to review its traditions and customs. As I have already said, this solemn undertaking was not forthcoming, since part of the package was referred for consideration by the Councils and, down the line, by the national administrations. It has to be said, therefore, that the Commission failed in its attempt to apply what I call the Jean Monnet method, the securing of a solemn agreement rising above everyday difficulties.

Secondly, the proposals on technological cooperation. We tried to present a coherent package which was complementary to the French Eureka initiative. There are three justifications, ladies and gentlemen, for taking advantage of the Community dimension as a means of advancing the progress of technological development. The first is to be found in the links with structural economic policy. New technologies pervade all aspects of economic life, bringing profound changes in methods of production. We have to ask ourselves how we should be going about the organization of analysis and monitoring of new technologies, while at the same time endeavouring to regenerate the dynamism of the Community economy. That is the question facing us. The second justification is the need for flexible structures, which the Community is capable of providing, meeting the requirements for real progress: pre-competitive research, for which we have a model in the Esprit programme; production, with a range of projects for testing purposes, for which we have a model in the telecommunications programme. It really would be pointless to venture into high-technology research if we were unable to carry it through to the point of meeting demand from the public or private sector, which is the only guarantee of profitability, rational allocation of resources and the profound changes needed for the development of our economy. The third and last justification for the Community dimension is the need for an external economic policy.

Who would be convinced, ladies and gentlemen, setting aside all the strategic aspects, by the proposition that the Community should not engage in talks with the Americans about what they are doing on their side? I warn you, the whole Commission warns you, of what is going to happen in the absence of such negotiations: with its economic and financial muscle, the United States will come looking for our advanced technology and transfer it back home, with no reciprocity; in other words, the technologically weaker party will be the one to suffer from technological

Delors

transfers in reverse. Those were the three reasons which made a Community dimension essential.

(Applause)

The Milan Summit is now behind us.

What assessment can be made of it, what is the outlook?

To begin with the positive aspects. To my mind, the Milan Summit marked — as indeed have events in the Community these past few months — a broader, deeper and more serious awareness of the challenges facing Europe, mainly on the economic front. There were convergences which offered fresh opportunities, and I hope that we shall be able to seize those opportunities. With regard to the processes for decision-making and action, there was a debate between those referred to as the 'pragmatists', who had taken a step forward, who recognized the need for improvements in the decision-making process, and the 'institutionalists' who considered it insufficient. Without being ironical, I suggest that, if the Milan Summit had taken place two years later, the forward movement made by one side and the realism of the other might perhaps have brought them together and the clash of opinions about which you have heard might have been avoided. But there was one factor which kept the two sides apart, in my view, and that is the sociological model of the Community's day-to-day life and its decision-making. Out of every 100 decisions going through the machine before being submitted to the Council, there are 45 which require a unanimous vote and 55 requiring a qualified majority.

As matters stand at present, ladies and gentlemen, there is no difference in the way that preparations are made for either type of decision: there is the same obsessive concern to achieve unanimity in both cases. It is this 'logic' which must be changed. Unfortunately, I think that this cannot be done without amending certain articles in the Treaty.

(Applause)

It is for this reason that, seeing a split in the offing, I made a proposal, on behalf of the Commission, for action to be taken in two stages. I said to the Presidents and Heads of Government: agree to the amendment of three articles in the Treaty, Article 57, second paragraph, on the right of establishment in the professions, Article 99, on harmonization of taxes and duties, and Article 100, which would clear the way for the removal of barriers and completion of the internal market. And I made this proposal to them according to a formula which reconciled my idea of democracy and efficiency. Democracy, because it was the European Parliament which would have had the power to decide when the Council could vote by qualified majority rather than needing to act unanimously. This would have given the European Parliament the oppor-

tunity to work to promote integration along lines fully consistent with the philosophy of the Treaty of Rome.

(Applause)

At the same time, though, the transition to majority voting would have given added flexibility to the decision-making process.

During the second phase there could have been an intergovernmental conference to examine the remaining problems. In making this proposal, the Commission was motivated by its fear of the inevitable split in prospect. A split accompanied, moreover, let us make no bones about this, by something of a rush into ill-considered developments. But I have to report that this proposal met with no success, doubtless because each party was locked into its own strategy or its domestic preoccupations. We therefore arrived at the decisions which were taken.

I should now like to discuss these decisions briefly, under three headings: the intergovernmental conference, the strengthening of Europe's economies, the decisions concerning which are on the whole positive, and finally the extension of Community areas of competence.

On the intergovernmental conference, neither you nor we got what we wanted, clearly defined terms of reference and a short timescale. In the absence of such arrangements, it seems to me, unless this conference has been concluded by the end of October and finalized its proposals under Luxembourg's Presidency, it is to be feared that it will go on for three or four years, during which time, whenever we attempt to make any progress in the Community, we are going to be told: wait for the outcome of the intergovernmental conference. That is not realistic, it is not sensible.

Despite this, therefore, I feel that we can expect some immediate improvements, as President Santer has been saying. Certain decisions could be taken on the basis of a simple majority. The rules of procedure allow such votes to be taken in the Council. Others could be taken unanimously, on the understanding that an abstention does not negate a unanimous vote. This leaves the improvements requiring amendment of the Treaty; more frequent use of majority voting and arrangements to deal with vital interests; closer involvement of the European Parliament; greater scope for the Commission to make proposals and take action. The Commission is not seeking additional powers. It wants to be able to take action without being bogged down day after day in the grey area between the Council and the Commission, where civil servants arriving from our national capitals are blocking all progress and sometimes even going against what has been decided by their heads of government.

(Applause)

Delors

Immediate improvements, then, before the intergovernmental conference, improvements requiring amendment of the Treaty, and finally extension of the Community's areas of competence.

There are two quite different aspects here. On the one hand there are the problems which are currently not within the purview of the Community — human rights, education, health — and on the other there is political cooperation, with the possibility of a separate treaty and the question, which I mentioned earlier, of a political secretariat.

Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that if the Council of Ministers were to decide on two intergovernmental conferences, one on political cooperation, to which the Commission would not be invited, and the other on the subjects covered by the Treaty, I can give you no guarantee that the Commission would take part in the latter conference, since such an arrangement would in itself be formal acknowledgement that we had drifted away from the precepts and intentions of the Treaty of Rome. It is as well to make myself clear. I shall of course consult my colleagues, but I believe that a very important point is at issue here; the organization of two intergovernmental conferences would already signify the splitting of the Community.

(Applause)

As regards the strengthening of Europe's economies, I feel, despite the reservations that I have expressed, that the Commission's approach on the subject of the internal market was broadly taken into consideration. We shall be bringing forward proposals. With Luxembourg in the Presidency, we shall be getting a lot of help, I know. In the area of technological cooperation we shall be conducting our cooperation with Eureka in parallel with the continuation or indeed acceleration of Community action, avoiding duplication and putting the emphasis on the Community dimension, as I have been saying. There will be an important meeting in Luxembourg; perhaps it has passed unnoticed, but this corresponds to what many of the Heads of State or Government are looking for, in an attempt to account for the relative sluggishness of our European economies when compared with the American and Japanese economies. I said to the European Council in Milan: 'I do not know the answer. But if we work on it, if we consult widely, perhaps we can come up with fresh ideas so that, by the time the European Council meeting in Luxembourg comes round, we shall have the basis for decisions which would simultaneously involve convergence of our economies, closer monetary cooperation and a revival of the social dialogue'.

There you have the Commission's assessment of the Milan Summit, in the light of which it is making seven proposals for the months ahead. I shall just run through these proposals.

First, to organize the first stages of development towards the internal market, immediately bringing them back into proper alignment with the development of structural policies and the indispensable social dialogue. Second, to continue the work in the technological field.

Third, to further the advancement of a people's Europe — and here, the Commission has been put in the same position as the Council. With great regret, I have to say that it can do nothing. The plans which should have made for progress towards a people's Europe have been blocked in the Council. Some of the reasons which have caused them to be blocked are very important, such as considerations of security or the drugs problem, but others are trivial. What the Commission can do here is to sort out which are which, and then define the important problems so that they can be analysed thoroughly and settled.

Fourth, to launch the comprehensive assessment of the future of the common agricultural policy, an extremely complex subject. We at the Commission hope that there will be a wide-ranging debate in the European Parliament, in the national parliaments, and a sounding of opinion from all sections of economic and social life.

Fifth, to carry out an analysis of the reasons for the sluggishness of the European economy, to which I have already referred.

Sixth, and this is surely not the least important point, to reaffirm the ability of the Community to stand on its own two feet in its external economic relations and to stop constantly giving ground or getting the wrong end of the stick when Japan gives the false impression of liberalizing its trade or when the United States attempts, under pressure from its public opinion, to impose unilateral measures on us. Rest assured, ladies and gentlemen, that if the Member States fail to reach agreement on taking firm stands on these issues, then the holding of an intergovernmental conference on the future of Europe will be a pointless exercise.

(Applause)

Seventh, in parallel with these developments, the Commission intends to play an active part in the intergovernmental conference, bringing forward proposals in good time, as I indicated to your Committee on Institutional Affairs. I should like, in this connection, to re-state two important points: the Commission is a joint institution of 10 Member States, and we shall therefore spare no effort to reconcile their points of view and to understand the attitudes of those which felt it necessary, at the Milan Summit, to refuse to entertain any amendment of the treaties.

(Applause)

Delors

Expectation of the worst possible contingency is no basis for making plans . . .

(Applause)

Finally, the Commission is the custodian of the treaties. It has the right of initiative. With these responsibilities in mind, there are three points to which we attach particular importance, on which I shall conclude. The unity of the institutions, as I have already said, is essentially from a Community perspective. Secondly, economic and social integration must necessarily be founded on unity of the market, financial solidarity — or indeed, solidarity in the broadest sense — and Community preference. Finally, the democratization of the Community, via a Parliament elected by universal suffrage, can be achieved only if it is accompanied by enhanced efficiency. I am convinced, ladies and gentlemen, that your determination to strive harder for Europe will mean that your proposals too will be aimed at achieving greater efficiency.

(Loud and sustained applause)

Mr Spinelli (COM), *chairman of the Committee on Institutional Affairs; rapporteur. — (IT)* Mr President, the European Council in Milan prepared a list of the major policies which, at the present time, the Community has to carry out.

If the European Council had done no more than give its august but platonic agreement to these policies, we might remain relatively unmoved by this list of wishful requests. The European Council likes pointing out great goals to the Community; but, usually, these goals are never reached, because the Community bodies that ought to achieve them are unsuccessful. And today, also, the fact that, in Milan, these goals were proclaimed in vibrant tones does not make them any easier of achievement. The unified market ought to have been in existence from the end of the transitional period of the EEC — in other words, for over fifteen years; and it is really nothing to get very excited about when, in Milan, we hear all of this described as a goal to be achieved in seven years, without a common currency, and without fiscal harmonization. Great research and development projects were outlined by the Commission in the early seventies, and the Council accepted them then in principle; little has come out of them. And today, working in the same old way, with programmes to be determined by intergovernmental meetings and agreements, and relying on a weak financial contribution from the Community, do we really hope to start closing Europe's technological gap?

The European Council in Milan however marked an historic turning point in the life of the Community, because it recognized that, with the Community and political cooperation as they are today, it is neither possible to tackle new problems nor to hold on to the

gains that have already been made; because the majority of the Council rejected the idea that we can get out of the **impasse** in which we find ourselves by simply making the instruments which the Community has at its disposal work better, and therefore decided to call an intergovernmental conference to fix, in the form of treaties for ratification, the fundamental laws necessary to reform the Council's decision-making procedure, to increase the role of the European Parliament and the Commission's managerial powers, and to define new fields of joint activity in the economic and political field.

Almost as though to emphasize its own lack of efficiency the Council — knowing as it did that, in order formally to call this conference it had to obtain the opinion of this Parliament, and knowing also that we should be meeting here today — was still not able to put this request before us. But we shall not saddle ourselves with the responsibility of letting the autumn come without any action having been taken, and we will express our opinion now, knowing anyway as we do the precise terms in which the European Council has formulated its decision.

It is our opinion that this conference must be held, and that the aims to be achieved are those that the Council has indicated. But to this opinion in favour, which had to be forthcoming in order to start things moving, the European Parliament has a duty to add a number of precise criticisms and a number of precise requests, firmly calling on the Council and, subsequently, the conference to bear them in mind.

The Committee on Institutional Affairs has therefore drawn up a motion for a resolution that I shall briefly outline to you, on which it proposes that this Assembly should vote.

First of all, the Parliament must deplore the lack of coherence and realism in the approach of the European Council, insofar as it is proposing four different types of institutional procedure for revising the existing Treaties, drafting a new treaty on political cooperation, defining the reforms needed to finalize the internal market, and creating a framework for European technological cooperation.

We say again emphatically that what is needed today is a single treaty that encompasses all Community policies and policies for political cooperation, and entrusts their implementation to efficient, democratic institutions of the Community or the Union.

The European Parliament has long since drawn up and approved a Draft Treaty, which meets these requirements. This treaty has the merit of being coherent and realistic, and it was drawn up by representatives of a large majority of the political parties existing in our countries. If the conference wants to work with the speed that has been asked of it, on the subjects that have been assigned to it, it must take as its basis the

Spinelli

text already prepared by the Parliament, proposing amendments where it considers them necessary, but respecting its good points and its spirit, as the Dooge Report proposes.

Since it is a treaty between states that has to be drawn up, it must naturally be discussed by the governments in an intergovernmental conference, and approved and signed by them before being finally presented for ratification. But it is not simply a treaty: it is the fundamental law that a Community already in existence wishes to enact so as to become a real Union. And that, in true democratic manner, must be done and approved by the Assembly that legitimately represents the citizens of the Community.

For this reason we formally demand that, after having duly discussed and approved the text of the Treaty, the conference refer it back to the Parliament for it to be read a second time, and that, if there are any differences between the conference's text and that of the Parliament, an appropriate conciliation committee should suggest a compromise text to both parties.

We cannot accept that an act of such importance as the construction of the Union should be left to a few ministers and the swarms of diplomats in their train. These gentlemen have already made abundantly clear their tendency to let obsolete but tenacious national prejudices prevail, whereas the European Parliament, on the other hand, has shown its ability to bring forth visions and concepts of a supranational character.

We wish the conference success, whilst pointing out, however, that if the conference were to fail to achieve unanimity, the governments of all those Member States in favour should proceed to draw up and adopt a Treaty of Union.

The firm intention to achieve genuine, far-reaching institutional reform should be ascertained quite quickly. It is said that, in this way, a 'two-speed' Europe would be created; but Europe as it is at present is a 'no-speed' Europe, and if part of it decides to start moving, that will mean the beginning of the creation of a democratic political Europe . . .

(Loud applause)

. . . The door must always remain open to countries who are slow to follow and, in the meantime, interim arrangements should be devised by common accord between the Union and the States concerned.

Finally, we call on the Commission to escape from its present state of indecision, which was apparent again today in the speech by President Delors, and unequivocally support the Parliament. The action that we call for is designed to ensure that, from the decisions in Milan, a real Union will be born. It will be a long and difficult process; a complex system of political alliances, some of them new, must be established, and in

this system the alliance between the Commission and the Parliament will be of fundamental importance.

On behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs I therefore ask you to vote in favour of the resolution, and, with regard to the amendments that have been put forward, to vote for or against, according to what our Committee recommends. We have often been obliged to recommend the rejection of amendments which were quite acceptable as to their content, but which were out of place in a resolution which is intended not to lay the foundations for European policy as a whole but to achieve agreement on one very precise point: — to make the Council understand that we are in favour of calling the conference; to ask it to work efficiently and bravely and not in the way that was envisaged; and to see that the Parliament is associated with the drawing up and approval of the draft.

Let us endeavour, ladies and gentlemen, not to water down this request by talking about everything all at once.

Mr President, even those who denigrate this Parliament most bitterly, even the proudest defenders of so-called 'pragmatism', must acknowledge that if at Milan our governments finally shook off their European torpor, and if they decided to undertake the reform of the Community and the construction of the Union, that was only possible because this Parliament had continued working, in a measured way but still tenaciously, for that Union.

In Milan, with a characteristic reaction of rejection, at the very moment of accepting the idea of reform that was submitted to them by the Parliament, our Heads of Government ostentatiously ignored the Parliament's draft, and its request to continue to be one of the 'constituent powers' in the building of the Union.

What do you want, gentlemen of the Council? Grounds for another quarrel with the European Parliament? This, Mr President of the Council, is quite a dangerous path to tread, both for the Community of today and for the Union of tomorrow. Please tell this to your colleagues!

(Loud applause)

(The sitting was suspended at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

Mrs Banotti (PPE). — Mr President, may I draw your attention and that of the House to a very disturb-

Banotti

ing event which occurred this morning. A group of young Irish shopworkers involved in a long-running and peaceful protest against the *apartheid* policies of South Africa were turned back in mid-air from visiting that country, to which they had been invited by Bishop Tutu in recognition of their services in the anti-*apartheid* cause. It is absolutely unforgivable that citizens of this Community who are legally entitled to visit South Africa should have their legal entitlement revoked literally in mid-air as they go on a peaceful visit.

Mr Andrews (RDE). — Mr President, I share the concern of Mrs Banotti on this question of the arrest of the Dunne's Stores strikers in South Africa. They are being held *incommunicado* by the fascist South African regime who have been welcomed here in Europe by certain member governments. I want to say that I have supported the Dunne's Stores strikers from the outset. They refused to handle South African fruit and South African products in their stores. Furthermore, I want to say that I think it is important that this Parliament today — not tomorrow but today — suspends standing orders so that we can get down to the business once and for all of discussing South Africa and the South African policy of *apartheid*. It is not just a question of black and white, it is of concern to anybody who disputes the laws they have, and I suggest that we take the opportunity straight away of suspending standing orders.

I have already checked the Rules of Procedure for an opportunity to suspend standing orders so that we can discuss this issue. It is a most important issue and something we cannot ignore. I appeal to you, Mr President, to give us a ruling right now that we suspend standing orders and that we have a full debate on the *apartheid* policy in South Africa, in particular with reference to these innocent, decent people who have protested more significantly than anybody I know, including this parliament, against the horrible system of *apartheid* in South Africa.

President. — I am afraid that I am not in a position to do as you ask. The agenda has been adopted and under Rule 56 can no longer be amended. I would suggest that you raise this matter elsewhere in the appropriate form.

We shall continue with the debate.

Mr Jospin (S). — (FR) Mr President, I am doubly pleased to be in Luxembourg today, first because the leaders of our host State have just begun their term of office in the presidency of the Council, and secondly because our presence today in this chamber, rather than at Strasbourg, where the chamber has been enlarged, provides tangible evidence of the fact that the agreement recently concluded on enlargement enables the elected representatives of Spain and Portugal to join us.

As convention demands, my speech as spokesman for the Socialist Group will be concerned with the recent Summit Meeting of Heads of State or Government.

The first comment that we have to make about this Summit is that it is difficult to weigh up with any confidence. As I see it, there are two aspects to the Milan Summit. One is barren and disappointing: the decisions not taken or postponed. The other is more fertile and promising: the commitments given and the tangible progress made. The prospects and expectations naturally look different according to which of these aspects is foremost.

It is disappointing that, because they were unable to reach a consensus, the Heads of State or Government failed to improve the decision-making process, to intensify political cooperation, or to strengthen the powers of the European Parliament. On these subjects the outcome of the Summit has left us in suspense, even though the European Council has served the useful purpose of clearing the air.

However, I have a second preliminary comment to make on this Summit, and that is that, in my view, it is difficult to take stock of it without first stressing that it was a quite unusual example of its type. For once there has been a Summit at which money was not the focus of attention, no doubt because Europe had managed, between Fontainebleau and Milan, to leave its antagonisms and internal quarrels behind it and settle the main issues which had been blocking all progress for too long. It would in fact have been almost surrealistic to have been holding discussions on Europe's future if no solutions had been found to the problems of enlargement, the need to increase own resources, or the integrated Mediterranean programmes. The fact is that this entire Summit revolved around a single question: towards what kind of Europe do we wish to make progress? If called upon to encapsulate in a few words the spirit and approach brought to this occasion by the Heads of State or Government and the initiatives from various quarters, including the Italian Presidency of course, but also France, Germany and the United Kingdom, I would describe this Summit as one whose objective was the affirmation of Europe's identity. It is for this reason that I, for my part, see this Summit in terms of three essential dimensions, and these will form the basis of what I have to say.

The first of these relates to political Europe. The Milan Summit was the occasion when notice was given officially of the Member States' will to progress to a new stage in the construction of a Europe initially conceived as a primarily economic Community. In an increasingly troubled international environment, the Community has demonstrated its ability to speak with a single voice on the political scene — on Afghanistan, on Cambodia, on southern Africa, on the Middle East, and even more recently on Central America.

With regional crises breaking out in various parts of the world, with the United States and the USSR con-

Jospin

ducting campaigns to extend their spheres of influence, we believe that Europe must continue to evolve methods of making its voice heard more clearly. It can propose its own solutions to the major international problems, it can offer its own model for economic and social development, its own form of civilization, it can begin — without any diminution in loyalty to its alliances — to show that, while it stands between the two superpowers, the question of its security is to be determined by its own resources and must conform with its own interests and thinking.

The forms and practicalities of such political cooperation are under discussion, it is true: additions to the Treaty of Rome, new treaties which only those States wishing to embark upon such a course would sign. The Presidency and the Commission now have the task, over the coming months, of defining the lines along which such cooperation could be developed, in consultation with all those willing to take part. At all events, the Milan Summit has provided an opportunity to clarify the position, and that was absolutely essential. In the past few years there has been a succession of speeches, plans and declarations of intent proposing a variety of formulas for strengthening political Europe, but there has never been the real will to carry these proposals through. In addressing itself to this question at Milan, Europe was no longer content to settle for speeches and vague promises; a vote was taken, and in democratic societies this remains the best way to reach a decision. In this vote, a majority of the States clearly expressed their resolve to leave declarations of intent behind them and to hold an intergovernmental conference in the near future at which their common will can be formulated in concrete terms. A choice has now been made by a majority of States, and the fact that it has been affirmed unambiguously is to be welcomed.

The vote by the European Council does not close any debates, nor does it preclude any prospects. On the contrary, in my view, it opens up scope for Europe to pursue new ambitions to which the Twelve can commit themselves.

The second dimension of the Summit is represented by technological Europe. The Community has been concerned to demonstrate its ability to meet the technological and scientific challenges of the day, and to create the most appropriate structures for this purpose. The status of economic subcontractor does not make for political independence. Without concerted action, without common strategies to develop the scientific and industrial potential of the Community, all efforts to achieve greater political unity will be in vain.

In this connection, the support given unreservedly by the European Council for the Eureka project presented by France represents a real step forward towards technological independence for the Community.

The Eureka project, the Commission's proposals, and the Esprit and Race programmes are all positive responses to this problem. The movement is now under way. On 17 and 18 July the Ministers of the Twelve responsible for foreign affairs and research, perhaps with their counterparts from other European countries, will be setting to work on this theme at a meeting in Paris.

The third and last dimension of the Summit: citizens' Europe. The citizens of Europe must be able to recognize the Community, to be aware of it as the background to their daily lives. Europe must have a real existence for these 320 million men and women who must be able to come into contact with Europe, to judge for themselves the advantages of the Community dimension in their everyday pursuits, whether they be in the field of culture, education, sport or civic life. Here, the European Council's wish to see implementation of the proposals submitted by the Committee on a People's Europe must be realized without delay. Faced by these various challenges, Europe has set dates for a number of meetings in the near future. These will either bring significant progress in their respective fields or they will be so many missed opportunities, depending on the attitudes adopted by the Member States.

For the *ad hoc* committee on Eureka, we can hope for positive results. For the Foreign Affairs Council, agreement now seems possible and we want to believe that it will bring a strengthening of Parliament's powers. Finally, for the intergovernmental conference, I think it best for us to be fairly prudent in our expectations at this stage.

At all events, with these meetings in the offing, a number of principles should be restated. Institutional reform is not an end in itself but should be the instrument of a political will, providing the means with which to achieve the aims that we have set ourselves. There must be no artificial separation of our complementary policy objectives: technological development and commercial policy, economic efficiency and social justice, creation of the large internal market and concerted action by the Member States to combat unemployment. Europe must forget no-one. Industry and commerce, scientific institutes and Member States must enjoy freedom to carry out their projects, as long as they comply with the rules of the Community and its institutions.

I conclude, Mr President, by saying that the Milan Summit has received a muted response, it has to be admitted, from many observers and, to judge from the speech made this morning by the President of the Commission, some of those taking part have similar feelings about it. One can understand why. This was not a Summit Meeting of enthusiasm at which obstacles were swept aside. But important decisions were taken and everyone's intentions were made clear. Not everything about it was for the good, nothing was

Jospin

decisively settled for the future, but at least there were discussions on the real issues, on questions of great importance to the future of Europe. On this occasion the topics brought before the Heads of State or Government were the sort of thing which really should be discussed at this level. That gives grounds for optimism, which I find a suitable note on which to end.

(Applause)

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Milan has been described as the moment of truth, and I think this is correct. The next six months will show us more of the truth which must predominate in the European Community.

Let me begin with a few words of thanks and congratulations. Thank you first of all to prime minister Senter for his statement, for telling us of his intentions and giving us his report. We wish him and his government every success in the difficult task which lies before them in the coming six months. We are convinced you will do your best, for we know you as a member of this House, and we know you to be a dedicated European.

A word of thanks too to the Italian presidency which, as we have acknowledged in this House on many occasions, has made great efforts towards advancing European Union. We also thank the governments which have firmly endorsed our desire to increase the powers of the European Parliament and thus close the democratic loophole which exists in this Community. But particularly warm thanks are due to someone who shares our own perception of his responsibilities, namely the Commission President, Mr Delors . . .

(Applause)

. . . who seeks to preserve and further guide the Community as a whole along the lines and in the spirit of the Treaties. All of you whom I have thanked know that my Group will continue to support you in the next six months.

To give a brief assessment of the Milan summit: we consider that Milan signals a new phase of Community politics. There is no doubt that we would have wished for a clearer mandate for the intergovernmental conference than we in fact got. But on the other hand we concede that Milan revealed a determination to take decisions, and what this Community urgently needs is decisions. We may not agree with all of them, but without them the Community is likely to wither and die.

Following the Milan summit we need first of all to consider the question of the intergovernmental conference. We should like to see this prepared by people personally delegated by the heads of government and not in a routine preliminary meeting of Coreper. Not

that I wish to belittle the capabilities of the officials in Coreper, but they are up to their eyes in routine. We should like to see the meeting prepared by men who are particularly close to the heads of government.

We hope that Spain and Portugal, whose accession — as the Milan summit also made clear — constitutes a truly gratifying enrichment of the Community, will also take part in these consultations and that the Commission will play an important part in them. We also hope that the President of the European Parliament will also be appropriately involved.

I speak on behalf of a group which knows that six of the seven governments which took this decision and stand by it are firmly supported by our member parties. We thank them and are glad that together with France they are resolved to embark on the road to progress for the European Community. We hope that all twelve will follow this road together, but we cannot deny that we are a little tired of waiting for the slowest vehicle in the convoy, especially when its driver keeps claiming that she is not quite sure which way to go, whether the opposite direction is not perhaps the right one. Anyway we want this intergovernmental conference to prepare decisions for the summit which can enable the Community to advance.

Which, then, are the points which we should like to see finally solved? Firstly there is the Community's decision-making process. Many sensible things have been said today on the subject, and I can only agree with all those who have spoken on the matter. For us there are three points which count. We want a return to the majority voting provided for in the Treaties. We want to see the introduction of the necessary additional majority decisions which the Commission's programme for the internal market will require, and we would also think it a good thing to regulate the use of the 'vital interest' veto in such a way that it can only be used in very rare circumstances, publicly justified and vetted.

Secondly, and this demand is most fitting, we must point to the need to close further the democratic loophole which still exists in the Community, for although we are a community of democracies we are in many respects not as democratically structured as we might be. The first need here is to strengthen the powers of the European Parliament. We must not cease to work for Parliament's right of co-determination; we are prepared to discuss a better consultation procedure and above all the powers lost by the national parliaments must not be allowed to vanish in that grey zone which President Delors so pithily described this morning. And so my Group believes that the determination to obtain more powers for the European Parliament is synonymous with more efficiency on the part of the Community. For no one to date can accuse this House of not fulfilling its role with great expertise and a great sense of responsibility. One only needs to study Parlia-

Klepsch

ment's opinions and pronouncements on the proposals which have been submitted.

When we talk of struggling against bureaucracy you should not, President Delors, make the mistake of thinking that we mean only the Commission bureaucracy. We both know that the most ponderous bureaucracy in this Community lies in the grey zone you have defined. And whilst all these people are doing their job most adequately, they see it differently from the way in which the spirit of the Treaty requires.

What exactly do we want to see settled? We want to have the plans for the internal market made reality, and I can only endorse what the Commission has said. On no account can we agree to everyone picking out those bits of the package which are particularly to his liking. This would not be doing the Community a favour. The whole thing needs to be pushed through. Whatever is of benefit to the Community as a whole must be realized, even though it may work to the advantage or even disadvantage of an individual country. In addition, if we do not wish to lose out in this world in matters of science, research, technology, environmental protection — in short everything which President Delors has today called the technological community — we must be given the necessary powers. Quite simply we need to have them. The Community abounds in valuable studies which substantiate this, and I can only endorse their conclusions, but so far there have been no actions towards this end.

Let me add a further point: we need to expand political cooperation into a joint foreign policy comprising security aspects also. Otherwise we risk being dismissed as a community of traders concerned only with economic advantage but not with the overall interests of the people living in that community.

Where the environment is concerned no trade policy is enough, however skilled it may be. We hope, therefore, that the people's Europe will receive more than the excellent written basis provided by the Adonnino report, and that concrete measures will also be taken. We should also like to see greater emphasis on the cultural approach.

But in anticipating such developments we know that there are several possibilities of which we must all be aware. We need additions and amendments to the Treaties on an appropriate scale. I leave it to the wisdom of the intergovernmental conference to decide what it thinks the appropriate scale is. But it is clear to us that agreements can also be reached under the Treaty as it stands. And we must make full use of the fact. We think that interinstitutional agreements between the various organs of the Community are feasible even without amending the Treaty and should be covered in our discussions.

As I said at the start, the moment of truth has arrived. As I and my Group see it the moment of truth begins

with the question: who will bring the Treaties of Rome to the climax heralded by so many summits? The question is addressed to all the Member States and all political bodies in the Community. There is no doubt as to our objective. We want to create the united states of Europe within the foreseeable future. The foreseeable future is a very elastic period of time. But we are clear about one thing: throughout the world we are regarded as the model of a successful association of free members who have managed to preserve peace for forty years.

What we need for the future too is an order rooted in freedom and human dignity, economic capability, social justice and solidarity. This can be achieved under the Community umbrella. There have been a number of institutional or bilateral government initiatives taken outside the Community aimed at securing the unity of Europe.

My Group would like to see everything done beneath the Community umbrella. It is convinced that we Europeans must guard this umbrella and do our best to bring the European Community to fulfilment of the objective which underlies the Treaties.

(Applause)

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — I, too, would like to thank the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission for their excellent speeches which encouraged us all. All of our group welcome wholeheartedly the adoption by the Milan Summit of the major proposals made by the Commission in the Cockfield package for the total opening up of the internal Community market to exchanges of goods and services. This reflects the recommendations of the Ball and Albert report, the Herman report of the last Parliament and the manifesto on which our group and our party fought the last elections.

We are happy, of course, that the bulk of the work has been done by a British Commissioner, Lord Cockfield, and it is our view that the quickest and the most effective and lasting way of getting our unemployed back to work, reducing the enormous government spending on unemployment and finding the money needed for investment in new products is to remove all the barriers between willing buyers and willing sellers in a market of 320 million people. The alternative of growth through deficit financing funded by public borrowing is totally inadequate, both in experience and in theory, to create the number of jobs needed and will not last. That is the experience of the Americans, who took that route; even with America's colossal borrowing, on which they are now paying 180 billion a year in interest, their growth is at an end. This was the clear view that we found on the recent visit of a delegation to the United States Congress, with unemployment stuck at 7% despite the growth they have had.

Catherwood

So the Cockfield package is the centrepiece of our policy for expansion. It is incomparably better than any alternative. Failure to achieve a truly common market would be a disaster for the economic and social structure of every Member State and would put enormous pressures on our social system. But, given the strong and extensive sectoral vested interests, it is most unlikely that it could go through the Council without majority voting, whereas under Article 100 the Treaty currently requires unanimity and not majority.

There is a strong view in both Britain and Denmark, reflected by a minority in our group, that Treaty amendments are better left on one side, at least until the economic dynamism of the Community is a good deal clearer than it has been in the 12 years since our countries became members. But the problem, as the majority of us see it, is that the policy we all agree will give our market the economic dynamism that we need depends at the very least on the alteration of Article 100. Otherwise, our feeling is that all of the proposals will take years and years, as each of them is opposed by whatever sectoral interest has something to gain by opposing that programme. Of course we have agreed with our governments that if there is any way of getting ahead with the Cockfield package without the delay needed for the ratification of a Treaty change by national parliaments, that of course would save a lot of time. But the majority at Milan clearly felt that a Treaty change had to be considered, and that option now looks most unlikely.

So on that issue I don't think there is all that much difference between the group and our governments or between the majority and minority within the group. We all want the Cockfield package to succeed and we all want to find a way to avoid its being held back by the thousand silken strands of vested interests. It is a question really of the best way to do it.

On the institutional proposals there are deeper differences, which is why we had a free vote on the Croux report and why we are to have a free vote on today's Spinelli resolution on Milan. The Croux report showed that there was a majority of our group in favour, and I personally speak for that majority. But there are good reasons why we respect the position of our minority. The two countries in our group are the oldest in the Community with — partly because of geography, partly by good fortune — an unbroken succession of 1 100 years for the Danes and 900 years for the British. So we both have very deep roots and strongly embedded social structures. Neither the Folketing nor the House of Commons is limited by any elected upper house, and the House of Commons is not limited by a written constitution or a Supreme Court to interpret it or by the minority parties produced by proportional voting. We can well understand the anxieties of those in the Folketing and the Commons who are deeply suspicious of any encroachment on their sovereignty. So no British or Danish Govern-

ment would wish to arouse their suspicions without the most compelling reasons. We have the greatest sympathy with those in our group who reflect those feelings. The majority of our group are just as anxious to safeguard the vital national interests of our two countries, but it is a question of what those vital national interests are and how they are best served.

It is my personal view that the vital interests of Britain — and my Danish colleague will speak for Denmark — are best served by being part of a Community that is powerful enough to protect our really vital common interests in a rough world because it has an effective decision-making process. If we do not have an effective decision-making process, we will in the end become client States of a superpower. We will each of us rank a long way behind the Japanese in our influence in international affairs. If we do not have an effective European treaty which obliges us to take decisions when they are needed, then our rate of unemployment will continue to rise, our welfare services will continue to decline, the strains on our democratic way of life will produce even worse social tensions than we have now and the consensus needed for democracy will fail.

So most of us very much welcome what we have here. We think that Milan is a major step towards economic recovery and that it is a long step on the way towards establishing the decision-making process needed to safeguard all our vital interests — economic, social and political.

(Applause)

Mr Cervetti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Italian Communists support the motion for a resolution put forward by the Committee on Institutional Affairs and outlined this morning by Mr Spinelli, and will vote in favour of it. They will do this not only because they share the view which it expresses of the Milan Summit, both as to its successes and its limitations, but also because, by adopting the motion and showing that it looks to the future, Parliament can once more show the way out of the crisis in the building of Europe, and towards European Union.

To make our intentions clear, with even greater force, we have furthermore presented, Mr President-of-the-Council, a motion for a resolution on your statement, in which we link the fundamental institutional work of a 'constituent' character to the concrete programmes for the implementation of a technological Europe, a real internal market, and effective political co-operation. It is another way of looking ahead; and today there is a real need for commitment and, before that, even, a clear indication of the road to take.

It is quite true: at Milan the crisis in the building of the Community did not turn into paralysis, as was possible, and indeed was feared. Instead, for the first time

Cervetti

in the summits of recent years a halt was called to the precipitation of crises and, with the calling of the intergovernmental conference — albeit in an inadequate, unsatisfactory form — new possibilities were opened up for confrontation, conflict, and political battle for the European ideal.

And there we have the results and, at the same time, the limitations of the Milan Summit: a new battleground has been opened up, the real stakes are disclosed, the points of resistance have been made clearer, but the path to take has not yet been clearly shown. The difficulties remain, as the President of the Commission, Jacques Delors, rightly said this morning — adding that, whilst we must not be pessimistic, nor can we load ourselves with illusions — and as the secretary of the French socialist party, Lionel Jospin, reminded us a short time ago. That is why it is impossible for us to express a feeling of satisfaction, and why it is necessary, instead, to make clear our commitment, with more determination than before. We have, in fact, above all else, to look ahead, to define clearly the objectives that have to be pursued, the means to achieve those objectives, and the forces to be mobilized.

But before speaking about that, ladies and gentlemen, may I be allowed to say, briefly, something further about the European Council in Milan, and about the Italian presidency.

With regard to the latter, our verdict is not an adverse one, and the fact that, in Italy, we are an opposition party does not prevent us from saying as much. We see, in fact, the positive results of the Italian six-month's term of office — such as the accession of Spain and Portugal, which is important — not forgetting however the hesitations and failures — as, for example, in the field of agricultural policy. But, as I said before, the verdict is not negative. Rather, we consider there was one serious deficiency, because of which the Italian presidency did not release all the energy that it could have done and needed to do.

It is a fact that, in Italy, all the large political and social bodies openly support the European ideal. We have launched a proposal and a challenge: why, on the great question of Europe — as on all great international matters — do we not come to a real, productive agreement and take up a position of national unity that transcends party differences in the majority or the opposition? That would give our country much more strength, prestige and authority. For this reason, where this point is concerned we shall continue to make that challenge and to criticize and pressurize the government and the other democratic political parties. We are doing this and shall continue to do so, in the interests of Italy and Europe.

With regard to the European Council, may I just say how apparent it was that all the obstacles and aversions to European Union come primarily from the

Conservative side. Mrs Thatcher is the personification of this, but Mr Kohl is not far behind. True, there is resistance also from other quarters, but Mr Papan-dreou — let us say this quite openly — for his part is concerned with the need to correct the present great regional imbalances and the North-South relationship of the continent.

The 'conservative' obstacles, on the other hand, are more substantial because they are raised by bodies of political opinion that are totally opposed to any idea of 'supranational solidarity' — without which, obviously, it is impossible to make any real progress with the work of constructing the Union.

This is the point, and this — which is what we want to emphasize — is what all the progressive forces in Europe must fully understand, so as to organize their commitment and make them constitute the essential part of a broad democratic alliance.

And now let us come to this commitment, today and in the next few months. At the end of your statement, Mr President-of-the-Council, you said you hoped for the support of the Parliament. You can be sure of it. But you will have it — at least that is our intention — in order to make progress without delay along the road to achieving the following objectives: firstly, the success of the intergovernmental conference has to be ensured. To do this, a number of precise conditions are essential: the instrumental diatribe on the so-called improvement of the decision-making process, which is used to oppose the drawing up of a new draft treaty, must be abandoned; the latter is the principal requirement for the construction of the Union and it was moreover indicated by the European Parliament and adopted in substance by the Dooge committee. Then, without excluding anyone, and indeed whilst working to convince and include everyone, there must be no giving way to blackmail, from whichever quarter it comes. Also, there must be one conference and one alone, and the idea of creating cumbersome new structures, such as the secretariat, must be abandoned. Finally, the institutional system set up by the Union must busy itself with the work of solving great, acute economic, social and political problems.

And here we come to the second set of objectives: economic recovery and development. We have talked times without number about the internal market and technological Europe. These objectives are inescapable. But if, for example, we insist on a realistic, concrete plan for employment — particularly youth employment — and on the reform of the monetary system, so as to make the ECU an authentic currency, and on giving Eureka a Community dimension, and on rejecting American space projects, it is not so as to add on one problem after another. It is because this is the only way to make the market a credible economic reality, and technological Europe an instrument to compete as well as to collaborate with others, rejecting any subordination.

Cervetti

The third type of objective concerns the building up of international relations in many areas. It has to be acknowledged that, in recent months, Europe and some particularly aware countries have acted in the right direction, but today, standing still or taking only tiny steps in the right direction is no longer sufficient.

That is why I am concerned that, in your speech this morning, Mr President of the Council, you made no mention of Latin America, Central America and the planned so-called second S. José di Costa Rica conference. And what is the meaning of the references in purely general terms to a commitment in the fight against hunger in the world? Or the absence, in Milan of any speech on burning international questions such as the Middle East or — again at Milan — the lack of any political initiative in response to the Comecon countries, and, instead, a mere request to the Commission to sound out intentions?

This is not the way to strengthen political co-operation, nor, especially, to give our Community prestige and authority. Something else is necessary. We have to make a move with our own proposals and policies, which can be summed up in the following formula: alliance with our allies, friendship with the other European powers, and co-operation with everyone, particularly the Third World — but, make a move we must. This is moreover the only way we can start to tackle, in the correct manner, the broader questions and responsibilities of security and defence, and make the necessary contribution to détente, disarmament and peace.

I do not know whether, by outlining purposes and commitments, I have succeeded in explaining also the more general concept that guides us, the aim of which is increasingly to commit this Parliament and its progressive members — as well as the vast alliance between the workers' movement and the democratic supporters of the European ideal — to the battle for the unity and independence of Europe, and for the coherent affirmation of the principles of freedom and human rights and the values of solidarity. I do not know even whether I have made clear our political conviction that, in order to progress towards Union, a transition is necessary from the Europe of individual governments to the Europe of democratic institutions, democracies, and the democratization of every single process. I hope at least to have clarified the aims for which we are fighting today, and to have shown our readiness for any useful convergence of views, as well as our determination and tenacity in the achievement of these aims.

(Applause from the benches of the Communist Group)

President. — At this point I should like to announce that I have received eight motions for resolutions¹

¹ See Minutes.

concerning the statements by the Council and the Commission on the Milan Summit. We shall vote on these at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

Mr Nord (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, the smoke that rose over the events at the European summit meeting in Milan has not yet completely cleared. On the one hand, we have those who like to talk about another defeat for Europe, on the other, those who see the summit as a step in the right direction in that the essential issues, the nature and future of our Community, were at last discussed. According to decisions that had been taken beforehand, the European Council meeting in Milan was to have concentrated on the institutional reforms needed to prevent a further decline in Europe's position in the world. Who dares to claim that the preparations were not adequate? The problem itself is as old as the Community and has become progressively more acute as more and more Member States have joined.

The last Parliament spent three years debating publicly what should be done, and this led to the draft Treaty on the European Union, which we adopted in early 1984. The heads of government reacted to this by setting up the Dooge Committee, which after nine months of study and discussion made a number of recommendations that bear a great deal of similarity to Parliament's proposals and were to be the focus of the discussion. The time seemed right, since major proposals had been made for the completion of the internal market and for a joint approach in the field of technology: the Commission's white paper and the Eureka project. These initiatives should have top priority. But we know from bitter experience that nothing more will be done, that they will remain paper projects unless the reforms that can restore real vigour to the Community again are carried out. And for these reforms new Treaty provisions are needed.

In Milan it unfortunately, but not unexpectedly, emerged that not all the Member States share this conviction. There are still some that seem to believe that the *liberum veto* of the old Polish diet is the best form of decision-making in Europe. But it also emerged in Milan — and we see this as the positive side — that seven Member States plus the two countries that will be joining us in January were not prepared to listen again to the sirens singing the old song that everything was really going very well and nothing special needed to be done. We are grateful for this and very much endorse their views.

The forthcoming intergovernmental conference will show where agreement can be reached. We must make it clear here that we no longer accept the tyranny of the slowest. Only if that is made perfectly clear, is there still a chance that a general consensus will be reached. In some quarters we are accused of excessive rhetoric and hypocrisy. But who — I should like to ask — is in fact guilty of rhetoric and hypocrisy? Is it

Nord

not those who hold fine speeches about a single market, about political cooperation and a joint approach to security problems, only to reject all the measures that need to be taken if what they too claim to want is to be achieved?

Mr President, Europe will have another great chance in the coming months. EPC, security problems, technology and the integrated domestic market can turn the tide in Europe's favour. Institutional reform is indissolubly linked to this and must therefore occupy an important place in a package of this kind. This is the message that must go out to the governments from this Parliament today. This is the message contained in the resolution before us. My group will therefore vote for this resolution.

(Applause)

(Mr de la Malène asked for the floor)

President. — Mr de la Malène, Mr Plaskovitis is to take the Chair at 4 p.m. and therefore I am calling him now to speak.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, as in the past we were allowed an opportunity to express our views on the Spinelli report by the Committee for Institutional Affairs concerning European Union, so also today we Greek Socialists of Pasok declare that we are not opposed to the idea of European Union. What concerns us, however, is what sort of European Union are we talking about? On the Committee for Institutional Affairs, on the Dooge Committee, and at the Milan Summit Conference, according to our information, a number of views received support concerning political cooperation, a common foreign policy, the defence policy, the matter of unanimity when the Council of Ministers is to adopt a decision, and the matter of the internal market due to begin functioning in 1992.

However, Mr President, it is plain to see that unless there is some balance in the economic and social development of all the Member States of the Community, and unless we agree in advance what the common foreign policy is to be, the strongest and largest countries in the Community will be those that will in essence be able to impose their own policy, without any means for the weakest countries to defend the specific and vital interests of their peoples.

More specifically so far as Greece is concerned, Greece is the only Member State of the Community which, unfortunately, is in dispute over the sovereignty of part of her territory, and this indeed against a neighbouring country with a far greater population, and which, as a member of NATO, is an ally. Greece is also a country which has sustained and bears to this day a grave injustice against a section of the Greek

nation, namely the Greek Cypriots. 37% of the territory of Cyprus is occupied by the troops of a foreign power, and still no solution to that problem is evident. So how can my country commit itself in advance to any foreign policy when nothing is forthcoming from the European Community towards a solution of those two most serious and outstanding problems, which concern vital Hellenistic interests? And how can we abandon the principle of unanimity when matters of such a kind and scale remain outstanding? Also, how can the internal market be accepted unreservedly before some convergence of the economies has been secured and achieved? We could certainly accept a more reasonable application of the principle of unanimity, but we have all seen recently that even the German Government used its veto in connection with the price of wheat. With the Spinelli report, we have arrived at the point of being asked to accept formally the creation of a two-rate Europe in the name of European Union, and a repeal of the Treaties of Rome with the creation of a new treaty. We are totally opposed to such solutions, which essentially lead not to progress, but to a backsliding of the Community to its early stages. We believe that during the intergovernmental conference there could be some more attentive and understanding discussion of these matters leading to recognition that neither breaking away, nor the imposition of *faits accomplis* by the stronger Members are likely to lead to a better and more effective Europe. Consequently, we will vote against the Spinelli resolution because it goes against all that we have said. We shall vote in favour of the resolution by the Socialist Group when the time comes, together with the two amendments we tabled to paragraphs 6 and 18, and we are also inclined to accept the joint Arndt and Dido resolution.

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, I am very sorry to begin my speech with a protest about your way of handling proceedings.

(Mixed reactions)

It gives me no pleasure to do so, since you are a good friend. I find it most disagreeable to be told at the last minute that someone else is going to speak before me, when my name has been posted. You perhaps had good reasons for this, but I have to say that I do not care for this way of doing things.

This said, Mr President, I now turn to the much more agreeable business of discussing the topic of our debate. I should like to begin with a brief comment on the procedural aspect. At this Milan European Council we were treated not only to a completely superfluous dramatization of the event but to equally superfluous tactical convolutions — this assessment comes not from me but from the journalists covering the meeting. Two procedural superfluities: dramatization and tactical convolution. I do not wish to dwell on the procedure, however, and turn now to the substance.

de la Malène

Three subjects were discussed in Milan, if my understanding of what has been said by the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission is correct. In broad terms, these were the internal market, technological Europe, and the institutions.

With regard to the internal market, we are pleased that the governments should have symbolically doffed their hats in its direction. We support the initiatives taken by the Commission in this area. We are simply disappointed that the Council did not give more time and thought to putting stronger emphasis, in its procedures and its timetable, on the establishment of this internal market, which we too consider essential.

The next topic was technological Europe. Once again, we are of course in favour of this, but I am afraid, Mr President of the Commission, that there is a point on which we do not see eye to eye. Mr Delors had told us that this technological Europe should be bounded by Community Europe — these were not his actual words, but I take this as his meaning. I for my part say that, on the contrary, we should not allow ourselves to be unduly constrained by Community Europe. And my position on this is closer than his to that of the French Government; I am not making any reference here to domestic politics. I consider it desirable, in the interests of progress in the development of technological Europe, to have great flexibility. He has referred to the Esprit programme and, without intending any pun, I could mention Ispra. While Esprit is perhaps a success, I am not convinced that Ispra has been all that successful. But this is not the full extent of our disagreement on what the President of the Council has called the indispensable Community reference. I am quite happy that there should be this Community reference, but I should still like to be told exactly what it means. If it is to make progress, Eureka must not be confined within an unduly narrow framework; if it is to make progress, it must not be restricted to a framework which is too rigid for the provision of the necessary finance without being governed by the unanimity rule which you are trying to get relaxed in other areas; as yet, incidentally, no progress has been made on the arrangements for finance. I believe that Eureka, which is becoming synonymous with technological Europe, should be given every chance of success, which means that it must have the necessary flexibility, but, apart from this disagreement on the importance of the Community reference, we are gratified by the Milan Council's ability, in a short space of time, to give a favourable decision on technological Europe.

The whole of the rest of this Council was given over to institutional problems, however. I do not regret this, I do not criticize, even though it would have been preferable in my view if more time and closer attention had been given to the internal market and technological Europe, because these are fields in which it is essential to make progress. Why? Mr Delors has said that the institutional problem cannot be circumvented.

I am not sure of that; I would prefer to say that it is a crucial problem. Saying that it cannot be circumvented is like saying that it would be better if it could be avoided, but it cannot. My own position is that it must not be avoided but must be faced head on in an effort to find a solution. Why? Because of what we have seen since the first, the second and now the third enlargement, which has been a continuous and constant drift, gathering pace from one European Council to the next, away from the original Community idea, based on financial solidarity and transfers of economic resources. That was the original idea, and we are gradually, imperceptibly but surely, although without acknowledging it, moving towards a different formula, a different conception, that of a large group, with somewhat permeable internal frontiers, but frontiers nevertheless. We hope that you will get rid of them; we are not sure that you will, but we hope so, and we will help you. And in this large group, with twelve members now, little remains of the original solidarity, financial solidarity in particular, little remains of the transfer of economic resources. It is a large group, and as such has its merits. This large group will have certain agencies, concerned with technology among other matters. So be it. But what are the implications of this conception? Without solidarity, we can be confident that the peripheral regions are going to suffer, that regional Europe is dead, that transfers are at an end! We can also be confident that the agricultural policy, which was an instrument of solidarity, of the transfer of economic resources, is tending to be downgraded — witness your budget for 1986! Under your budget for 1986 the funds allocated to this common agricultural policy — which was a policy for the transfer of economic resources — are to be increased by 2.5%, including inflation. In other words it is being eroded, as is the regional policy, and we are making a transition from this first notion to a different notion, which it has its virtues but not the same virtues as those of the first. This is why I should have liked the opportunity offered by this enlargement, this *last* enlargement, to have been taken to make a thorough reappraisal of this fundamental problem of the direction to be taken by Europe in future.

You said to us this morning that there were four schools of thought. At the time of enlargement, instead of spending one, two or three years negotiating over fisheries or whatever, due consideration should have been given to the substantive problems rather than adjusting the Europe of the Six to the Europe of the Nine, and the Europe of the Nine to the Europe of the Twelve!

That way cannot work, as we shall see. An overall view should have been taken and mature consideration given to this trend. Perhaps there was no alternative, but then the appropriate inferences should be drawn; if there is no alternative, the fact may be regrettable, but no useful purpose is served by regretting it. It serves no purpose to regret Europe with the United Kingdom if the United Kingdom is becoming part of

de la Malène

Europe anyway. It has to be made to work, even if one is unhappy about it. This is what was not done at the time of enlargement, and it is because of that and because this trend is pursuing its course that we are sorry that there has not been a proper review of the institutions which would have provided a basis for tackling this essential problem. In the event, what was done? Recourse was had to Article 236. The burden of what was said is this: we are going to take a majority decision now so that we can take a unanimous one later.

Allow me to express a modicum of scepticism when I hear it said how wonderful and marvellous it is that a majority decision has been taken, that it has been decided on a majority vote that the next stage will be a unanimous vote!

I am more than ready to believe in miracles, but I still find it hard to believe that this majority will be transformed into unanimous agreement during the course of the summer. If this actually is what is going to happen, I welcome it in anticipation, I shall be delighted to have been proved wrong. No-one will be more delighted.

There was also talk — subdued talk — of a two-speed Europe. We are against this. We are in favour of a two-speed Europe in such areas as technology, we are in favour of a two-speed Europe in any area of minor importance, but we are against a two-speed Europe when it comes to fundamental political problems. We do not believe in the possibility of developing a united, cohesive political Europe and, alongside it, a Community of Twelve pursuing economic objects and at the same time having political aspirations. That is a chimera; we are against such a two-speed Europe because we do not find it believable. This is not a philosophical stance, far from it. It is just that we do not accept that it is workable.

Finally, we are also against a truncated Europe, this being a point which I should perhaps address to Mr Spinelli. We do not believe that one or other Member State can be backed into a corner and told: if you do not like the way things are, withdraw. That too is a chimera, just as much as a two-speed Europe. We must not let ourselves be carried away by flights of fancy.

We are not in favour of confrontations within the Europe of Twelve, which would serve no purpose, other than to produce deadlock. If you believe that you have only to confront such and such a Member State with its responsibilities for it to withdraw, you are mistaken. No, it will stay, and your system will be brought to a standstill. What benefit will come from that?

You wanted — we wanted — to create the Europe of Six. Good. Then came the Europe of Nine. Good, the process continues. Problems. Since then the member-

ship has risen to ten, and now twelve. But we are not going to reverse the process. Do not think that we are going to come down from twelve to ten, and then from ten to nine, and from nine to six or seven or five: that is a chimera. Admittedly, it is attractive to think along these lines, the idea that 'those who are unhappy have only to withdraw' is appealing, but it is unrealistic because that is not what would happen if someone chose to take this course. We must live with the Europe of the European peoples and the Europe of the European governments as it is. We may not like it. It would be easier to walk away proclaiming such and such an ideological attitude. That would be easier. But we have to be practical.

We really do not expect a great deal. One cannot turn a majority into unanimity. We are in favour of cooperation. If progress can be made, that is all to the good as far as we are concerned. The President of the Commission is a little concerned. We share that concern to a certain extent. Mr President, we are not in favour of European Councils which seem to have the sole object of endorsing the credentials for the governments taking part as 'good Europeans'.

It is apparently important, and we are delighted that it should be so, for our governments to have the reputation of being good Europeans. They attend meetings of the European Council to burnish their reputations, and come away telling us what good Europeans they have been.

In our view, Mr President, this attitude, this conception of the European Council, falls short of what is required, and, if it is to be continued, the European Council should work more effectively, with everyone pulling together, not tinkering with highflown theories but addressing themselves with determination to the practical problems, so as to bring the real progress for Europe which we all want to see.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS*Vice-President*

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — *(DA)* Mr President, I am afraid that we shall be unable to qualify for the 'Good Europeans' Diploma which has been mentioned. As you know, there has been a deep and longrunning conflict in Denmark between supporters and opponents of membership of the European Community since 1972. Since the Milan summit this problem has completely changed; the Community we knew is now no longer the same. We are faced with an entirely new historical question: where do we stand on the question

Hammerich

of this Central European Union, which seems inevitable, and what will be our relationship with it?

The appallingly authoritarian methods of the Milan conference have shown clearly what awaits us: the Franco-German proposal at the last minute without any opportunity for discussion in the Market Committee, discussions behind the backs of the small countries, the forced vote on an intergovernmental conference to draw up plans for Union, Federal Chancellor Kohl's concluding remarks to the effect that the firm hand of those in favour of Union would force the waverers to give in.

It is patently obvious that Denmark cannot go along with a Union having a common foreign and security policy, a restricted right of veto and legislative power delegated to the European Parliament. Only 6% of Danes want such a Union. The people of course have the right to be consulted by a referendum when the timetable for Union has been worked out. It is also clear that Denmark cannot be thrown out of the Community against its will, even if a majority of countries force through a plan for Union. All treaties entered into will continue to apply in the future. But this is a unique opportunity for Denmark to evaluate and discuss its future relationship with the Union. A Government which faithfully honoured the resolution of the Folketing on the European Community would already be preparing the relations we should have with the Union, meeting the wishes of the population for closer Nordic cooperation and based on a form of association which would not consist of binding membership. In fact we want to determine for ourselves the implications of what some have called a multi-speed Europe or a Europe with variable geometry. We prefer to call it flexible forms of cooperation.

The Government must make an urgent and thorough examination of the conditions for a free trade agreement on industrial goods, which the Nordic countries have, and special agreements on agricultural and fishery products and access to the market. It must map out arrangements for the participation of research and industry in Community research projects on an *ad hoc* basis, as Norway and Sweden do, pursue intense diplomatic contacts with the Nordic Governments with a view to reactivating cooperation and prepare arrangements for voluntary cooperation with the Community case by case. In short: the Danish Government has two clear and elementary duties: to consult the people on the question of Union by means of a referendum and to make responsible preparations for the country's relations with the European Community and other countries when the people have voted 'no' to Union.

Mr Romualdi (DR). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are all in agreement — at least, those of us who genuinely want the political integration of Europe are — in our approval of what happened in

Milan; that is to say, the decision, albeit by a majority — it was not, unfortunately, a unanimous decision, as would have been desirable — to call an intergovernmental conference, and thus to take a step forward towards integration and European Union.

Naturally, that should be seen in the spirit of the documents that had already been adopted by the Parliament with a large majority, and that were moreover examined and adopted by the parliament in my country. All of this must obviously take place in full freedom for every one of us and every political party to judge, separately from the institutional question, the political character of this Community which, if it is to be — as we all hope — a great, true, free political union, must not only be able, with the necessary economic and financial resources, to meet the great technological and development challenges of the other great powers, but must also have, within the framework of its traditional, natural alliances, the determination and resources to guarantee its security and its defence, which is a necessary condition for it to be able to contribute, with appropriate, responsible measures and not just useless, mournful appeals, to the peace and freedom of the world. But, from what we heard this morning from the President-in-Office of the Council — loyal, honest statements, though perhaps a little over-hesitant and not entirely clear — and, above all, from what we heard from the President of the Commission, Mr Delors — who was irritated by many things that occurred in Milan and after the Milan Summit, and is very concerned at the situation that is developing — and, finally, after careful examination of the report of the Committee on Institutional Affairs — which has now been outlined by Mr Spinelli — that we are now debating and have to vote on, we have the feeling that, probably under the impression of doing exactly the opposite, the conditions are being created for a great deal of back-tracking.

Perhaps because, in this society in which crisis has every real value in its grip, we do not believe in the success of great leaps forward and valiant battles of ideas, or perhaps because the uphill climbs — even when they are long and difficult — frighten us less than the falls and disillusionments, which always cause delay when they are not downright fatal, the fact remains that, at this point, we should like to see greater commitment on the part of the presidency and at the same time greater clarity in regard to the terms of reference of the conference, the way it is to be called, its level and, particularly, the way in which the Parliament can actively participate, whether directly or indirectly, but in any event decisively. At the same time we should like our friends in the Committee on Institutional Affairs to give more thought to the dangers inherent in over-hasty anticipation — the dangers, for example, that might derive from the proposals in paragraphs 9 and especially 10 of the resolution, which we should have preferred to delete. If the Council of Ministers really proposes to adopt these measures and pass them on as a mandate to the conference, and if

Romualdi

the conference instead of disregarding them — as would perhaps be best — were really to implement them, we should have a strange institutional, political and practical situation: we should no longer have either a two-speed economic Community or a two-speed political Community, as someone observed, we should in fact have two Communities. One, that of the non-signatories — in their natural state, that is, without either purpose or direction, propelled only by the vested interests and concerns of its three or four members, or however many it might end up with — and the other, the Community of the Seven — if there should remain so many — quite unable to get anything done either at the political or the institutional level, since there could not be another institutional level until the new treaty had been approved by the governments and national parliaments, which would be a long, uncertain business.

And so, what is to be done? As regards the conference we are in agreement, as we have said before; and on the need for it to produce a fresh impetus towards Union, we are also in agreement. It is in this sense, but this sense only, that I and my colleagues of the Italian Right will be voting for the document. But the manner of implementing the draft — the fundamental lines of which, as far as we in the European Parliament are concerned, have already been set down in our oft-recalled draft of 1984 and made clear by the infinite statements made by our Parliament on the subject in recent years — and the procedures to be followed and the definition of tasks are matters that we think should best be left to the conference itself. Otherwise it will be to some extent superfluous, or it will be impossible for it — being blocked by the over-rigid clauses of its mandate — to do everything possible to repair, dutifully, the 'rent' that happened in Milan, which surely cannot augur well for the complete success of the initiative. Or else, we shall see the end of the Community of Twelve, because that is what the position would be, ladies and gentlemen, if we fail in the attempt to set up a new Community made up only of States that are firmly committed, up to the hilt, to achieving this.

The new Union must be a true union, a political union, without any institutional and political compromises, and with all that this implies politically and institutionally, as well as at the economic and the practical levels. And this is so in part because, honourable members of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, a real union can only be a political one — it cannot be a kind of 'Travellers's Rest', as the aforementioned paragraphs in the resolution might suggest, in which people come and people go, possibly to return again, depending on their own special needs or interests that are destined to change in accordance with the changing interests of the political policies in the various countries, by which they are determined.

Ladies and gentlemen, I thought it as well to say all this because I firmly believe in Europe's destiny, and whilst, as I said, I find slow, laborious uphill climbs,

like those that we have been engaged on for years, obviously disagreeable, they frighten me very much less than disillusionments and ruinous falls, from which it is difficult to get up again.

Mr Pannella (NI). — (FR) Mr President, Mr President of the Council, Mr President of the Commission, something strange is still going on in our Community, in our Parliament.

We are being accused, in judgmental tones, of indulging in utopian fantasies. That is as may be, but I still take the view that the saddest and most idiotic utopianism, which is completely devoid of any basis in common sense, is the belief that we can change anything whatsoever for the better by changing nothing at all, lest it be for the worse, and simply leaving things to rot. Because that is what it comes down to.

Today, the President of the Commission still managed to strike an optimistic note. I had the impression that he was once again hoping for the best when he made his appeal to the Europe of the Council, the Europe of our governments.

Mr President, I wish you every success. We would be delighted to see it. But what grounds do you have for expecting your voice to be heard in those quarters when you yourself have said that, in Milan, there was nothing to suggest that any attention was paid to the proposals which you made on behalf of the Commission? The no-utopian course, so to speak, the practical course, is to be found along the narrow, difficult path indicated by the motion for a resolution which we shall be adopting, I hope, in a few minutes. To the new Presidency we have to say that we expect much of Luxembourg, of its European spirit, and we call upon the Presidency of the Council to display, if only when replying to us, the idealism associated with Luxembourg's European tradition of which, I am sorry to have to say, we saw no sign in the speech that we heard from the President of the Council this morning. Luxembourg itself had nothing to say about the involvement of Parliament in the process which we are about to commence. It should have spoken out. Was this an oversight? If so, it was a dangerous oversight. It is my belief, then, that we must make it clear that we have had our fill of utopian proposals. We have had our fill of rhetoric. I believe that we must no longer give a hearing to those who say we did not want the Six, we did not want the Nine, we did not want the Ten, we do not want the Twelve, we do not want the Fourteen!

Perhaps we would like Europe to extend to the Urals. In the meantime, we cannot even muster the energy to build a European institution! We have a very simple message for our States: we have no faith in them. We represent these States, in so far as they are constituted by our peoples, just as much as our governments. It is therefore by virtue of being the elected representatives

Pannella

of our peoples, voted into office by the same people for whom the governments claim to speak, that we put this question to you: over the past twenty years, what have these States done about the challenge from Japan, from the United States, or even from the Soviet world? What has Europe done, Mr President of the Council, about the Third World? Just what did you do about this problem in Milan? The Commission, in the person of Commissioner Natali, failed to honour its obligations, because there was a specific resolution of which it did not breathe a word to the European Council. And the European Council once again ignored this aspect.

Mr President, I am reaching the end of my time, I fear. Let me just say that it really is time that everyone began to play their proper parts again. The utopians are those who have been telling us for the past twenty years that, without changing anything, without a European State, we can meet the technological challenge, the cultural challenge, the economic challenge, whatever history throws our way. Enough of this utopianism! Enough of these utopians! Enough of their customary pretence of realism which is so out of place! Let us set out upon the narrow path of realism proposed by Parliament, the only glimmer of hope that we have seen this year for institutional Europe, and therefore the only glimmer of hope that we shall transcend — in the positive sense of the world — our national States.

Mr Formigoni (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is difficult to express full satisfaction with what happened at the European Council in Milan. However, I think I can state that, in the crisis that is currently affecting the building of Europe and the functioning of its institutions, the Presidency of the European Council has courageously taken decisions in Milan that will certainly influence the development of the Community. I think that from this standpoint we in the European Parliament must thank the Presidency for what it has done in these six months, and for the decision which has marked their conclusion.

The fact that the decisions reached in Milan were taken by a majority may certainly be a source of dissatisfaction for some governments, but there is no doubt that the result of the decision must meet with the approval of those who, like ourselves, believe in the need to implement European Union.

The calling of an intergovernmental conference with a broad mandate is something that must call for immediate reflection and proposals on our part, even though we know that referring something to an international conference — and this we know by experience — is a very risky business. The fact remains, however, that for the first time in the history of the European Council, the majority has prevailed. Ladies and gentlemen, I should like to emphasize that in this

European Council in Milan there was perhaps one great absentee — the European Parliament — and it is above all on this question that we have to fight today, as in the past we fought for a modification of the Treaty that will allow our institutions to achieve the objectives that were originally laid down by the Treaty itself. We have to say forcibly today that we want the European Parliament to be clearly associated with the work of the intergovernmental conference. Excluding the European Parliament and limiting its role would mean that the European Council, locked in the Sforzas' stronghold in Milan, remained deaf and insensitive to the voices that were raised in the streets and squares of that city and that were urging the Heads of Member States to act, not in accordance with the dictates of the chancelleries of diplomacy but in accordance with the will of the people, which is the only will that counts in the building of Europe.

The Parliament must insist that the intergovernmental conference shall not degenerate into proposals merely for political collaboration between governments, which would be a step backward that would be politically fatal for the European Union that the peoples of Europe call for, and that the most enlightened statesmen of our countries have identified as being the only possibility for the salvation of our civilisation, our European culture and our best traditions.

The way it has been framed by the European Council may, however, cause the action by the Community to be fragmented into purely intergovernmental approaches, instead of producing true, united progress. I wish to emphasize clearly, adding my voice to those that have already been heard in this Chamber, that we are deeply opposed to this diminishment — which is what intergovernmental approaches constitutes — not least because we, the Parliament, have already indicated the proper road, the road to a further integration of our countries, and we have done this in the Draft Treaty which our Parliament approved in February last year, and which combines in one single plan all the different kinds of action that can be taken at European level.

We know that the overwhelming majority of the populations that we represent here are in favour of the political, economic and social integration, once and for all, of the countries that make up our Community. We have to consider the fact that these populations have not yet had a chance to express themselves directly in regard to the final political decisions involved in European integration.

We, the direct representatives, the elected representatives of all the citizens, must therefore consider whether at whatever is considered the most suitable time we ought not possibly to think of organizing a referendum in Europe, to ask our citizens to state their views, positively and directly on the final political, economic and social integration of Europe. A referendum, therefore, to decide in a clear and obvious man-

Formigoni

ner on the Union towards which our Parliament has been working for some time.

Ladies and gentlemen, brief as this speech must be, I should not like us to forget that it is political union that our continent needs; it is political union that our countries need for the very development of our civilisations and the full development of the cultural potential that is the heritage of our peoples; it is political union that we all need for our cultural and social future.

Our continent lives today in a strange condition of twofold subjection: on the one hand, our continent is still suffering from the division into two parts that the Yalta and Potsdam conferences imposed upon it — an unnatural division that we cannot accept as being final. Our continent is suffering from the presence of the Soviet empire, an empire in which whatever developments and changes occur are followed with us by interest, but which remains up till now an illiberal, tyrannous régime which, in many cases, has no respect for human rights and the rights of peoples. On the other hand, ladies and gentlemen, our continent — we must not hide the fact — is suffering from cultural subordination *vis-à-vis* the other great superpowers. We are indebted to the Americans for so many customs, so many ways of doing things. Technology and science are often imported from these countries. It is unthinkable that our young people should live and grow up in continuous cultural subordination of this kind.

The political union of Europe is therefore fundamental not only to the development of Europe as a 'third force' — which should in my view be rejected — but so as to allow Europe to grow as a great loadstar of freedom and culture — a great voice crying out for justice for the whole world.

In Europe, over the centuries, some of the greatest humanistic cultures have developed. If these cultures are not to perish, we must provide ourselves with single, independent political structures. Political union is necessary, just as it is necessary for at least some of the great countries in our continent to progress with decision along this road, giving the lead to other countries that, today, seem more reticent.

Mr President, I should not like to finish my speech without first of all mentioning, albeit briefly, some of the other subjects that were discussed by the European Council in Milan.

In the first place there is the question of political cooperation. I think we should congratulate ourselves every time that some progress is made where political cooperation is concerned, because undoubtedly the need for Europe to be able to speak with a single voice is most acute; strengthening political cooperation must mean strengthening the Community, not weakening it. Strengthening political cooperation must constitute a

step forward towards political union, and not a diagonal, ambiguous move. We must remember that true political cooperation can only come within the framework of established political union.

I should like therefore to express my amazement at the proposal, that was put forward in Milan, to set up a political secretariat outside the institutional framework of the Community: amazement at a proposal that would reduce the competences of the Commission, limiting them to the economic sphere, which would be a totally unacceptable situation.

Another question that I should like briefly to mention is that of the Eureka project and the 'technological plan'. The same considerations apply here as those that I have already mentioned. A plan for technology is very welcome, but it is not acceptable if it is to be dealt with only at intergovernmental level, because that would mean depriving the Community's own organizations of their authority. I therefore look with concern — and I do not conceal the fact — on this kind of delegation of powers, to a Member State of our Community, to convene an *ad hoc* committee with the Foreign Ministers and the competent ministers for technological research.

On the question of the internal market, the Peoples' Europe and the economical and social situation, I think that the Parliament should support the Commission's recent efforts and the work it has done in recent times. I cannot dwell on these matters any longer, because my time is running out. I would simply like to emphasize the matter reported by the Commission — that is, the commitment to combat drought and hunger — and thank the Commission for the work it has done and the proposals it has put forward.

In conclusion, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think that on this question of European Union the commitment of our Members of the European Parliament is great and decisive; and great are the expectations of the people who look to us, seeing in us their direct representatives.

Ladies and gentlemen, I took part, together with a number of you, and together with some tens of thousands of people, in the popular demonstration in favour of European Union that took place at the same time as the meeting of the European Council.

I should like to conclude now with the same words with which I ended my speech in the Piazza del Duomo in Milan:

'We are not authorized to resign ourselves to pursuing a political course that leads in any other direction than to the construction, in the shortest possible time, of a real single entity, and to the real integration of our countries. Our efforts will go on, must go on, because on them depends the destiny of our peoples'.

(Applause from the Centre)

Mr Toksvig (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, many had high expectations of the Milan summit, others have had high expectations so many times that optimism has gradually given way to a certain cynicism. I think it appropriate for me to start by thanking both the Presidency, Prime Minister Santer, and the President of the Commission for their sober and factual account of a meeting which in fact amounted to nothing very much.

It should have been a milestone. It was not. It should have taken the initiative for institutional reforms, so that we could have a better decision-making process. It did not succeed in that either. There are those in this chamber who make little secret of their satisfaction at the failure and would like to thank the heads of Government, because once more national selfishness has triumphed over rational thinking. Their aim is to destroy, not to build. It is therefore doubly important to try to emphasize the many positive features to be found in the reports from Milan.

So we are to have an intergovernmental conference. I think, like Sir Fred Catherwood, that the Danish and British Governments are set to do some positive and goal-conscious work at this Conference, which I know our host country Luxembourg will stage with customary and commensurate vigour.

As a democracy Denmark is bound by the wishes of the majority in the Folketing. We have a number of doubters in the Folketing who only measure European progress in ECU on the revenue side. But others among us see in the intergovernmental conference a possible new forum which may be able to elucidate the processes at work in a new and more convincing way. I entirely share Mr Delors' fear that the Conference will be a kind of cushion doing service every three or four years as a built-in excuse for lack of action. Parliament thus has a clear interest in sustaining pressure to ensure that this does not happen. We may expect that it will be one of our most important tasks when we meet again after the summer break.

We have reason to be glad of the very positive way in which the ideas behind the Citizens' Europe have been received. This is a clear mandate to the European Parliament, a direct challenge to us to keep up the pressure and ensure that these ideas are put into practice.

We have reason for unmitigated satisfaction over the fact that we are to launch aid to the ACP countries in developing an effective drought strategy. This is a task for which we in the Community have all the expertise needed. I should like to make a special mention of the contribution which the European space organization can provide: European satellites and technology are there to be used. The data which already exist will be of invaluable assistance in the work of pinpointing predictable drought symptoms and of charting the causes of the desertification process which has led to the present disaster.

This again is a task in which the European Parliament can act as a catalyst, a connecting link, as Europe's uneasy conscience, which never loses the objectives from view and never allows these vital tasks, in the most literal sense, to be smothered in paper.

With regard to the Europe of technology, I only have enthusiasm and words of praise. The French Eureka project is an immensely exciting challenge, which we must take up. I do not disagree with the procedure adopted, ie, first to take stock of the existing situation. But it is important to make progress rapidly. If the process flags or gets bogged down in inertia of one kind or another, we in Parliament should help by simply taking an initiative of our own. I have no misgivings in proposing that, if by Christmas we have got no further with the Eureka project than fine words and rhetoric, the European Parliament should call a conference of European industry which can define the objectives and resources needed.

Thus, with all the disappointment over the way things went, there are many positive aspects from Milan which are to be welcomed. Our debates in this Chamber get bogged down too easily in institutional matters, which diverts our attention from endeavouring to influence and channel developments in a positive direction. One word of warning is called for here: the President-in-Office of the Council said that the intergovernmental conference would show that all the plans we have, all these developments, interrelate and are complementary to one another. There is some reason to fear that precisely these interrelationships may make it difficult to find solutions. In the field of nuclear physics my countryman, Niels Bohr, said that complementarity was a state in which the particles one wanted to measure and identify were so small and unstable that the very fact of measuring them had a distorting effect on their state. My fear arises from the fact that there is also complementarity in politics and that we may discover at the intergovernmental conference that our attempts to clarify the interrelationships and render popular feeling measurable will have a blocking effect on action. Here I think that Parliament's task is clearly identifiable. It is our task to keep up the pressure, ask questions, push and shove, irritate. In this way, perhaps the Milan summit may even yet turn out to be a milestone.

Mr Wurtz (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, the French Communist Members have already made their views known on the Milan Summit. We think we have entered a qualitatively new phase, which will certainly endanger the sovereignty of the States in political and military terms.

Moreover, from a strictly Community standpoint, I must tell you quite openly that I find it very difficult to understand the optimism of the President of the Council at the close of this summit.

Wurtz

It is now established fact that by requiring a majority vote for convening an intergovernmental conference, by using the procedure of majority voting for tackling basic political problems, the President of the Council has attempted to carry out a real *coup de force*. This attitude has not only divided the Community countries among themselves but also risks having a considerable effect on public opinion in all the Community countries which are interested in European cooperation provided this is a voluntary cooperation between nations with equal rights. If there is any time when the Community must not be divided, it is now when it has to face new political, economic, and commercial challenges. A delegation from the European Assembly has just returned from the United States where it discovered that the American Government is even more resolved than ever to strengthen its commercial aggression *vis à vis* the Community, to block technological transfers and to attack the very foundations of the common agricultural policy.

In this situation, a new institutional project which would cast doubt on the sovereignty of the Member States can only create further divisions and weaken Europe's position in the world.

As for the decisions taken by the European Council, which gave rise to embarrassed explanations on the part of Mr Delors, we feel the same about them as the European Trade Union Confederation: consternation. The internal market has in fact been promoted to the rank of priority of priorities, but this is above all a question of the free movement of capital. It is in fact a question of removing all the barriers which still restrict the dismantling of undertakings in Europe and the acceleration of restructuring. So it is not by chance that this project is clearly linked to the deregulation of the labour market. In any case, a Commission representative openly acknowledged this at a recent meeting of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Technology: 'rather than harmonization', he said, 'it would be more appropriate to speak of deregulation'. I wonder what has happened to those famous European collective agreements which President Delors has been promising us since his appointment.

Lastly, European technological cooperation, which in principle is of course unquestionably positive, is not following a very reassuring path. The acceptance by several Member States of the Eureka projects is openly linked to the implementation of military applications and to paving the way for the American 'star wars' project.

The latest statements by President Delors suggesting that the Commission be given the role of leader of the orchestra in a European association with the ISD going the same direction entirely, that of militarizing the Community's activities.

This morning Mr Delors told us that strategic aspects could be left aside. Could he please explain how?

In other words, the reason we criticize the Milan Summit is that it casts doubt on a certain form of European cooperation in which we believe, a cooperation based on the social achievements and potential of our Member States, a cooperation based on the objectives of peace, a cooperation based on the existence of sovereign nations which voluntarily cooperate.

Mr President, that is why we obviously cannot accept the resolutions proposed to us, which welcome the outcome of the Milan Summit.

Nor will we accept the resolution adopted by the Committee on Institutional Affairs which aims at a genuine *coup de force* by advocating the creation of a new 'European Union', against the openly expressed will of several Member States.

Mr Romeo (L). — (IT) Mr President, there are some who have doubted the wisdom of the decision, taken in Milan, to vote on the intergovernmental conference. But anyone that listened today to President Santer and President Delors ought not, I think, to be in any further doubt. Everyone was in agreement on the fact that we could not go on any further in this way, we could not continue repeating the Athens or Brussels Summits, we could not continue presenting European public opinion with a set of failures. It was, therefore, necessary to change the rules, not by any means so as to revolutionize the Community, but simply so as to preserve that much of the Community that we have already built up, and which could not survive a continuous succession of paralyses such as those that are already on record, with the very figures for the number of proposals that are still pending after years of waiting for the approval that they are unable to obtain.

When, therefore, Mr De la Malène states that Milan produced disasters, my answer is that the disasters that he quotes would certainly have occurred if nothing had been decided. It is true that, on the last occasion, the same Mr De la Malène had forecast that there would be no disasters at Milan, but that, at the same time, nothing would have happened: well, he has shown himself to be a poor prophet. I am convinced that he will be seen to be just as poor a prophet where his statements today are concerned, and that the disasters that he predicts will not occur. We have to keep the true dimensions of the problem in mind for it to be clear that no-one is worried about institutional problems in themselves; their concern, instead, is to solve the problems that are facing us, taking into account the vastness of the technological field and the vastness of the internal market. Of course, what happened with regard to the Eureka project has done nothing to put the minds at rest of those who want a technological Community, because the French government — which is one of the governments of the majority — is reluctant to admit that there is a Community aspect to this solution; and as far as the pragmatists are concerned, those who are looking for so much concrete progress,

Romeo

it is a fact that we are then told that those who want the internal market consider that the standardization of indirect taxes is a pure dream. And I wonder if we can seriously imagine a unified internal market when anyone knows that, by simply manipulating indirect taxes, enormous obstacles can be created that are even more serious than those that are represented, symbolically, by customs duties.

President Delors maintains that, in perhaps two years' time, everyone would find themselves in fundamental agreement. If, however, I accept his distinction between institutionalists and pragmatists, my answer to him is that, as far as the institutionalists are concerned, we would all be in agreement on practical things right away. We should have no need to wait two years. But when President Delors imagines a conference lasting three or four years, or even goes so far as to suggest two conferences at the same time, I have to say that he is carrying pessimism beyond all useful bounds; I do not in fact believe that we have, here, to divide ourselves into optimists and pessimists, because these are subjective, personal attitudes, whereas we have to stick to concrete things.

Those who have deplored the confusion that marked the Milan Summit should I think also bear in mind that a summit lasts a day and a half; the intergovernmental conference will not, I hope, go on for years, as President Delors fears, but it will go on for months, and during these months there will be an opportunity to study new solutions, to find practical expedients, to examine possibilities that do not boil down simply to these black or white alternatives that we are now faced with. Of course, something must be done about the veto, but we do not have to consider its total abolition; we can talk about a postponement, we can talk about a specific list of precise cases. There will be time to think of these things.

I should like, however, to say one thing: the President of our Parliament has stated, and has confirmed, that in his view, if the Community were to find itself in 1989 in the conditions in which it is today, it would be useless holding elections to the European Parliament by universal suffrage. Should one call President Pflimlin an extremist? He is one only in the sense that he is close to the spirit of one of the founding fathers, who are only continuously invoked here when to do so appears harmless.

We must also bear in mind that those who took part in the Milan conference emphasized that, when the seven voted in favour, they did not only decide on a procedure, they took a decision that had a political content, and they set a political course. It was not a procedural decision, with nothing more to it. We must all think about this — both those in favour and those against. The hypothesis of there being two Communities is a hypothesis that we hope will not come true, and if it were to, it would have to be of a temporary nature. The dimensions that we have to bear in mind are not

only technological, they are also political. We need to bear in mind the problem of security, which concerns a large country such as Germany; we need to bear in mind the problem of underdevelopment, which concerns Greece; it is not true that the large countries will be imposing their will. During the negotiations these requirements must be taken into account, and it is not true that the small countries are destined to be sacrificed, just as it is not true that the large countries will impose their will. I should like to conclude by saying that the identity of Europe, where culture is concerned, is centuries-old, but it is useless to invoke it as such. Now, the identity of which President Delors as well spoke of, is either political or it is non-existent.

(Applause from the Liberal and Democratic Group)

Mr Lalor (RDE). — Mr President, I want to say first of all that I am in full accord with what Mr de la Malène said a short while ago, and I am sorry that you are deciding to take it out on me.

From our Irish point of view the recent Milan Summit failed to deal with the most important issue in the Community, namely, unemployment. This was the main problem that the leaders of Europe should have discussed; instead they played and toyed with grandiose schemes for European union. This is cold comfort indeed for the 13 million people who are unemployed and seeking work. In my own country unemployment has risen from 65 000 in 1973 to almost a quarter of a million now. In percentage terms Ireland has consistently headed the unemployment table in the Community.

It cannot truthfully be said that the Milan Summit represents the dawn of a new age. In reality Europe's image has been very seriously tarnished. Clearly, there was disunity over the proposal to call a conference on European unity. It seems that Britain and France spend their time trying to upstage each other. The intergovernmental conference that has been convened to draw up a treaty on a common foreign and security policy on the basis of the Franco-German and United Kingdom drafts, together with amendments to the Treaty, represents a dilution of the Dooge and Spinelli reports and resolutions.

The new treaty is to be confined to political cooperation, while the Rome Treaty is to be retained and amended. Some parliaments will never ratify the sweeping changes in majority voting. Just because Ireland supported the holding of an intergovernmental conference, it does not follow that our Irish vital national interests have any built-in protection.

In the conclusions reference is made to a treaty on a common foreign and security policy on the basis of the Franco-German and United Kingdom drafts. This may create the impression that our Irish position regarding neutrality has changed, that we favour both a common

Lalor

foreign policy and a common security policy. This is not the case, Mr President. Ireland cannot sign any treaty that would bind us to a common foreign and security policy. Such a step would be incompatible with our declared position of positive neutrality.

The way the debate on neutrality has been conducted, the distinct impression being given is that a position of neutrality is wrong. Such a view could not be further from the truth. I believe that our neutrality has a potential value for the Community. It emphasizes the peaceful nature of the Community and enables the Community to be represented in international peace-keeping forces without simply regarded as a part of NATO.

It is the economic and employment issues that should be to the fore. Last year investment in the manufacturing industry in my country fell by almost 40% in terms of volume, whereas in the Community as a whole such investment rose by an average of 7%. What we need is a coordinated economic recovery at EEC level that will benefit each and every Member State. Far too little recognition has been given to the fact that economic integration imposes considerable costs on weaker or what I describe as peripheral economies. Activity gravitates towards the centre and to the most densely populated areas.

There must be a genuine commitment to an effective regional policy, a policy that will once and for all ensure that the term 'disadvantaged' will no longer apply to any region of the Community. This is a major objective of the existing Treaty and the special protocol which Ireland negotiated at entry. It is meaningless to expect some Member States to participate in monetary union or economic integration in their present state of development relative to other Member States.

Finally, Mr President, a study has been proposed on why the other major industrialized competitors are succeeding where we are evidently failing. Why was it not suggested that a study be carried out on why most of the other smaller and medium-sized OECD countries are performing better than the European Community? The Community's great potential is stagnating, the attitude of Europe's leaders to the real problems must change.

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on 14 February 1984 when Mr Spinelli concluded the drafting of the Treaty on European Union by saying 'I have helped to deliver the baby and now that it is walking. . .', had he perhaps thought that possibly this baby would never walk and would be paralysed? For in fact what was proposed in the Treaty on European Union was both a content and a method.

As for the method, the European Parliament had put the national governments and parliaments on the same

level. I am not exaggerating when I suggest that Parliament showed its predilection for the national parliaments. And what are we seeing now? The Committee on Institutional Affairs agreeing to a *coup de force*, one might say, by the Heads of State and Government, to an institutional development which was not exactly that intended in the Treaty on European Union. In fact, even before receiving the opinions of the various national parliaments, they are rushing on, saying: 'Quick, we must make Europe; let's not make it any old how'.

So the Committee on Institutional Affairs seems to be tolerating this executive act of force and encouraging it at the cost of the existing treaty, for it looks as though the committee would not be averse to a two-speed Europe.

Briefly, in this affair, the European and national legislative power is losing out for the time being. It is losing out because it may be that the outcome of the inter-governmental conference will not be submitted to the European Parliament. The European Parliament will have finally abdicated.

We can no longer see the originality of this method today. But, on the other hand, we must also stress that Milan — which is the secret summit, the summit which in the end was not very accessible to the citizens, so that forty-eight hours after its end the European press found it difficult to discover what had really happened — agreed to an extension of competences in some areas. Only in some areas: defence policy, technology policy, external relations policy. But where are the social policies provided for in Article 55 of the draft Treaty on European Union? Mr Santer tells us: 'The European Parliament is a forum for political discussion and we are a kind of recording room. We can discuss, but in the end the decisions are taken elsewhere'.

In these circumstances, what powers will be given to the European Parliament? When one hears Chancellor Kohl or Craxi stating that: 'As for the European Parliament, it can be given co-decision-making powers for the ratification of the accession treaty', that seems very little to me and rather ironic at the present time. The so-called pragmatism we are seeing will, I fear, be judged by history as a flight forwards. In any case, we have a rendezvous in a few months, since the problem of unanimity will obviously come up again in a few months time. We cannot therefore accept the motion for a resolution tabled in the report of the Committee on Institutional Affairs.

(Applause from various benches)

Mr Van der Waal (NI). — (NL) Mr President, the press and various Members have reacted with disappointment to the outcome of the European summit meeting in Milan because it was not decided to amend the present Treaties to make way for the European

Van der Waal

Union. We cannot endorse this view. Nonetheless, we were also disappointed by the outcome of this summit, not because of the absence of a decision to amend the Treaties but because it was not instead decided to seize the opportunities offered by the existing Treaties to improve decision-making in the Community, even though various proposals to this end had been put forward.

The Community is an association of sovereign states, all of which intend — and rightly so to our mind — to remain sovereign states. Is it then surprising that certain aspects of national interest should bring differences of opinion to light, especially over the line it is suggested we should follow in European cooperation? After all, with the advent of the welfare state, citizens and governments became indissolubly linked by all kinds of facilities. What could be more obvious in such a situation than that a consensus should be reached on the basis of compromises? Why was it not decided in Milan, where everyone was so convinced that European cooperation cannot go on as it is, to opt for pragmatic proposals that would lead directly to an improvement in the functioning of the European institutions? Why insist on institutional changes in law for which a very time-consuming procedure has to be followed?

Even after the statements by the Presidents of the Council and Commission it is surely difficult to maintain that all that needs to be done if the Community is to function better is amend the Treaties. Even paragraph 5 of Mr Arndt's motion for a resolution says that it is not absolutely necessary for the Treaties to be amended. How can it be claimed that the majority of the Member States appear to have the political will to amend the Treaties, which will force them to accept majority decisions on all kinds of matters, when it has been impossible hitherto for decisions to be taken on these same matters owing to a lack of political will? We surely cannot say, for example, that the *impasse* over the prices of cereals and the failure to establish a common transport policy since 1970 have been due to obstacles in the present Treaty of Rome even though the political will to make progress was there. After all, we need only consider all the things that have been accomplished even though no mention is made of them in the Treaty: EPC, the Lomé Convention, the EMS, projects like Airbus and Esprit. Why have they been possible? Because the will and the ability were there.

At the Milan summit the European Council spoke positively of the completion of the internal market and the development of European technological cooperation. All the heads of government were firmly convinced that these initiatives would benefit Europe's economic recovery and employment. Then there will surely be the political will to take action. Hence our question: why is the striving after federalist ideals, even at the expense of European unity, ideals that again find expression in the Spinelli resolution, allowed to prevail

over a pragmatic approach to cooperation which would actually benefit the citizens of Europe in the short term?

Mr Tognoli (S). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Italian Socialists will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Commission on Institutional Affairs and now outlined by Mr Spinelli.

The decision to call the intergovernmental conference has been considered by many observers, some of them in this Parliament, to be an inadequate, equivocal decision. Yet it must, on the contrary, be acknowledged that the firm coherence of the seven countries that agreed on the conference is in itself a surprising, positive fact in these years of crisis and political stagnation within the Community. This is one of the results of the six months' term of office of the Italian presidency, which achieved a number of important aims, that have been referred to during the course of the debate.

There has been talk of the opposing positions held by the so-called pragmatists and the idealists, or institutionalists — the former tied to the policy of progressing a little at a time, the latter committed to apparently unattainable institutional objectives. It seems to me that, in reality, and within its limitations, the interim conclusion of the European Council in Milan represented a pragmatic solution in a worrying situation of stalemate, in which not even the Franco-German initiative succeeded in achieving anything new.

The question that we have to ask ourselves today is, if anything, whether the seven countries will succeed in preserving a sufficient degree of cohesion and be able to convince the others.

Naturally, neither the intergovernmental conference nor the outline agreements on the internal market, the Peoples' Europe and technological development will be able to produce concrete results, unless the Member States of the Community abandon the policy of defending national interests that has prevailed in recent years.

Milan represents a step forward. We have to avoid taking a step backward in December. For this reason, whilst agreeing with the conclusions contained in the motion for a resolution, I want to emphasize the need for reform of the Treaties as soon as possible. Naturally, every effort must be made to persuade those who, today, are the most lukewarm supporters of institutional reform, but we have to escape from the *status quo*, which will bring the Community to its knees with sclerosis.

It should not be thought that the Italian Socialists are insensitive to the various different needs of Great Britain, Greece and Denmark. In this connection I should like to recall that it was Pietro Nenni, a past leader of

Tognoli

the Italian Socialists, who warmly supported, in Italy, Britain's entry into the Community, to which De Gaulle was at that time opposed.

Moreover, it does not seem possible to pursue the aims indicated by the conclusions reached in Milan, on the unification of the internal market and on technology, without revising the present decision-making system. As has been emphasized on a number of occasions in this Chamber, the European Parliament must participate jointly in preparing the decisions of the intergovernmental conference, not only because it has drawn up a precise Draft Treaty of Union, but because its exclusion would be the first, implicit indication given by States regarding the powers to be assigned to the Parliament.

We have therefore to fight decisively to attain an objective that is vital to the Parliament. Between Stuttgart and Milan two years have elapsed, without a proper budget in the Community. At Milan a lifebelt has been thrown. It should not be forgotten that the work carried out in some sectors is of a positive character and shows a widespread wish for greater political and economic unity in Europe.

The report on the internal market deserves appreciation for the priorities and deadlines that it has fixed, and which will be that much more acceptable if they are accompanied by proposals for the creation of a European 'social space'. As part of this it is to be hoped that measures will be put in hand for the financing of a European plan for employment, either through the Community budget, by strengthening the Social Fund, or by means of loans. These measures should also be accompanied by steps to extend the use of the ECU and strengthen the monetary system, so as not to create a market with too many broken links.

The proposals for the Peoples' Europe, which were adopted by the Milan Summit, also deserve approval. However, much of what is proposed is destined to remain on paper only, unless the Community, united, is able to steer a bolder course towards true integration free from the constraints of persistent barriers and new vetoes.

The economic prospects for Europe over the next two years are not particularly encouraging, but it will not be easy to reduce the level of unemployment without adequate growth. Where international policy is concerned, Europe's role remains weak, and the important decisions on military strategy are taken over the continent's head. There is therefore no other way than that indicated by the European Parliament — in other words, the strengthening of the organs of the Community, with greater democratization through the firm involvement of the elective assembly, and an increase in the sphere of supranational decision-making.

Variations can be considered; the road can be made wider or narrower, but the route is as indicated. If we

do not want to stand still, we must proceed decisively, removing the vetoes and the counter-vetoes.

Mr Beumer (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, two conclusions can certainly be drawn from the Milan summit. Firstly, a formal majority of the Member States want major changes in the decision-making procedures. The vote on this has been especially praised, and rightly so in my opinion, but it will not be known if this praise is justified until the seven feel obliged to express this view in practice.

Secondly, it was also formally stated that the White Paper is to be put into effect and that a technological community is also to be established. This statement is not new. But we have been bitterly disappointed in the past owing to the absence of an adequate decision-making procedure. This situation may still occur after the Milan summit. There are not yet sufficient guarantees in this respect. But I ask you: does not any significant development in the European Community entirely depend on greatly improved decision-making? This is also true of the White Paper, and it is also true of Eureka.

The President of the Commission rightly referred in an inspired statement this morning to the need for a minimum of cohesion. Mr President, is this minimum of cohesion not the most implicit aspect of a Community approach? Despite the considerable frailty of this Community approach, which is partly the consequence of the Council's behaviour, it is still the firmest and strongest framework that we know. And a Commission that advocates this should therefore have Parliament's support through thick and thin.

Mr President, a final comment on the report on a Citizens' Europe. The Council refers to it with gratitude and generally agrees with what it has to say. But the answers are very much of the moment and must therefore be given quickly. It is just like foreign policy, which the President of the Council said this morning was a national responsibility. The policy on broadcasting, which is closely connected with audiovisual developments, is also a national responsibility, but it is inevitably becoming part of a process of internationalization as a result of technological developments. What I and my group want to emphasize is that we are not satisfied simply with the creation of a programme industry, that it is not enough for us to create an international market with a green paper and to ensure a broadcasting system performs a public service. We must also ensure that there is a news service which presents the European view, that the voice of every citizen can be heard, that the rights of the minorities are therefore considered and that culture is adequately protected, an aspect to which my group similarly referred this morning. If the development of audiovisual broadcasting media satisfies these requirements, the European Council was right to stamp the report on a Citizens' Europe with its authority.

President. — I ask you to note a comment that I have to make. I would like to point out that at 5.30 p.m. the agenda provides for a vote on the Spinelli resolution, which is related to the present debate. There are still 16 speakers to come, with a total time of 1 hour and 10 minutes to share between them. Consequently, the debate cannot possibly be concluded before 5.30 p.m. if we want to vote on the Spinelli report at that time.

Since the President of the Council of Europe has expressed the wish to reply to the speeches made so far, I propose, in accordance with Rule 86 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, to end the debate at this point. May I therefore have one speaker for the motion and one speaker against it.

Mr Penders (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, as one of the 16 Members yet to speak, I very much regret this course of events. But I believe we must take a realistic view of the situation that has arisen. I think it is a good thing that the President of the Council is to have the opportunity to give a brief answer. I also think it would be a good thing for us to get through the agenda in as orderly a fashion as possible. I shall therefore support, with considerable reluctance, your proposal that the debate should be closed at 5.30 and that the names of the remaining speakers should be removed from the list.

Mr Ephremedis (COM). — (GR) It is not acceptable to end the debate when there are views radically different from those heard so far on the matter we are debating. Besides, the debate should not be terminated in so sudden a way, when an extension can be allowed for the President of the Council to reply to views other than those heard so far as well. Since I think it is now my turn to speak and there are five minutes left, I therefore ask you to grant me my four minutes — I could even make it three — so that the debate may close, if other colleagues are in agreement. You cannot at this point deprive us of the right to express views different from those already heard.

President. — I have already announced, in accordance with Rule 86 (1), the reason why an end to the debate is called for, and I ask that the vote should be taken pursuant to that Rule.

(Parliament agreed to the President's proposal).

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, I protest at what the Bureau has done this afternoon. The speaking order has quite simply been changed!

Mr President, you ought not to have spoken on the grounds that you had to be in the chair from 4 p.m., because in so doing you prevented your own group chairman from speaking. I agreed to put off speaking

for this reason, and now the debate is being closed! That is not good enough.

I thus expect the Bureau to rule that in future the list of speakers be adhered to so that it cannot be changed by a President without the approval of the House.

(Applause)

Mr Santer, President-in-Office of the European Council. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have listened carefully to the statements made by the various speakers. I apologize for not being able to listen to the other speakers, but I would like to begin by thanking all those speakers who have supported the presidency in what was certainly a very difficult and delicate operation, namely organizing the intergovernmental conference and translating the guidelines given by the European Council of Milan into concrete terms.

I also perceived in most of the speeches a positive element, a constructive element, in the appreciation of the work carried out by the European Council in Milan, so that a European who is as convinced and has such ambitious projects as Mr Spinelli could even speak of 'a historic turning point' thanks to Milan. It is true that thanks to Milan something new has appeared, something new is under way, a certain mechanism has got going.

I do not want to go into all the speeches I made this morning again, nor do I want to anticipate the programme speech to be made by the Luxembourg presidency, which will be delivered by the President-in-Office of the Council tomorrow. So at this stage I shall refrain from discussing some of the proposals made by the honourable Members.

However, I would like to go back to one point directly connected with the Milan conclusions, by giving a few details relating to the manner in which the Luxembourg presidency will tackle the difficult business of convening the intergovernmental conference. Specifically it is the question of how and according to what procedures your Parliament can be associated in the activities of the intergovernmental conference.

I said — and I am sure you noted it in my statement this morning — that one of the great political changes that has occurred since the signature of the treaties governing us is the election by universal suffrage of the European Parliament. I added that in my view the fact that the governments have not taken account of this vital change is one of the reasons for our present institutional difficulties. So I am fully aware — as I hope I made clear — that an intergovernmental conference cannot disregard this factor.

On the legal level, the intergovernmental conference must closely observe the rules of the treaty which is at present our common law. I am telling no secrets by

Santer

repeating here what you know: one of the determining factors in the decision of principle to convene an inter-governmental conference was the assurance that the rules of Article 236 would be applied strictly. The presidency will apply these rules strictly, if only because it is still our ambition to achieve modifications to the treaties which will be subscribed to by the Ten and by all the ten or twelve Member States and their national parliaments who must, as a matter of obligation, ratify any changes to the treaties.

Moreover, Mr President, in practical terms surely it is not only permissible but also desirable to involve the European Parliament in our discussions. As has already occurred during the preparatory work, close contacts should be organized and we should have a regular exchange of information.

Parliament is surely not expecting me to bring it the advance approval of the Council or European Council before it returns to and pursues the discussion on future amendments to our treaties and the passage towards European Union.

Without your initiative, ladies and gentlemen, in the form of a draft Treaty on European Union, we would surely not have had this discussion today. It is entirely up to you whether this dialogue continues. What is important, in my view, is for your voice to be heard, and for no one to fail to hear it. It is by results that we will be judged.

Ladies and gentlemen, those are the views I wanted to express. Tomorrow the President-in-Office of the Council will present the presidency's programme of action for the next six months. That will be the time for you to express your views on that programme.

For my part, I merely wanted to report as objectively as possible, leaving aside my personal opinions, on the outcome of the Milan Summit. At this moment, and during the coming six months — months which will certainly be important if not crucial to the further institutional development of the Community, the only ambition of the presidency is to serve the European Community as a whole loyally. — 'Ich dien', 'I serve', commits us to this task. . . I serve, and I serve loyally, and to add a further motto of ours which we also share with some other Community Member States: 'I will stand firm', for we need to 'stand firm' at this moment, in the important task we have to achieve.

(Loud applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

Vice-President

8. Tribute

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, it is my duty to inform Parliament of sad tidings which have just been given to us.

Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess Charlotte of Luxembourg has died.

On behalf of the entire House I should like to convey our sincerest sympathy to the Grand Duke and his family as well as to the Government and people of Luxembourg.

I would ask the House to observe one minute's silence.

(The House rose and observed one minute's silence)

9. Votes

Report (Doc. A-2-77/85) by Mr Spinelli, on behalf of the Committee on Institutional Affairs, on the follow-up to the Milan Summit as regards European Union.

*Motion for a resolution**Paragraph 8 — Compromise amendment No 50*

President. — What we have here is an amendment that has been submitted to me as a compromise amendment. I have just asked the House if it agrees to this amendment being put to the vote. We shall now proceed therefore to take the vote.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — I am sorry to interrupt, but this amendment was not available five minutes ago at the issuing place. Could you read it out please?

President. — I did not know that, I am sorry. I have a text here in French and will read that out to you.

Paragraphe 8. Remplacer le texte du paragraphe, après les mots «citoyens européens» par le texte suivant: «de participer, avec des procédures appropriées, à la rédaction du projet des traités afin que le texte final soit le résultat de la volonté convergente de la Conférence et du Parlement européen».

That is the text of the compromise amendment on which the House is being asked to vote.

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — *(DA)* Mr President, we cannot vote on an amendment which has not been translated into all the languages and which is read out

Hammerich

to us in French. It is impossible. It is not in conformity with the Rules of Procedure, and I must protest. We have to defend the small languages.

President. — Before putting this amendment to the vote I expressly asked for and got the agreement of the House. I do not think that we would be acting properly if we were to pass over this vote now and come back to it at a later stage.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* I have objected, but you have not put the admissibility of the amendment to the vote. It does not feature in my list of amendments which comprises numbers 1 to 49. I had assumed the list to be complete. I have not yet had a chance to examine this amendment seriously and am thus really against it. Nor have I finished translating it. My question is quite simply, why have things been done in this way? Perhaps the rapporteur could explain to us again clearly the differences between the old and new text, because if the new version is really an improvement in line with the Committee's wishes I would not want to oppose it. But we cannot vote on the amendment at the moment, with hardly any translations or documents.

President. — Mr Arndt, I think that it is a pity that you have to get back into the fray on this one. When I asked the House to agree to the amendment being put to the vote — and that was at a time when I myself did not know that it was available only in the French version — you said that it was not a compromise. I then said that it had been submitted to me as a compromise amendment, whereupon you nodded. I understood from that that you were making no objection. No one else made any objection either, and the decision to vote was taken. I find it a pity that it is only now, when we have got this far, that objections are being raised. I think it is entirely at variance with parliamentary procedures to vote first and then to argue that we should not have voted. Anyway, I shall now ask Mr Spinelli to explain the exact purpose of the amendment, and then we can see whether we should go ahead with the vote.

Mr Spinelli (COM), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, I would ask everyone not to dramatize things. This amendment does not in fact express any idea that is different from what appears in the text. It is simply couched in more explicit terms, that is to say, it states that there must be convergence between the point of view of the Parliament and the point of view, as it will be, of the conference. And since this was also already said in the first text, albeit not so openly, I think that we can adopt the amendment without any great difficulty.

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I think we have observed our Rules of Procedure after the speech by

Mrs Hammerich, now that a complaint has been made about the absence of translation into all the languages before the vote is taken. I do not see on what grounds there could be any infringement of the Rules of Procedure.

Secondly, since Mr Spinelli has spoken on the basic question, may I say in one word that I regard the original text as excellent since it calls for convergence between Parliament and the Conference; but the new text calls for a confusion between the executive and the legislative, which is serious. I am totally opposed to such a confusion.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I feel that our rapporteur spoke very wisely just now when he said that we should not dramatize the whole matter overmuch. If a formal protest were to be made by at least ten Members at the fact that the amendment is not available in all languages, then the vote could not be held. However, that has not happened in this case.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* I am sorry — although it was my group that tabled the compromise amendment with another group — that there was no vote. Mrs Hammerich spoke before the vote, and we do have to vote. No vote was taken on this compromise amendment. We have not voted. Therefore I believe that we must either refuse to vote on the basis of the remark made by Mrs Hammerich, or we must vote. But we cannot regard a vote as having been taken, for there was no vote. I would point that out.

What I would also like to say is that if the Assembly decides that there should not be a vote, the amendments which had been tabled previously would naturally regain their full value.

Mr Marshall (ED). — I was only going to suggest very briefly that when Mr Beazley asked you in what languages the amendment had been tabled and you then said it was only available in French, not all Members realized perhaps how unavailable it had been. Given that information, I think that at least you ought to ask the House whether 10 Members object to the vote taking place, and I suspect that 10 Members would so do.

President. — Mr Marshall, that is exactly what I was planning to do. When I said that I had it in French, I did not know that it was only available in French, I meant that I only had it in French. I will now ask the House if there are more than 10 Members who object to this amendment being put to the vote.

(More than 10 Members rose to their feet)

Since 10 Members do so object, this amendment cannot be put to the vote. This also means, as Mrs Veil

President

has just said, that the original amendments now stand once again.

Explanations of vote

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* The Socialist Group will vote in favour of this amendment by a majority simply because we require a clear sign from the European Parliament in this situation. But in our view no final decision has been reached, and Parliament must continue to exert pressure on the parliaments of the Member States. We are not particularly happy about the decision on item 10, since what is primarily at issue is the forthcoming intergovernmental conference, when we ought again to try to develop the European Community further. Item 10 has created the impression that the prime consideration is European Union and that this is something different from the European Community. We believe we must help the European Community to evolve into European Union and that the two are not two different coexisting concepts but the one and only European institution.

We thus hope not only that we can outvote those who are unwilling to stay with us at this pace, but also that our Parliament will try during the intergovernmental conference to convert those who are still wavering to our point of view. Only if we progress without force, without majority voting and without trying to have a two-speed Europe can we one day actually achieve European Union.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — *(FR)* The Group of the European Right would have unanimously voted for Mr Spinelli's report if the three priority amendments had been adopted. The first one reminded us of the need for a union of our countries to deal with the challenges facing all of them: their security, thanks to common defence, the organization of research at a time when the moon is no more than a step on the way to the stars, the development of their economies by job-creating investment, the revival of their demography, which is vital to our survival.

The second amendment maintained that without a political revival, based on the development of strong moral values that are durable and greater than our ephemeral lives, that can resist totalitarianism and terrorism, that will act as the motive force of its own development and that of the countries of the South, the union will not have the necessary impetus for take-off. The third amendment, which refers to our devotion to family, land and home country, which is so natural to man that God commands it, defined three priorities; defence and security, an independent foreign policy and a market economy.

Since they did not manage to have these three amendments considered today, the French members of the

Group of the European Right will abstain in the final vote.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Cryer (S). — First of all, I just want to comment briefly that some people have invoked a greater union as some sort of economic solution, a market of 300 million apparently being necessary to restore and create jobs. The odd thing is that Japan does not need an internal market of that size to be one of the most economically successful countries in the world.

I am opposed to the 'United States of capitalist Europe' which has been advocated by many proponents of this Treaty of European Union, a union because of which since 1979 46 000 million pounds have flown from the United Kingdom because of the removal of the constraints and limitations on the movement of capital. I do not want to live in a United States of capitalist Europe in which the capitalists dominate the economic system! I want to ensure that the next Labour Government has the power to control the economy and to intervene to create long-term jobs. The intergovernmental conference that is being proposed and supported won't create a single job for the working class of any Member State of the Common Market and it certainly won't save the jobs of any of the 1 100 steelworkers that are going to be put on the dole by the policies of the people across there and the people in No 10 Downing Street. So I am opposed to it for those reasons!

Lastly, I am opposed to it because the creation of a large capitalist bloc in the continent of Europe will not enhance the move towards peace. A divided Europe is a dangerous Europe because it means a possible step towards a nuclear confrontation and a nuclear holocaust. I want to see us work with the whole of Europe; not just 10 or 12 capitalist nations, but all the countries in the continent of Europe. I don't think that the EEC contributes to that. I think it blocks it!

Mr Herman (PPE). — *(FR)* I will vote in favour of the Spinelli resolution, but I would like to add two requests to the President of the Council. The first is that we expect from him not the judgment of Solomon, but a certain driving force.

Mr President of the Council, would you please listen to me. You are on the bridge, not on the balcony. It is your duty to render more specific and to complete the excessively vague mandate given in Milan.

My second request relates to the organization of the conference; do not entrust the building of Europe to those who want nothing to do with it. The professional diplomats and the representatives of the national chancelleries will only give us a second Genscher-Colombo Act, and that is useless. And I

Herman

would say to the representative of Luxembourg: you are not the prime minister of a small country, you are the president of a great European Union in the making. In that mission you will always have Parliament's support.

(Applause)

Mr Nordmann (L). — *(FR)* I will vote for the resolution of the Committee on Institutional Affairs because it does put the institutional question, but without any illusions and regretting the fact that the question has been put badly. For surely we must look at reality: the reality of the Milan Summit is the entry into an intergovernmental Europe. This intergovernmental Europe has a different logic from the logic of European Union and institutional renewal. Looking simply at the example of our Assembly, could one imagine a European Parliament deciding on a Europe of different speeds, could one imagine a European Parliament made up of representatives of the various Member States elected democratically but which pushes aside some of its Members and welcomes others depending on the subject at issue or under debate? The Europe of intergovernmental cooperation is a Europe of different speeds. It is not the Europe of democratic control. A Europe of different speeds is conceivable from the standpoint of the fields of common action, but makes no sense when are dealing with the question of the institutional structures of such action.

That is the fundamental contradiction of the Milan Summit. We have entered a different Europe. Let us be fully aware of that fact, otherwise we would be condemned to continuing to play the role — with Parliament and the Commission confused within an unhappy community — of tragic chorus and to seeing, and this is not new for the French, that 'Délorism' is nothing but 'dolorism'.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Coste-Floret (RDE). — *(FR)* I shall vote for the Spinelli motion for a resolution because it aims at ending the stagnant torpor into which the European Community has sunk and which would be fatal for it if it were to last any longer. While I do have some reservations about paragraphs 8 and 10, the overall thrust of the resolution seems to me positive on the whole, since it points the way we must take if we want to avoid prolonging a stagnation which would in the end be lethal for Europe.

I think the Milan European Council did well to convene a governmental conference by majority vote, but I also think it sinned by omission because it was wrong not to give that conference a specific mandate and not to give it a deadline for its conclusions.

I think the Spinelli proposal palliates these two defects; firstly, it rightly calls on the conference to

take as its starting point the Treaty on European Union adopted by Parliament, which is politically balanced and legally very specific; secondly, in the event of no conclusion being reached, it proposes continuing with those who want to build Europe, who are resolved to do so.

The President of the Commission said this morning that we must not plan for the worst. Certainly we must not plan for it, but it is only realistic to make provision for it; that is what the Spinelli Report rightly does. And it is because I am realistic and European that I will endorse it.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — As on previous resolutions on institutional reform my group will have a free vote. I personally welcome the majority decision to hold an intergovernmental conference this autumn, and it is my sincere hope that my government will decide to participate. But this conference must produce results. Nothing can be worse than a long drawn-out series of meetings which end inconclusively at best or in confusion at worst. Therefore, it should be known beforehand what is expected to be achieved. The agenda must be precise. Before this conference gets under way, we, this Parliament, need to have the Council's assurance that we shall be consulted on the decisions of the conference at the conclusion of it and before they are implemented.

Finally, we must avoid at all costs a two-speed or a two-tier Europe.

(Applause)

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — *(NL)* On behalf of several other Members, I too must register a protest. We have been deprived of our democratic right to present our constituents with alternative views in this debate. At no time during the debate this afternoon has there been any serious discussion on how reasonable a technological Community is. The main concern is clearly not the interests of the citizens, the farmers, the workers, the peoples of the Third World, but what is good for Philips, Siemens, Messerschmitt, Thompson and others. That is what is being inflicted on Europe. The market is saturated. We cannot all buy three videos and three cars, so the decision is to expand. A technological Community will be a Europe dominated by a military-industrial complex. The two speeds will ensure that the strongest succeed. My group will vote against the Spinelli resolution and table its own resolution tomorrow.

(Applause from some benches)

Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (RDE). — *(FR)* One of the salient aspects of Milan seems to me to be in the end the gap that has appeared between, on the one side, the seven countries that called for the intergovernmen-

Thomé-Patenôtre

tal conference to be convened and on the other the three countries which did not want it. But the priorities of the intergovernmental conference, which unfortunately was given no precise mandate, should be to define as early as possible, by October, objectives which would make it possible to discover whether it is worth being fewer in order to go further. For the question is as follows: what exactly do the seven countries who wanted the conference convened wish for? If their reply is a real and significant one, then one could envisage continuing with seven countries. If, on the contrary, the objectives remain too vague or too limited, that is certainly not worth any useless disassociation between the Ten.

For my part, since I do not want to see this conference get bogged down, I will vote in favour of the Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Spinelli in spite of a few reservations.

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — I shall be voting for this report with enthusiasm, but if Members would like to know the reasons, I shall put them in writing.

(Applause)

Mr Megahy (S). — I shall be voting against this resolution, as will other British Labour Members. We are not divided like the Conservative Group who, having spent all their time enthusiastically trying to push us into a European superstate, are now being ground to a full stop by the actions of their own government! I think that Milan was a perfect example of why we should not give greater and greater powers to European institutions. It was perhaps one of the first examples we have had of majority voting, and what a mess-up it has been! What an example!

How can we go forward to entrust to institutions like the European Council, the Foreign Ministers, even, I might say, the European Parliament, greater and greater powers over our economy, over our defence and everything else?

I think that this Milan Summit illustrated that it is time that this European Parliament recognized the realities of the situation, stopped playing about with the rhetoric of European Union, accepted that there is sensible cooperation and that there are ways in which we can cooperate together in Europe and got rid of the idea of moving into a European superstate. I think that the Spinelli committee should accept that their views are no longer relevant. It is time that they gave up the battle and accepted that we should not go forward into a federal Europe.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr Cryer and Mr Megahy have almost persuaded me to vote in favour of this

resolution, because I much prefer a united, successful, prosperous and capitalist Europe to the disunited, shabby, declining Socialist Europe which they seem to stand for.

However, with regret I am going to have to vote against the Spinelli resolution, and for the following reason. Paragraphs 9 and 10 refer to the possibility of a two-speed or two-tier Europe. Mr Delors this morning very cleverly summed up the Summit in terms of four schools of thought. He spoke of those who stood by the Treaties. Then the third school of thought which he mentioned consisted of those who prefer a two-speed Europe. I agree with the Commission. I would rather stand by the existing Treaties and a single-speed Europe. If you — as you have done — vote for paragraphs 9 and 10 and a two-speed Europe, you have undone all the achievements of the last 12 years in bringing the democratic States of Europe together.

That, I am afraid, is something for which I cannot vote. I shall vote against.

Mr Christiansen (S). — *(DA)* As far as the Milan Summit is concerned, the debate here today has been marked by disappointment and bitterness. This intergovernmental conference in Milan was not a meeting burdened by weighty budgetary matters or questions concerned with enlargement, and what did we get? A ritualized exercise to see how many Union models could be stacked on the tip of a pencil! The representatives of the old EEC in Milan were so proud to show a majority in favour of Union, but what is the practical use of this majority? Is it to be used to disunite the Community? It was unwise to push ahead so hard with demands for treaty amendments which everybody knows cannot be made effective — but the lesson was learned that wielding the big stick will not work in Community affairs and will not achieve anything in cooperation between independent states.

I also cannot help noting that one result of the Milan Summit was that the right of veto became firmly established in Community cooperation. The Treaty of Rome remains in effect and cannot be altered or abrogated without unanimity and the involvement of the national parliaments. The timetable for Union is, in my opinion, even less realistic than before Milan. No, colleagues, I think that all true Europeans present here must realize that it could have boosted optimism in Europe as to the future of Europe if the Milan Summit had instead chosen the pragmatic way, within the existing treaties, with regard to the main points reviewed by Mr Delors in the conclusions to his speech.

We Danish Social Democrats must therefore say 'no' to the Spinelli report, and I have to point out, for the benefit of Mr Spinelli in particular, that the Community is still bound by and dependent on decisions taken by the democratically elected national parlia-

Christiansen

ments and governments, not on those taken in this European Assembly.

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Moves towards political union are simply not realistic until a true economic union exists. This Commission White Paper on completing the internal market is documentary proof of how far we are from achieving a true, single internal market.

Hindrances are frequently caused by those Member States pushing hardest for political union. Which Member States are resisting moves towards lower air-fares? Which Member States are refusing to allow a free market in financial services, especially insurance? How will majority voting help to bring these things about, given the entrenched interests of which my colleague, Sir Fred Catherwood, spoke earlier? Which member States are measuring the contents of vehicle fuel tanks at frontiers? Which are insisting on lorry quotas? Which Member States recently refused to allow a small and overdue reduction in grain prices?

These States are the ones who are lacking in the true European spirit. They are the guilty ones standing in the way of that economic unity which is the necessary precursor of political union. The report from the Committee on Institutional Affairs under the name of Mr Spinelli ignores this reality. I shall therefore vote against it.

Mr Bonde (ARC). — *(DA)* Mr President, there may indeed be some who lack the European spirit. On the other hand there are others who lack the democratic spirit. When the Danish Prime Minister arrived in Milan on Thursday evening, he did not have the Franco-German document which was to be discussed and which some wanted to have adopted the same weekend. He had to send a messenger up to the Palace to get the document; he was only able to get it in French, not in his own language. Some of the texts adopted in Milan were adopted in a form which does not yet exist in Danish translation. Thus all Members of this Parliament from Denmark are obliged, on the basis of widely differing electoral programmes, to vote against the Union Conference. If this happens — and it is to be hoped that it will — we shall all be in line with the two resolutions adopted by the Folketing in opposition to the Union plans and, if the plans are nevertheless adopted, there will be a new situation in Denmark, which will consign the old difference between the pro-EEC and anti-EEC factions to history, for the question then will be: who is for incorporation in the Union and who wants a different form of association with the Community?

Mr Huckfield (S). — I shall be voting against this report. Indeed, I have voted already against amendments to it, because I believe that any amendment to this report to make it more acceptable or more palatable is equally dangerous. I say that in the knowledge

that there will be Conservatives in this House, Members of the European Democratic Group, who, if they vote for these proposals, will in fact be voting against the express wishes of their own government. I hope that colleagues in this House will take very careful note of that.

What this report purports to do is to take away powers from the Member States' own parliaments. However, our constituents look to their Member State's own Parliament to protect their interests.

I think it cannot be denied that the entire economic and social life-blood of areas like the ones that we represent has already been sucked away by membership of the European Economic Community. What this report seeks to do is to give a political underwriting and a political endorsement to those procedures and to that grievous loss.

It is very interesting to note who the multinational corporations and the business interests are that have written to me asking for my support for this report. What is good for the multinational corporations in my constituency is not good for my constituents. On those grounds I shall vote wholeheartedly and with enthusiasm against this report.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — Unlike the Labour dinosaurs, one of whom has just spoken, I shall be voting in favour of this report with, I suspect, the majority of my colleagues.

(Applause)

Mr Prag (ED). — I shall be voting for this report, and I would like to stress that, whatever impression may be given by the number of explanations of vote, from the voting and from my position here it has been quite clear that a large majority of my group have been voting for this resolution in a free vote.

I shall vote for the report because I believe that the Community's decision-making procedures must be reformed and the central blockage to progress removed.

Secondly, binding procedures are essential to break the log-jam. Pious wishes for greater political will have not achieved anything so far and will not achieve anything in the future.

Thirdly, if European political cooperation were to be formalized outside the Community framework and if there were to be a structure for technological research and coordination outside the Community framework, the undermining of the Community would continue.

Fourthly and finally, I shall vote for this resolution because this Community must become not only more

Prag

efficient but also more democratic. I am firmly against a two-speed Europe and dislike paragraph 10, but we cannot, for that reason, put off for ever the decisions needed to make the European Community work effectively and democratically.

(Applause)

Mr Pearce (ED). — We are at a rather important moment in Europe's development. We know where the Socialists are. They want out of Europe because it stops their own plans for an anti-democratic future for our continent. The rest of us know that the Community is the only way forward to build prosperity and full employment and, indeed, to maintain peace.

However, in the democratic half of this House, there are two ways of proceeding to the future. One is by tinkering with the rules, by constitutional engineering such as that advocated in this report. Many of the people who advocate this — I must say — are people who are not really in touch with opinion amongst the ordinary people of our continent or with practical political realities.

The second way forward is to continue the argument on practical issues until we can move forward to evolve the system by the consent of our people. I say, let us put the law books down. Let us get out amongst ordinary people and do better with the organization that we have got.

For that reason I shall vote against.

Mr C. Beazley (ED), in writing. — I shall vote for this report believing, as I do, that progress towards a harmonious and united Europe is a question of the greatest political necessity. The United Kingdom has suffered from the failure to join the Community at its foundation and now, a Member State for 12 years, it is essential that Britain continues to play a leading role in the process of evolving a more effective method of conducting its affairs.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE), in writing. — *(IT)* Much has been written and much has been said about what comes after Milan. We can however state that, in the crisis that is currently affecting the building of Europe and the functioning of its institutions, the European Council has courageously taken decisions in Milan that will decisively influence the development of the Community.

The fact that the decisions were taken by a majority vote and not unanimously may be a source of dissatisfaction for some governments, but there is no doubt that the result of the decision must meet with the approval of those who believe in the fundamental values of European Union.

The calling of an intergovernmental conference with a broad mandate is something that must call for immediate reflection and proposals by those whom I would call the principal actors in the process of European development — I refer to the European institutions.

I turn first of all to the Commission, which is rightly called the guardian of the Treaties, and I consider that its participation in the conference should be prepared in advance through a process of agreement with the Parliament, so that the two institutions assume on a basis of full collaboration those political responsibilities that the situation demands.

Our Parliament must in turn insist that the intergovernmental conference shall not degenerate into proposals merely for political collaboration between governments, which would constitute a step backward that would be politically fatal for the European Union that our citizens call for, and which the most enlightened statesmen of our countries have singled out as being the only possibility for the salvation of our western civilisation, our European culture and our best traditions.

We know that the overwhelming majority of the populations that we represent here are in favour of the political, economic and social integration, once and for all, of the countries that make up our Community.

However, they have not yet had a chance to express themselves directly in regard to the final political decisions involved in European integration.

We must therefore consider whether, at whatever time is considered most suitable, we ought to think of organizing a large referendum throughout Europe, to ask whether our citizens are prepared to respond positively to the request that we proceed definitely to the political, economic and social integration of Europe, thus creating that Union which our Parliament has already voted in favour of by a very large majority.

I am convinced that if that question were put to them clearly, it would receive a favourable vote far beyond our imagination.

Mr Christensen (ARC), in writing. — *(DA)* The Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community voted for a number of Greek amendments aimed at substantially diluting this wide-ranging report on Union. These motions have all been rejected. The People's Movement has also systematically protested in the Committee on Institutional Affairs over the fact that the motion for a resolution and the motions for amendments were not available in all the official languages when they were discussed, in violation of the Rules of Procedure.

It is symptomatic of the kind of Union they want to force on us. The Danish People's Movement against

Christensen

Membership of the European Community notes that its representative in the Committee was alone in presenting the views in opposition to a political union made known by the Danish Folketing.

We vote against the proposed resolution because it builds upon the Union idea, which the vast majority of the Danish people reject. We vote against it because it is formulated in terms which seek to confer power on the European Parliament and, finally, we vote against it because the discussion of the motion in the Committee was illegal.

If this resolution is adopted, Parliament will have declared war on Denmark and other countries in the Community which are opposed to the development on Union desired by the majority in Parliament.

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) We think that European public opinion is right to deplore the fact that at the Milan Summit Conference no consensus was reached regarding the requisite decisions for specific steps towards a European Union.

We believe that one of the basic reasons for the delay is that both the Milan agenda and the content of some of the proposals that appeared contained negative points which did not respond to the spirit of the European Parliament's well known decision based on the Spinelli plan. We also believe that not even the best institutional solutions can acquire real value so long as the policy to be followed by the Community remains unclear, especially in relation to the economic priorities and the harmonious development of the Community as a whole.

In truth, the very acute problem of the Community's 13 million unemployed was ignored. There were no integrated proposals for the development of new common policies. The regional dimension and the problem of converging the economies were also almost ignored. But what we want to stress most of all is that even the slightest hint about increasing the budget and the Community's own resources was conspicuously absent.

Colleagues, we must not delude ourselves. If the political will for harmonious development of the Community and for bold steps forward really existed, this should have been manifested by a budgetary increase 2 to 2.5 times as large as the present one. And it is quite clear that, for example, the completion of the derestriction of the internal market by 1992 without at the same time having even a remotely sufficient budget, and consequently without any effective new common policies, will neither eliminate the gap between Europe and its American and Japanese competitors, nor reduce, but on the contrary widen the chasm between the richer and poorer countries and regions within the Community, while ultimately the full burden of the crisis will continue to fall on the shoulders of working

people, with increased unemployment and a decline in their standard of living and quality of life.

Mr President, we agree with almost everything in the Spinelli report, and we will vote in favour of it. However, we believe that the threat it contains, of a two-rate Europe, is negative and must be eliminated. Because it strikes mainly at the symptoms and not at the root cause of the disease.

Mr Colocotronis (S), in writing. — (GR) In a few words, I would like to clarify the intention of my vote with a brief comment on what seem to me to be the main points to have emerged from the Milan Conference.

Now that the European Community is trying to define its attitude in the direction of substantial changes, it is appropriate to take a clear look at the institutional, political and economic issues that affect all our countries, and especially those with severe and acute problems, each for their own reasons.

It is indeed time to begin reviewing the Treaty of Rome, and I concur with this effort when its aim is to safeguard the interests of countries with a low level of economic development, such as my own country, Greece. The formation of the internal market must be combined with specific measures for the convergence of the economies, with support for the structural policies that will bring economic development to my country. This implies appropriate investment in the less well developed countries of the South.

I also concur with this procedure when it secures for my country the right to develop its own foreign and defence policy, because Greece has special and distinct problems related to her independence, Cyprus, the Aegean, and more generally to peace in her area.

The right to veto must be preserved, and it is not right to combine the increased authority of the Community's bodies with any decline in the role of the national parliaments.

With these thoughts in mind, I shall vote against the Spinelli report.

Mr Marshall (ED), in writing. — It is a tragedy that the French and German Governments, by the discourteous and tardy tabling of their proposals, succeeded in making agreement at Milan more difficult. It is a further tragedy that Members of this House seem determined to compound this error by sticking to the Spinelli proposals of 1984. Those individuals are adopting a 'head-in-the-sands' approach. The Spinelli report is in effect dead, and it is high time this House recognized that fact.

Talk of a two-speed Europe, as contained in this resolution, is an insult to the peoples of Greece, Denmark

Marshall

and Britain, who have indicated that they will not agree to these changes. In parenthesis, can I ask those who talk of a two-speed Europe which country allows the free movement of capital? Which country has delayed the adoption on an insurance directive? Which countries oppose the liberalization of air fares? Those who advocate a two-speed Europe in political affairs should not be in the slow lane when it comes to economic advance.

What is clear is that many of the changes necessary in Europe do not need an amendment of the Treaty. They require the rules of the Treaty to be observed.

Before the Milan Summit the British Government produced proposals for improving decision-making in the Community and for closer political cooperation. These proposals should have been accepted in Milan. I believe they will form the basis for any advance. They are practical and workmanlike. They — and not the Spinelli report — deserve our support.

Mr Turner (ED), in writing. — I welcome the Council's approval and endorsement of the Commission's Memorandum 'Towards a European Technology Community' (COM(85)350 final). I hope this means that the Council accepts that the Community is to be the channel for initiating policies and projects. Members of the Energy Committee have just returned from a visit to the USA, where the overwhelming impression in government circles, universities and industries is of the all-embracing and comprehensive effect of large US Government funds (whether for defence, space, or whatever) on civil industry. These can create a whole generation of new technologists and build up R & D facilities. The long-term effect on Europe would be irreversible.

Therefore new proposals for positive R & D projects to prime the pump of European technology to be carried out by the various alternative means put forward in the Commission Memorandum are vital, and I support such proposals so long as the Community is to be a substantial vehicle for them. But in addition a common European response is necessary to the US SDI Programme. Already US recruiting agents are visiting European universities and companies on behalf of the SDI projects. It would be a disaster if European universities and companies were picked off one by one. Many SDI projects will be of little interest civilly, but some projects will involve vital civil effects for European industry and in many of these the USA will be dependent on European expertise and technical facilities. In the case of such projects, Europe must respond as one so as to obtain a proper proportional share of decision-making, management and use of technology produced. This is in line with paragraph 5 of the urgent resolution in the names of myself, Messrs Seligman, Prag, Herman, Poniatowski and Ducarme and Mrs Veil on behalf of the ED, EPP and Liberal Groups, Amendment No 1 replacing Docs. B 2-497/

85, B 2-463/85 and B 2-454/85, which states: 'Believes that cooperation and coordination with American projects are necessary to ensure effective coordination of all European participation (whether by governments, universities, research institutes or companies) so as to ensure a proper share for European policy-making, management and access to technical information.'

*
* *

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

10. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament

President. — The next item is the statement by the Commission of the European Communities on the action taken by it on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament.²

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) I would like to make a clarificatory statement. The Commission's statement of 13th June concerning the amendments relating to the Regulation on the IMP's contained a number of errors. Specifically, amendments number 29, 30, 53, 37, 28, 45 and 69, which the European Parliament did not vote for, should not have been mentioned in the statement. The remainder still stands, i.e. so far as amendments 1, 7, 8 and 17 are concerned the Commission agrees with the view that they express, while appreciating that they depart from the text of Council's Regulation, so that there was no need to restate them. In addition, the Commission confirms that it agrees with amendments 4, 6, 20, 21 and 23.

Mr Pranchère (COM). — (FR) I have a question to put to the Commission on the report by Mr De Pasquale on the IMPs which was adopted at the Strasbourg part-session. The rapporteur was rightly worried about the levying of credits for the IMPs from the structural funds, fearing that other regions, non-Mediterranean regions, might be penalized. I entirely share his view, and that is the object of my question to the Commission: can it assure me that the implementation of the IMPs will not penalize other operations using the structural funds, especially the integrated operations for which the preparatory studies have now been concluded? This is true, in particular, of France.

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1/corr., 2/corr., 14, 19 to 21 and 49;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 6 to 13, 18, 23 to 27 and 29 to 48.

² See Annex.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) One of the amendments accepted by the Commission is that interventions by the Regional Fund should continue normally, i.e. not to the detriment of activities other than those relating to the IMP's. Consequently, I can assure the Honourable Member that he need not worry on that score.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — I welcome the Commission's willingness to sign the Council of Europe's Convention on the Protection of Vertebrate Animals used for Experimental and other Scientific Purposes. I also welcome the Commission's statement that it is in complete agreement with this Parliament that the Community should formulate legislation of its own. How soon can we expect such legislation to be submitted? Perhaps the Commission could even give us a precise date on which this will happen?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) In the document circulated to all the Honourable Members it is stated that this will be done as soon as possible. Unfortunately, I am not in a position today, to tell you exactly when 'as soon as possible' might be.

Mr Wurtz (COM). — (F) Our Assembly has adopted a resolution which called on the Commission to transfer to the fifth European Development Fund, at the end of this year, the balance not yet allocated by that date, namely 13.58 million ECU from the third EDF — which have still not been allocated specifically — plus 34.86 million ECU which have not yet been paid.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) I note the Honourable Member's question. I am not in a position to answer at this time, but will certainly answer him in writing in due course.

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — (NL) During the June part-session Parliament adopted a resolution that called on the Commission to assist an area of East Flanders in Belgium which had been hit by a natural disaster. It was also asked to reclassify this area as a development zone. May I ask the Commission how and over what period assistance can be given to the area affected by this natural disaster. I have read that no emergency aid was allocated within the Community in June.

Can the Commission tell me whether this assistance will be provided shortly, in July?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Unfortunately I cannot answer that either. I just want to say that the question relates to a resolution by Parliament, and not to an opinion concerning a regulation, so that the matter it raises does not come within the scope of this debate. However, once again I shall submit an answer in writing.

Mr Cryer (S). — On page 8 the statement mentions several sums of money being given as emergency aid for third countries. Several of those sums are itemized in footnote 1, which says that: 'These three decisions are part of a 19 450 000 ECU logistic support plan for internal transport of the aid.' The plan includes aid to Ethiopia, the Sudan and Mali for transport, which is a very welcome move.

Could the Commissioner say whether this means that some of the massive cereal mountain, currently more than 5 million tonnes, in Community stocks will actually be moved to some of the starving people of the world? It appears from the figures given on page 9 that only 9000 tonnes of cereal have actually been released. Really, we should be giving aid in the form of cereals and indeed of any other food we can give. Surely that should be one of the aims of the Commission, and does the transport grant indicate that is going to be one of them?

Mr Natali, Vice-president of the Commission. — (IT) I should like to tell the honourable Member that, on the basis also of a check *in loco*, it has been ascertained that the supplies of cereals to the countries hit by famine correspond as far as quantity is concerned to the objective requirements.

Our commitment, as he reminded us, is now to endeavour to develop the means of transport, and to get cargoes landed at the local ports which are at present blocked up. The honourable Member is of the opinion that we should increase the amount of cereals. I think that, at the present time, that would not be the right decision, on the basis of the information in our possession.

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) I too would like to go back to the comments made by Mr Pranchère on the structural funds and the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes.

I would like to ask the Commission the following: how is it that it is clearly indicated in the guidelines of the Social Fund for 1986-88 that projects undertaken in the framework of the IMPs will be financed from the Social Fund? Is that not in itself a kind of diversion of the structural funds in favour of the IMPs?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) This is one of the priorities set by the Social Fund, but it does not exclude other priorities. That is the best answer I can give.

Mr Seligman (ED). — On the animal experimentation question, Mr Delors' letter to Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on 4 April said that the proposal would be ready by the end of May or June. It is now July with the summer recess coming, and I feel that reply was therefore not satisfactory. I would like to know whether more

Seligman

pressure will be brought to bear. Will the Commissioner commit himself to bringing more pressure to bear to bring that proposal out more quickly?

Two other quick questions: which Commissioner is responsible or is going to be responsible for this directive, or will it be Mr Delors himself? Secondly, the Commission statement says: 'the whole question of animal protection should be treated in all its aspects in a single directive.' Does this mean that the directive will go outside pure animal experimentation and cover the whole question of animal protection?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) The time required by the Commission to reach a decision, which I cannot predict exactly, will be considerable because there must first be a careful study of all the national legislations. As soon as this survey has been completed the relevant action will be taken, and I can assure the Honourable Member that we will act as speedily as possible. The Member responsible for the matter you have raised is Mr Clinton Davis.

President. — I thank the Commission for its answers. Now, ladies and gentlemen, the House has put itself in great difficulty by reason of the fact that the vote on the motion for a resolution from the Committee on Institutional Affairs and the ensuing short debate on the statements by the European Commission took exactly 90 minutes, the very 90 minutes that had been set aside for Question Time.

Earlier today in this Chamber the spokesmen for the various groups were very forthright about the fact that they definitely wanted the group meetings to start at 7 p.m. That makes me hesitate to suggest to you that instead of holding the group meetings we should prolong the sitting. On the other hand Question Time was on the agenda, and that is something to which Parliament has a right. Thus we are clearly in a very difficult position. I should like therefore to hear the views of the House as to how we should now proceed. Please make it very brief, so that we can possibly arrive at a proposal that I can put to the House.

Mr Elliott (S). — I think it is important that political group meetings should continue. Indeed, they are already started, I think. I therefore don't think we could carry on with Question Time now. So many people who have put questions will not be able to be here and it would be a farce. But I must say that I can't believe that we should risk losing Question Time. I therefore urge that it be rescheduled as part of the business of Parliament later in the week, and not too late either.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Regretfully, Mr President, I would agree with what has just been said. The House is so empty and the political groups have

decided that they want to have their meetings this evening at 7 o'clock. Indeed, as you can see, they have almost all gone. To reschedule Question Time is almost an impossibility with such a crowded agenda as we have got. I suppose the only time really is on Friday morning, which would seem a sensible time to have Question Time — that is, if the Commission can bear to be here on the Friday.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) I want to stress how difficult it is for the Commission to be here on Friday morning. Today eight Commissioners are present, ready to answer questions. Of course, if any one Commissioner could undertake to answer all the questions, that would be possible, but I fear that the debate would not be as satisfactory as when all the responsible Commissioners are present.

President. — I do not think it is necessary to spend much longer discussing this question, especially in view of the small number of Members that are still here present. I am going to put a proposal to you and I would ask you to make up your minds quickly on it with a brief 'yes' or 'no'.

The procedure that I would propose to the House is that the Chair should make a proposal to you tomorrow about how the Question Time that should have been held today can be fitted into this week's agenda. Obviously, this will have to be followed by numerous contacts and consultations so that the most suitable time for all concerned can be arrived at. Finally, the Chair would be able to put a proposal before the House upon which it could then decide.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — With respect, Mr President, I think that the President should undertake now to make a statement tomorrow morning at, say, 9 o'clock or half-past-nine, whenever you prefer. But do not wait for the question to come from the floor. It is for the Presidency to make the statement at, if you like, 10 o'clock.

President. — That is exactly what I was proposing, that the Presidency would make a statement tomorrow morning proposing to the House at what time the Question Time which should have been held today will be held.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Mr President, I should like, on behalf of my colleagues, to offer our apologies to the Commission, who have come here with answers, who were prepared to give those answers and who are not going to give them because we have made a mess of our agenda. Can I ask the Bureau of this Parliament never again to expect a statement from the Commission, a vote on an important report and Question Time all to take place in the space of 90 minutes. It is a

Marshall

mathematical and physical impossibility, and we are shamed by our own incompetence.

(Applause)

President. — May I remind you, Mr Marshall, that it was not the Bureau but the Assembly itself which decided to have this vote before Question Time. So if there is any shame to be felt, I think we all share it.

Mr Ducarme (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, if the debate goes on much longer, it would mean we could have had Question Time during the time we have been speaking. I would therefore suggest that we keep exactly to your proposal and meet tomorrow morning to fix a time. After what has just been said by our col-

league, I think it might be useful during the appropriate consultations for you to consult the Commission to find out whether it does in fact agree to be present on Friday morning. That is the decent thing to do.

President. — I would not want Members to miss both Question Time and their group meetings. Therefore, I am now going to ask you for your approval of the suggestion I have just made, namely, that the Presidency will propose to the House tomorrow morning a time for Question Time to be held.

(Parliament agreed to the suggestion)

(The sitting was closed at 7.15 p.m.)¹

¹ *Topical and urgent debate (announcement) — Statement by a Member — Agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.*

ANNEX

**COMMISSION ACTION ON EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT OPINIONS ON
COMMISSION PROPOSALS DELIVERED AT THE MAY AND JUNE 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 May and June 1985 part-sessions, and of disaster aid granted.

Reports adopted by Parliament in May which were included in the June "Commission Action" paper do not appear here unless there have been subsequent developments.

This paper also covers a report adopted at the April part-session in respect of which the Commission adopted an amendment to its original proposal in early June.

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

A. In connection with the following reports the Commission has adopted amended versions of its original proposals which incorporate the proposed amendments it accepted at the plenary sitting.

1. Report by Mr Schmid, adopted on 7 May (EP A 2-1777/84), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive on limiting the placing on the market and the use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (2nd PCB/PCT directive) (COM(84)513 final)

The amendments serve to specify that:

- (a) Member States are to take all requisite measures to ensure termination of the use of PCB/PCT by 31 December 1985 at the latest,
- (b) the use of PCB/PCT as starting or intermediate substances for the conversion of other products would be accepted up to 31 December 1989 at the latest,
- (c) information concerning the maintenance and use of equipment containing PCB/PCT had to be given on the labels of the equipment.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14 March 1985, pp 246-248

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 15 March 1985, Part II, pp 22-23; Minutes of 7 May 1985, Part II, pp 2-3

2. Report by Mrs Banotti, adopted on 17 April (EP 2-2/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a draft recommendation on social security for volunteer development workers (COM(84)710 final)

The amendments are intended in particular to:

- (a) emphasize the needs of the Third World,
- (b) specify that volunteer development workers must be "properly qualified",
- (c) make it clear that the workers may be sent out by non-governmental organizations or be directly recruited by the governments of Third World countries,
- (d) incorporate training periods prior to the departure of volunteer workers in the periods to be regarded as equivalent for the purpose of unemployment benefits.

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, Part II, pp 1-8
 Amended Commission proposal: COM(85)260 final, 3 June 1985

B. At the time of the Council's deliberations the Commission made amendments to proposals that had already been considered by Parliament in the following reports:

1. Report by Mr De Pasquale, adopted on 13 June (EP A 2-49/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a regulation on Integrated Mediterranean Programmes (COM(85)180 final)

The amendments relate in particular to:

- (a) the IMP approval procedure,
- (b) the greater importance to be accorded to small and medium-sized undertakings, cooperatives and craft industries.

The Commission also repeated, and had accepted by the Council, that the regional authorities, empowered by the Member States, were to play an active role in the preparation and implementation of IMPs.

On 25 June the Council, acting on proposals from the Commission, adopted a common position on the IMP regulation.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 13 June 1985, pp 255-257, p 271

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 13 June 1985, Part II, pp 76-90

2. Report by Mrs Schleicher, adopted on 10 May (EP A 2-26/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a draft resolution concerning a European Community action programme on toxicology for health protection purposes (COM(84)248 final)

Further information concerning experiments on animals

In its resolution closing the consultation procedure on the toxicology action programme the European Parliament referred to its previous resolution (of 24 May 1984) on the limitation of experiments on animals and the protection of laboratory animals and asked the Commission to present a proposal for a directive to this end rapidly.

As previously stated during discussion of the June "Commission Action" paper, the Commission departments have been working on this for a long time, they are going through the very varied rules currently applied in the Member States and are endeavouring to coordinate their work with what is being done by the Council of Europe.

In February 1985 the Commission asked the Council for a brief to negotiate with the Council of Europe with a view to the Community becoming a party to the Convention for the Protection of Vertebrate Animals used for Experimental and other Scientific Purposes. On 31 May 1985 the 21 member countries of the Council of Europe adopted the new Convention, which was made open for signature. The text adopted provides for the participation of the European Communities. The Commission will be presenting a proposal for a Council decision as soon as possible authorizing the signing of this Convention by the Community and a request from the Council to the Member States asking them to sign the Convention at the same time as the Community.

In its resolution of 24 May 1984 Parliament stated that it was not enough for the Community to be party to the (future) Council of Europe Convention and that it ought to formulate legislation of its own. This view is fully shared by the Commission. The Commission considers that over and above the provisions contained in the several directives on animal nutrition, pesticides and pesticide residues, feedingstuff additives, chemical products, veterinary matters, cosmetics and toxicology, and the specific references in some of the

research programmes, the whole question of animal protection should be treated in all its aspects in a single directive.

The directive which is to be proposed to the Council and Parliament very shortly is not intended to take the place of the Council of Europe Convention but rather, on the contrary, to ensure that with the entry into force of the directive effect will be given to the provisions of the Convention. Some parts of the directive will also be specific to the Community, to meet the needs of the common market and the disquiet expressed by Parliament and public opinion.

- C. In respect of 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 plenary sitting debates:

1. Report by Mrs Schleicher, adopted on 14 June (EP A 2-53/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to deepfrozen foodstuffs intended for human consumption (COM(84)489 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14 June 1985, pp 308-309

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 14 June 1985, Part II, pp 30-38

2. Report by Mr Seligman, adopted on 14 June (EP A 2-36/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a regulation concerning a support programme for technological development in the field of oil and natural gas (COM(84)658 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 13 June 1985, pp 278-279

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 14 June 1985, Part II, pp 11-14

II. *Commission proposals in respect of which Parliament did not request formal amendment*

1. Further report by Mrs Schleicher, adopted on 14 June (EP A 2-57/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive on the limitation of emissions of pollutants into the air from large combustion plants (drafted following presentation of the amended proposal) (COM(85)47 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14 June 1985, p 314

Text of resolution adopted by EP: Minutes of 14 June 1985, Part II, pp 39-40

2. Report by Mrs Squarcialupi, adopted on 14 June (EP A 2-52/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive laying down the list of simulants to be used for testing migration of constituents of plastic materials and articles intended to come into contact with foodstuffs (COM(84)152 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14 June 1985, pp 316-317

Text of resolution adopted by EP: Minutes of 14 June 1985, Part II, pp 41-43

3. Report by Mr Turner, adopted on 14 June (EP A 2-58/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a decision on preparatory action for a Community research and development programme in the field of telecommunications technologies — R & D in advanced communications technologies for Europe (RACE) — Definition phase of RACE programme (COM(85)113 final + /2, COM(84)145 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 13 June 1985, pp 282-283

Text of resolution adopted by EP: Minutes of 14 June 1985, Part II, pp 15-16

4. Report by Mrs Lentz-Cornette, adopted on 14 June (EP A 2-56/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive on health and veterinary

problems connected with the importation of meat products from third countries (COM(84)530 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 14 June 1985, p 318

Text of resolution adopted by EP: Minutes of 14 June 1985, Part II, pp 44-45

5. Report by Mrs Weber, adopted on 14 June (EP A 2-59/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council for a directive amending Directive 72/461/EEC on health problems affecting intra-Community trade in fresh meat and Directive 72/462/EEC on health and veterinary problems upon importation of bovine animals and swine and fresh meat from third countries (COM(85)57 final)

Report without debate

Text of resolution adopted by EP: Minutes of 14 June 1985, Part II, p 1

6. Report by Mrs Weber, adopted on 14 June (EP A 2-60/85), on the Commission proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 3626/82 on the implementation in the Community of the Convention on international trade in endangered species of wild fauna and flora (COM(85)128 final)

Report without debate

Text of resolution adopted by EP: Minutes of 14 June 1985, Part II, p 2

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

Report by Mr Mertens, adopted on 10 June (EP A 2-23/85), on the Commission proposal to the Council 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 (COM(84)445 final)

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 10 May 1985, p 303

Text of proposal adopted by EP: Minutes of 10 June 1985, Part II, pp 1-10

IV. *Emergency aid granted in June*

Emergency aid within the Community

Nil

Emergency aid for third countries

Financial aid

<i>Country</i>	<i>Sum (ECU)</i>	<i>Reason</i>	<i>Distributed by</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
Niger ¹	250 000	famine	WFP	7. 6. 85
Burkina-Faso		(Dublin		
Mali		plan)		
Chad				
Sudan				
Ethiopia				
Mozambique				

¹ These three decisions are part of a 19 450 000 ECU logistic support plan for internal transport of the aid. 17 800 000 ECU, left over from previous operations and reallocated, have been apportioned as follows:

Ethiopia: 8 million ECU

Sudan: 8 million ECU

Mali: 800 000 ECU

to be decided: 1 million ECU.

Mali	750 000	“	government	11. 6. 85
Mauritania	1 000 000	“	Nave de la Pace (Italian Red Cross)	7. 6. 85
Niger				
Mali				
Chad				
Mozambique				
Ethiopia				
Sudan				
Niger ^{1 2}	1 500 000	“	government Caritas Niger Unicef Niger Red Cross WFP	7. 6. 85
Mali ¹	400 000	“	(Swiss relief corps)	27. 6. 85
Lebanon	500 000	recent events	ICRC (Lebanese Red Cross) UNRWA	11. 6. 85

Food aid

1. On 6 June, after the Food Aid Committee had delivered a favourable opinion on 5 June, the Commission decided to make the following allocations of *food aid*:

<i>Country</i>	<i>Quantity (t)</i>	<i>Product</i>
Mauritania	500	skimmed milk powder
	200	butteroil
Cape Verde	300	skimmed milk powder
	100	butteroil
Niger	200	skimmed milk powder
Djibouti	4 000	cereals
Honduras	800	skimmed milk powder
Nicaragua	5 000	cereals
	1 800	skimmed milk powder
	300	butteroil
	500	vegetable oils
	3 500	beans

Amendment of a Commission food aid decision

On 3 July 1984, after the Food Aid Committee had delivered a favourable opinion, the Commission decided to allocate 40 000 tonnes of cereals of Sri Lanka. This has now been reduced to 30 000 tonnes.

Food aid substitute project

This project comes under the regulation approved by the Council in 1984 which provides, in certain circumstances, for financial support for agriculture and food develop-

¹ These three decisions are part of a 19 450 000 ECU logistic support plan for internal transport of the aid. 17 800 000 ECU, left over from previous operations and reallocated, have been apportioned as follows:

Ethiopia: 8 million ECU

Sudan: 8 million ECU

Mali: 800 000 ECU

to be decided: 1 million ECU.

² including 1 million ECU under the logistic support plan.

ment projects to be granted in place of food aid. Since 1974 Honduras has been receiving considerable assistance from the Community in the form of financial and technical cooperation and food aid.

The cereal harvest this last year has enabled the country to become temporarily self-sufficient, thanks in particular to favourable weather conditions. As Honduras could have received 5 000 tonnes of cereals in food aid the Commission has decided to allocate an equivalent sum (1 600 000 ECU) to this project.

The substitute action project will make it possible:

- (i) thanks to the supply of farm inputs, to ease the balance of payments;
 - (ii) to contribute to the economic and social development of Honduras, as the counterpart funds from the sale of the inputs on the local market will be used to finance projects to improve the living conditions of the most deprived portions of the population.
2. During this period the Commission also decided to make the following allocations of *emergency food aid*:
- 6 June: 70 tonnes skimmed milk powder for the World Council of Churches for distribution in Lebanon
 - 24 June: 200 tonnes butteroil and
370 tonnes beans for Christian Aid for distribution in Mozambique.

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 10 JULY 1985

Contents

Mr Pannella	88	9. <i>Welcome</i>	112
1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Ulburghs; Mr Cassidy; Mr Rogalla</i>	88	10. <i>Luxembourg Presidency: Council Statement</i> <i>— Oral questions, with debate, to the Foreign Ministers by Mr Poettering and others (Docs. B 2-594/85 and B 2-595/85):</i> <i>Mr Poos (Council); Mr Poettering; Mr Poos (Foreign Ministers); Mr Abens, Mr Estgen; Mr Prag; Mr Segre; Mrs Veil; Mr Lalor; Mrs Piermont; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Hänsch; Mr Penders; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Christensen; Mr Newens; Mr Poos (Council); Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Alavanos; Mr Mallet; Mr Iversen; Mr Filinis; Mr Poos; Sir James Scott-Hopkins</i>	113
2. <i>Agenda:</i> <i>Mr Rogalla</i>	89	11. <i>Question-time (Doc. B 2-627/85):</i> <i>Questions to the Council:</i>	
3. <i>Vandalism and violence in sport — Interim report by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (Doc. A 2-70/85):</i> <i>Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mr Mattina; Mr Brok; Mr McMillan-Scott; Mr Barzanti; Mrs Ewing; Mr Verbeek; Mr Almirante; Mr Ulburghs; Mrs Buchan; Mrs De Baker-Van Ocken; Mrs Jepsen; Mr Flanagan; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Selva; Mr Glinne; Mr Ducarme; Mr Cassidy; Mrs Dury; Mr Ducarme; Mr Sutherland (Commission); Mr Stewart</i>	89	• <i>Question No 72, by Mrs Banotti: European information centre on stolen works of art:</i> <i>Mr Poos (Council); Mr Hughes</i>	137
4. <i>EEC-Hong Kong economic and trade relations — Report by Mr Seeler (Doc. A 2-54/85):</i> <i>Mr Seeler; Mr Zahorka; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr De Clercq (Commission)</i>	101	• <i>Question No 74, by Mr Mac Sharry: Success of the Danish economy:</i> <i>Mr Poos; Mr MacSharry; Mr Poos; Mr Fich; Mr Poos; Mr Marshall</i>	138
5. <i>Trade cooperation between the EEC and the People's Republic of China — Report by Mr Hindley (Doc. A 2-74/85):</i> <i>Mr Hindley; Mr Bombard; Mr Zahorka; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Rossetti; Mr Fanton; Mr De Clercq (Commission)</i>	104	• <i>Question No 76, by Mr Elliott: Social Fund:</i> <i>Mr Poos; Mr Elliott; Mr Poos; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Poos; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Poos; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Poos</i>	139
6. <i>Customs debt — Report by Dame Shelagh Roberts (Doc. A 2-29/85):</i> <i>Dame Shelagh Roberts; Lord Cockfield (Commission)</i>	108	• <i>Question No 77, by Mr Marshall: Recognition of Israel by Spain:</i> <i>Mr Poos, Mr Marshall; Mr Poos</i>	140
7. <i>Repayment or remission of import or export duties — Report by Dame Shelagh Roberts (Doc. A 2-43/85):</i> <i>Dame Shelagh Roberts; Lord Cockfield (Commission)</i>	109	• <i>Question No 78, by Mr Fitzgerald: Emigration:</i> <i>Mr Poos; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Poos; Mr Balfe; Mr Poos</i>	140
8. <i>Trade with Taiwan — Report by Mr Van Aerssen (Doc. 2-1765/84):</i> <i>Mr Zarges; Mr Seeler; Mr De Clercq (Commission)</i>	110	• <i>Question No 79, by Mr Toksvig: European decision about siting of radiation synchrotron:</i> <i>Mr Poos; Mr Toksvig</i>	140

- Question No 81, by Mr Adamou: Payment of additional tuition fees by foreigners in Belgium:
Mr Poos; Mr Adamou; Mr Poos; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Poos 141
 - Question No 82, by Mr Raftery: Monetary Compensatory Amounts:
Mr Poos; Mr Raftery; Mr Poos 142
 - Question No 83, by Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou: Statements by the Austrian Government concerning the steps it proposes to take to reduce Community road transit traffic:
Mr Poos; Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou; Mr Poos; Mr Herman; Mr Poos 143
 - Question No 84, by Mr Romeo: Events in the Heysel Stadium in Brussels:
Mr Poos; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Poos; Mr Balfé; Mr Poos; Mr Patterson; Mr Adamou; Mr Poos 143
 - Question No 86, by Mr Deprez: Consequences of enlargement of the Community for the ECU:
Mr Poos; Mr Herman; Mr Poos; Mr Patterson; Mr Poos 144
 - Question No 90, by Mr Musso: Laissez-passer issued to Members of the European Parliament:
Mr Poos; Mr Musso; Mr Poos; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Poos 146
 - Question No 91, by Mr Van Miert: The Community's relations with Pakistan:
Mr Poos; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Poos; Mr Balfé; Mr Poos; Mr Zaborka; Mr Poos 146
- Questions to the Foreign Ministers:
- Question No 108, by Mr Raftery, and Question No 120, by Mr Marshall: Ethiopia:
Mr Poos (Foreign Ministers); Mr Raftery; Mr Poos; Mr Balfé; Mr Poos; Mr Kuijpers; Mr Poos; Mr Marshall; Mr Poos; Mrs Jackson; Mr Poos 147
 - Question No 109, by Mr Boutos: The European Community and the Balkans:
Mr Poos; Mr Boutos; Mr Poos; Mr Habsburg; Mr Poos 148
 - Question No 110, by Mr Tzounis: Development of new weapons systems by the Soviet Union in Europe:
Mr Poos; Mr Tzounis; Mr Poos; Mr Hughes; Mr Poos 149
 - Question No 111, by Mr Evrigenis: Common European stand on the Strategic Defence Initiative:
Mr Poos; Mr Evrigenis; Mr Poos; Mr Cryer; Mr Poos 150
 - Question No 112, by Mr Wurtz: Sanctions against South Africa:
Mr Poos; Mr Hindley; Mr Poos; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Poos; Mr Cryer; Lady Elles 150
12. Votes
- Mr Gerontopoulos; Mr Fajardie; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Anastassopoulos; Mr Adamou; Mr Filinis; Mrs Péry; Mr Patterson; Mr Nord; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Balfé; Mr Lomas; Mr Bøgh; Mr Croux; Mr Christiansen; Mr Pannella 151

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

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

Mr Pannella (NI). — *(IT)* Madam President, before we approve the minutes, I should like to recall that at the Enlarged Bureau yesterday President Veil raised the question of entry to our building by Members of the European Parliament. A request was made for the security teams to be of mixed composition, that is to say, made up of Luxembourg police and personnel from the Parliament, so that Members will not have to produce their passes two or three times. As I have again had the same experience and we are still at the

same point, I call on the Quaestors to take appropriate action.

1. Approval of the Minutes

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

Are there any comments?

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Madam President, may I ask you to have it recorded in the minutes that the small groups were unable to use up their speaking time yesterday. Their right to speak was not therefore fully respected.

President. — Mr Ulburghs, let us not get back upon what happened yesterday. The Chair made its decisions, and we cannot reopen a discussion on what has been laid down.

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Madam President, the point of order I wish to raise is that there are no voting-lists from yesterday, and many of us are rather anxious to see exactly who voted and how on the Spinelli resolution on the Milan Summit.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, the list is not yet available, but I assure you that it will be distributed as soon as possible.

(Parliament approved the Minutes)

Mr Rogalla (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, I presume that the minutes have now been approved. Nevertheless I have a query regarding item 14. It says that the President of today's sitting will submit a proposal concerning the time at which yesterday's question time is to be made good during the present part-session. Could you please tell me whether you already know when this will be, and whether you can tell us now if it will be some time today.

President. — Mr Rogalla, I was just about to make an announcement on the subject.

2. Agenda

President. — At the end of the sitting yesterday evening, the House decided not to take Question-time with questions to the Commission in order to allow the political group meetings to take place. The Chair undertook to submit to the House, at the beginning of today's sitting, a proposal for other arrangements for taking Question-time. Having conferred with the Commission, I should like to submit the following proposal:

Thursday, 11 July:

- from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m.: Question-time (questions to the Commission);
- from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 4 p.m.: Topical and urgent debate;
- 4 p.m.: continuation of the agenda as originally foreseen.

Before putting this proposal to the vote, I hasten to add that this is the only possibility there is for taking Question-time with questions to the Commission

during the present part-session, in view of the Commissioner's other commitments.

(Parliament adopted the proposal)

Mr Rogalla (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, we have just voted on the proposal, and I too voted in favour. Nevertheless I should be interested to know why the Bureau has cut the time for questions to the Commission by half an hour, since, if I understand correctly, it is to take place tomorrow from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m. and not, as would customarily be the case, from 10 a.m. to 11.30 a.m. Could you give me the reasoning behind this?

President. — Mr Rogalla, we agreed upon this change last night after having discussed the matter with the Commissioners for an hour and a half. We also have our order of business to get through, and so this was the only time we succeeded in settling upon. It goes without saying that at the September part-session we shall add the half-hour missing during this part-session. In this way, I hope that you will be in agreement.¹

3. Vandalism and violence in sport

President. — The next item is the interim report by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on vandalism and violence in sport (Doc. A 2-70/85).

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L), rapporteur. — *(NL)*

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, violence in sport is a disease. It is a virus that produces the same symptoms throughout Europe and far beyond. The Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport therefore decided to consider the subject of violence in sport a few months ago. The dreadful nightmare at the Heysel Stadium made it clear to everyone that it was two minutes to twelve and that the European Parliament must also react immediately, along with all the other bodies responsible. I wish to thank the members of the committee, the Secretariat, the interpreters and everyone else who has given his help quickly and unbureaucratically. Thanks to their efforts, the European Parliament is able to state its views a mere five weeks later on a whole series of measures that need to be taken without delay. The aim is not to abolish football or to exile it to some remote wasteland. No, the aim is to enable everyone to enjoy in safety a sport that can do so much to improve international relations and friendship.

¹ For items relating to texts of agreements forwarded by the Council and documents received, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

Larive-Groenendaal

The tyranny of the minority that terrorizes the majority can only be broken with practical preventive and restraining measures: a ban on the sale of alcohol, the confiscation of weapons, strict checks on the sale of tickets and on spectators, a ban on the admission of hooligans and the rapid imposition of tough penalties. Amendments have been tabled calling for the deletion of references to certain measures. What do we want? Yet more dead and injured, or safe football matches, where people can forget their daily worries, to which fathers and sons can go without concern, in the knowledge that well prepared policemen are present in sufficient numbers, in the knowledge that the stadia are equipped to ensure the safety of spectators, with supporters strictly segregated, with enough entrances and exits that can be opened and closed from a central point, with closed-circuit television so that hooligans can be quickly detected and removed, and in the knowledge that hooligans will be quickly and severely punished.

Your rapporteur is convinced that the public will not only approve of these measures but demand that they be taken in the interests of their safety. Otherwise their fear for their own and their children's lives will keep them away from the stadia. That would, incidentally, have far more serious financial implications for the football clubs than changing their stadia to meet European standards. The Belgians are also making it quite clear with their committee of inquiry that the proposed measures are not a luxury but an absolute necessity. Most of the measures we are proposing are not new but based on experience gained in various Member States. The Scots, for example, have brought football hooliganism under control with a very strict ban on alcohol under the 1980 Criminal Justice Act. Even the drivers of buses carrying supporters who have alcohol with them — they do not even need to be drunk — can be prosecuted. These measures have worked. So let us put an end to the situation in Europe where each country individually is trying to invent the wheel and at last start to learn from each other's experience. But, as Tolstoy said, making laws is easier than governing. Passing laws is not enough: they must also be enforced. Your rapporteur proposes that the proposed measures should be converted into a Community directive, because only a directive can ensure that they are all actually and uniformly taken in the ten, soon to be twelve, Member States and so prevent the hooligans from going where the rules are less strict, because they will then be the same everywhere.

The Council of Europe is to be congratulated on taking up the problem so quickly and laying sound political foundations for more detailed and more stringent legislation in the European Community. After all, unlike the draft convention of the Council of Europe, a directive must be incorporated into national legislation and must be monitored by the Commission, with the Court of Justice as the stick behind the door for the Member States that do not enforce it. And, with the work done by the Council of Europe as a basis and

in close consultation with the sports organizations concerned, the Commission could submit a proposal for a directive after the summer. This is our chance to show the citizens of Europe that Europe belongs to them and that it can react quickly and is not some amorphous organization.

There are indeed good signs that the Dutch Presidency, which will take over on 1 January 1986, is prepared to ensure that a Community directive is adopted quickly. The European Parliament has a duty to urge that early action be taken because the horrors of the Heysel Stadium will be quickly, far too quickly, forgotten and because of the tendency to get back to the business of day-to-day life far too soon. With the measures that have been proposed we shall come a good deal closer to limiting spectator violence on the football field because, as a German study shows, more than half of all German hooligans say: 'The stadium is the right place because you can do so much more there than in other places.' That will soon be a thing of the past. But we have not reached that stage yet. We must not fool ourselves. Unless structural measures are also taken in the longer term, the violence will simply move elsewhere. We shall only be fighting the symptoms. Your rapporteur therefore suggests that, after a thorough study has been made of the causes of the growing violence, based on a public hearing among other things, proposals for longer-term structural measures should be set out in a final report. The interim report already points the way and calls for a European programme of action involving an information campaign aimed at the general public, young people, schools and sport clubs and associations to persuade them of the need for fair play in sport. It also calls for more sports facilities for the general public, for sport to be a recognized subject at school, for a European sports year and for fair play prizes, not only for the individual sportsman or woman but also for a team and for sports clubs. And this brings me, ladies and gentlemen, to my concluding remarks.

Firstly, the time when governments and sports organizations could blame each other is over. Responsibility for tackling violence must be shared. Secondly, sport will continue to be channelled aggression as long as there are rules and as long as these rules are obeyed. But the development of sport has resulted in sports events being linked to economic, social and even political interests. The prestige attached to a European title, for example, means that the clubs participating in a competition want to succeed at any price and that the rules are therefore bent, that standards are dropping, that players break the rules in the knowledge that the referee will turn a blind eye and that managers urge their players to do their utmost because they know that they will lose their jobs if they do not get results. A heavy responsibility lies on the administrators of football clubs to call a halt to this trend because the violence began on the field. Violence on the field is catching and is imitated on the terraces. And, to be honest, I was therefore very pleased to see a tennis

Larive-Groenendaal

champion who is notorious for his bad manners literally having to give way to a young man whose behaviour is as exemplary as the way he plays.

As representatives of the peoples of Europe, ladies and gentlemen, the Members of the European Parliament have a duty to outlaw violence and hooliganism in sport. International sports events have a special contribution to make a better understanding and peace among the nations of Europe.

Mr Mattina (S). — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Italian Socialists and Social Democrats, I will immediately state my disagreement with the conclusions reached by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

The rapporteur rightly starts by considering the recent occurrence in Brussels. You will all remember that in Strasbourg, a month ago, we Socialists said that we should abstain from voting on the resolution agreed between the various groups, because we considered that document to be the fruits of a compromise that was too general and lacked drive.

Our position today with regard to this other document — which is hard, too hard, and, in short, incapable of implementation — should not, however, cause any surprise. We agree on the cause of the phenomenon, even if we believe, as we stated immediately after the events in Brussels, that we must avoid falling into the trap of facile sociology. We know that, behind the violence practised by the fans, especially the football fans, there lie interests very far removed from those of a purely sporting nature. The mercenariness that pollutes the world of football is not unconnected with the phenomena of violence that we denounce. The newspapers, moreover, have published the confessions of many violent fans: we know that these pass through the turnstiles at the gates of the stadium with impunity, and find their weapons — whether these are their own or other people's property — inside, supplied by organizations which they serve. We are sometimes talking, then, about out-and-out mercenaries.

But let us look at the essence of the rapporteur's proposals. On the one hand it is certainly desirable for the system of surveillance to be better coordinated at Community level, but it is not acceptable that, as part of the preventive measures, indiscriminate searching should be introduced, or fans be escorted from the trains or buses to the stadium. The rapporteur moreover calls for heavier penalties for violent fans and the drawing up — no less! — of a European 'blacklist', and goes so far as to demand a code of conduct for the mass media. Except for this last proposal, which sounds prejudicial to the freedom to which the press and journalism generally are entitled, they are quite frankly excessive measures that present a very dangerous threat to freedom.

It is true that, for example, the Liverpool fans normally arrive escorted and hemmed in by cordons of police. It is true that that also happened on the occasion of the last European Cupwinners' Cup Final. But it is equally true that these tactics were unable to prevent the slaughter. Over-severe measures are, in the end, useless, partly because they are difficult to carry out. Let us imagine for a moment what a football match would be like if all the measures put forward in the report were adopted. Instead of a demonstration of joy and pleasure, which is what a football match should be, we should be watching plethorical military manoeuvres. In the end, going to a football match would be an experience 'seasoned' with prohibitions, fear and worry. It is elsewhere, of course, that action must be taken to make sport cleaner and safer for the fans who watch it.

Although a month ago we said that we could not leave this Chamber with yet another, umpteenth ambiguous announcement, this time we say that we cannot fall into the temptation of imposing grave restrictions on freedom.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are already too many 'special laws' in our countries. Let us not introduce another one to weaken the status of law still further. It is with this in mind that I ask the rapporteur and honourable Members to assess the amendments that we, the Socialist Group, have presented, with the utmost calm and objectivity.

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, colleagues, after what happened in the Heysel stadium the idea has arisen that violence in sport is essentially concentrated in international sport and in football in particular. This is certainly not the case, since there is just as much violence at national games and in other forms of sport.

I should like to thank the rapporteur for the way in which she has suggested a whole series of methods of tackling this problem. There is no doubt that various security measures are necessary, for example where alcohol, control of certain clubs' supporters and stadium construction are concerned, but things must not be allowed to reach the point where anyone who goes to a ground is treated as a potential criminal. For this reason we must avoid generalized searches of people attending sporting events.

In my view, this House has the important task of dealing primarily with the causes. The causes are not to be found in a specific social system alone, since such phenomena are found under all systems, including that of the Soviet Union. Therefore we cannot look only to the problem of youth unemployment. Instead we must realize that many young people from all social strata and walks of life join these groups because of their own lack of perspective — in the abstract sense as well — and feel happy because they think that something is

Brok

happening. We must try therefore to restore to the younger generation some real perspective, in abstract matters as well, to get them out of this *impasse*.

The media and our educational systems have to help in this — the media especially! Sport must not be used as a way of intensifying pressures. It must not be allowed to become the instrument of excessive local patriotism or chauvinism. It is not conducive to peace for sections of the British press to use words like 'Blitzkrieg' and 'tank' in connection with a young tennis player. That will not lead young people away from violence. We must also eliminate the delight which many people find in national medals tables. I find it intolerable for young 14-year-old swimmers, whose lives have been ruined by drugs, to be forced into such performances, simply so that nations and officials can subsequently proclaim their pride in achievement.

(Applause)

This, too, whips up emotions. I think we have to make some changes here and to take the violence out of sport.

Let me make one last observation. Certainly some action had to be taken against British football clubs after what happened in the Heysel stadium. But it must not degenerate into a national life sentence because of certain clubs. If the necessary steps are taken, we ought over the next year to consider whether we should allow the English clubs back into European competitions. A certain disease did indeed come from Great Britain, but it exists just as much in other countries and we should not therefore hold the sportsmen of one country unilaterally responsible. This, too, is a task for the European Parliament!

(Applause)

Mr McMillan-Scott (ED). — Madam President, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, I welcome this interim report and congratulate the work put into it by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal. We, of course, have a particular concern for this matter because of the events that took place last month at the Heysel stadium. The question really is: what action should be taken by the Community or what by individual countries? I have to remind the House that a month ago in the debate on this matter we reported that measures were in hand in the United Kingdom, particularly in England and Wales, to control violence, particularly at football matches. Since that time the House of Commons, with exceptional speed, has passed legislation which will considerably tighten control, in particular on the sale of alcohol at football matches and to supporters on the way to football matches.

We believe this is the proper way to proceed because we are following the experience of Scotland, which in 1980 passed very stringent legislative measures which

control the sale of alcohol, control the sale of tickets and so on at football matches. The measures in Scotland have been effective and followed a very severe problem in that country. So where Scotland led, England and Wales are now following. The question for this House is whether the same sort of measures should be applied by other Member States of the European Community or indeed the wider membership of the Council of Europe.

You will be aware, Madam President, that the Council of Europe has made recommendations. In fact, in March 1984 recommendations very much along the lines of those now put into effect in the United Kingdom were made by the Council of Europe. We must ask ourselves whether this forum — the European Community — is the proper place to introduce stringent measures, because I fear that this is a wider problem and perhaps, as I have already said, where Scotland led and England and Wales have followed, other countries in Europe may soon have to take action. I therefore question the attitude of Mr Mattina, from the Socialist Group, that the freedom of the individual is paramount in these cases when we recall how many people died at the Heysel Stadium, how many people died in Bradford only a few weeks before and I ask, Madam President, how many deaths we need as a result of violence in sport in this continent before measures are taken by other countries.

I simply say now that we welcome the report, we hope that it is taken very seriously by member countries of the European Community and by their Sports Ministers and that in due course stringent measures will be applied throughout the Community countries, throughout the membership of the Council of Europe, following the precedent set by Scotland and now by England and Wales.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Barzanti (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, my group considers that some of the measures that are put forward in the forceful report by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal are important and useful for restoring to sporting events the atmosphere of correctness that they should have. We also consider that separating the analysis of these events and the causes that have frequently given them a dramatic or tragic character, from the measures to be adopted — in the most detailed sense — has caused a distortion that we wish to emphasize in highly critical terms. There is in fact the risk of seeing sporting events solely as something to be contained or controlled by police measures, deluding ourselves that the only way to restore fullness and fairness of behaviour to sporting events is by purely and simply repressive means.

For this reason we must all ask ourselves — faced with tragedies such as Brussels or others, which punctuate, in an extremely worrying and violent manner, the run-

Barzanti

ning of so many competitions — why all this happens, and we must also answer, bravely, that this happens because sporting events are taken, by clearly identifiable groups and fanatics, as a pretext for unleashing hooliganism, since the interests that have sprung up around professional sport have led to an emphasis on fighting spirit and to the interweaving of obscure intrigues, to a whole set of phenomena, in fact, which are at the bottom of the violence that is unleashed.

We therefore believe that various kinds of action are necessary. Of course, measures, are needed to control and facilitate the proper conduct of the events themselves.

From this point of view we hope to see improvements made to the text we have before us, by the adoption of amendments — we have tabled one on paragraph 3 — which can undoubtedly make the text more acceptable. Alongside these measures, however, resolute action is needed to reclaim the hinterland, from which the violent expressions of extravagant athleticism spring. To do this means that we have to commit ourselves — as, moreover, the report by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal emphasizes — to a great programme of education; it means we have to give help and space to those sporting associations that want correct participation in sport — sport, that is, in the sense once again of a happy, fair encounter and not as a hopeless, violent expression of clashes which, unresolved by society, are transferred to the stadiums.

Mrs Ewing (RDE), *Chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport*. — Madam President, and fellow Members, I am very proud to be the chairman of a committee with such a rapporteur. She worked night and day to get this before you at the request of the President of our Parliament. We are all aware in the committee that this is an interim report, and while we can very much sympathize with the many thoughtful remarks made by the speakers who are calling for a study in depth — we know there must be a study in depth — all we have brought here is an interim report with some practical measures which Member States can implement now. So the first thing is that we are aware of the need to study the causes and we hope to go on with that work which we had already started before this terrible tragedy occurred.

I should like to say that this was a European anguish, the more so because we saw it happen, we shared it together and the people out there on the streets, the people who go to football matches and the people who do not, the mothers of the sons who go to football matches are looking for an answer from us.

I would now like to deal with the consideration of liberty. I am aware that in France and Italy people are very, very concerned about the liberty of the individual. I would say, 'Whose liberty?' Ninety-nine per

cent of the people going to football matches behave well. They do not throw bottles, they do not throw cans, they do not get drunk. It is the small percentage that causes all the trouble. Have they not the liberty to go to a football match, that great spectator sport, in peace? It is for this reason we say that the liberty of the good people going to a football match is compatible with strict measures.

I am from Scotland, where we had a very grave problem of violence, and it was so grave that we had separate legislation for Scotland. As Mrs Larive-Groenendaal put it at our meeting in Venice, there is a European disease — it may not just be European — and one patient was cured. I think you must look at the incontrovertible evidence that while we have not eliminated the whole problem, we have drastically reduced it. My son is a football fanatic and he goes to matches every Saturday, and I worry about it. He does not mind the fact that he is frisked before he goes in to make sure he is not carrying a bottle. If he went on a bus he would accept the wisdom of not having any alcohol on the bus — and I think we might go even further and not sell alcohol in the town beforehand if there was a huge match taking place. I understand that in the particular case of Heysel the fans were drunk before the event. I would appeal to those who strongly back the liberty argument to reflect on this.

Lastly, I would say that we must pass this report with the practical measures that Mrs Larive-Groenendaal has accepted. I urge a full attendance so that we show the citizens that we have an answer to a very clamant problem.

(Applause)

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — *(NL)* Madam President, this report on violence in sport, although only an interim report, falls well short of the mark. That was to be expected. All it really does is indicate the symptoms. It is not really able to examine and understand the causes. Sport is the mirror that is held up to society. Many Members of this Parliament do not have the courage to look in the mirror. Just show me what happens at the sports grounds, and I will tell you what kind of society you have.

The kind of society that produces violence in sport is a society that is itself founded on violence. A society in which a Heysel tragedy can occur is a society that consists of a chain of violence. What right does a state, a society that constantly and structurally produces violence for filthy lucre have to talk about violence? Its motives are primarily economic and military, preparedness and armament, total nuclear destruction. Violence in its ideology, in its film, television and newspaper culture. What right, in heaven's name, do the Community's and NATO's upholders of capital and weapons, of the legal, official cycle of violence have to talk when their example, their passions lead to

Verbeek

violence on and off the field? I am also afraid that the children of violence will be condemned and denigrated in this Parliament today while their fathers and some of their mothers hide behind their indignation and tough measures.

Mr President, I referred to sport as a mirror. Look at a stadium and you will see society. Some play the tough, the cut-throat game, the rest are kept outside, unemployed, with no prospects behind the railings. Bread and games, yes, but otherwise keep your mouths shut and clap. The class society of the élite that play the game and the masses that can only look on, this class society does not stop at the gates of the stadium.

The police, judiciary and sports organizations apportion the blame and are themselves blamed. This report makes some new suggestions on the subject. Will they help? To ask the question is to answer it.

Yet more measures are proof of the inability and unwillingness to understand what is really going on. Only a society that is really interested in all its people, a society in which everyone is responsible to himself, can share in what this society wants, decides and does, a society that makes its members into full human beings and involves them in the decision-making, only a society of this kind will have a future and young people who play games fairly. A society that has replaced fair play with fists and violence, the right of the strongest, should not and cannot expect different behaviour in its stadia. What is done in the market-place and at the front will always occur in the stadium. My group will abstain in the vote on this resolution.

Mr Almirante (DR). — *(IT)* Madam President, I shall make a very brief statement on three points. First, to approve almost in its entirety — I shall explain why I say 'almost' — the brave and hard-hitting speech by the presenter of the report itself. We do not find — as the Socialists have declared, quite legitimately from their standpoint — that this report is too severe; on the contrary, we should like to see it sharper still, and we should above all like to have inserted severe financial and fiscal measures against the clubs, which are anyway to blame with their retinues of violently-behaving fans.

Secondly, and here I do not agree with the rapporteur — I want to say that it is not a case either of nationalism, or fascism, just as it is certainly not a question of communism or liberalism or, at all events, anything that deserves to be given a political label. It is — and here is the third point of my very brief statement — a case of mercantilism, which is the evil of our times. And we are also guilty. We call ourselves — and are to blame for it — the 'European Common Market'; but this is no market, this is Europe, this is spirit, this is tradition, just as sport should be all of these things.

I am ashamed, for example, as an Italian, when I read the news on the football-market in Italy. I am ashamed when I read that Naples — the victim, the guinea pig for all antisocial experiments — is the city that holds the record for the number of season-ticket holders, because of the 'golden boots' of Maradona. Italy is no longer the country of a hundred cities devoted to art, it is the country of the hundred-and-one foreign champions laden down with riches, for 'football' which no longer has anything whatever to do with sport. And I say this as a fan myself, as a militant from the sentimental point of view, as an exponent of trends, inclinations, applause and active participation — albeit very detached, in view of my age — in sporting activities.

Reference was made to the very young German tennis champion: seventeen years of age, a marvel. But I am sure that as I speak they are already sponsoring him, spoiling him, driving him away from the sporting spirit as it should be. Let us therefore all together make an examination of conscience, not only to approve the regulations that are here proposed but to make them sterner, above all in an endeavour to free every one of us, starting with myself, from that mercenary spirit that has unfortunately made us all its victims.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Madam President, the tragedy that occurred in the Heysel Stadium shows how degenerate competitive sport has become. The object of sport is physical and mental development, the improvement of human contacts and social togetherness. Sport must therefore be removed from the commercial sphere. It is unacceptable that human beings should be sold to the highest bidder, that sports and sports events should be organized for profit.

Madam President, when so many young people are out of work or not in worthwhile work, are they not more inclined to let off steam by becoming aggressive, at sports events, for example, where groups are stirred up against each other? Should we not direct our efforts, firstly, at a redistribution and reappraisal of worthwhile work, secondly, at creative relaxation and the social dimension of sport, thirdly, at a society geared to peace rather than aggressive armament, fourthly, at education geared to soberness and healthy living, a society where drugs, alcohol and excessive smoking are excluded? Perhaps we, the representatives of the people, can set an example in this respect. Whenever I wander round this Parliament, I see a great deal of alcohol being consumed. Why is this? A great deal of smoking goes on at committee meetings, sometimes so much so that it is almost impossible to work. Why?

Perhaps some healthy sporting activities could be included in Parliament's activities. Such sporting encounters might make our political discussions on sport more fruitful.

(Applause)

Mrs Buchan (S). — Madam President, I rise to speak on this report not just on behalf of the Socialist Group, but as a lifelong football supporter and as an Italophile who was saddened more than anything by the events at Heysel. It is correct that we should take whatever action we can to correct the situation, but already we are in the position of creating our own myths and I want immediately to correct two of them. First, Mr McMillan-Scott referred to the events at Bradford. We have no evidence that violence had anything to do with what happened at Bradford, and we must not make these easy statements.

Secondly, I congratulate Mr Brok on his speech, but I want to say to Mrs Larive-Groenendaal that the behaviour of Boris Becker in the match with Jarryd gave rise to a great many comments from tennis lovers on the way he had already, at the age of 17, slid into what one might call the McEnroe Syndrome. His behaviour has to be corrected if he is to have a career in front of him, as we all hope he does.

We should not be stampeded into instant political action or instant decisions, because these, like instant coffee, are not acceptable. My own interest in this subject goes back to the years when I was a magistrate in the city of Glasgow, when we had a disaster resulting in many deaths and we had a football conference then on football behaviour and violence — the two are not synonymous. It was a Labour Government — not just some mythical Scotland that did what it did — who took on this subject, and many of the reforms that are called for in the report are already in place in Scotland. That does not mean to say that the bigotry and racism that goes on is not reflected in Scottish supporters' catcalls any more or any less than in any other part of the country. It has been a major step forward, but it has not solved the problem. It was a major step because it was not just left to managers, it was agreed amongst supporters, among individuals and among the boards of football clubs, who must not be allowed to escape the responsibility for this.

I want now to refer to one or two things which in Scotland have been approved but also to others that have been rejected. In Mrs Larive-Groenendaal's motion for a resolution, paragraph 2(d), fourth indent, it says that standing accommodation should be replaced by seating accommodation. I have to say to the rapporteur that one of the most violent scenes I have seen on television was in her own country when the supporters whipped the seats out of the stands and threw them at the players. We have to be careful that this recommendation is not seen as one solution.

The arrangements for visiting supporters, as Mr Mattina has already said, are unacceptable. We have to have sport, like art, available at a whim so that people who wish to go and see a game can do so. Then we come to the amazing recommendation in paragraph 2(g) — the provision of entertainment before and after sporting events to prevent bad behaviour

arising from boredom. I would like to ask who would join with me in having a similar situation in this parliament. We would have bands in every ten minutes of the day to entertain us all and prevent boredom from sweeping over us.

Paragraph 3(e) asks for a European blacklist. The language of that, Mrs Larive-Groenendaal, is unacceptable. Europe has suffered from blacklists, and America, too, has suffered from blacklists. One minor offence by a junior in one police area, for example, would be disregarded as an offence in another. You cannot harmonize that. We do approve of asking for more sports facilities, but that means money, and we are in a Community — so-called — which spends more on rape-seed subsidies than it does on the entire Social Fund. We should get that priority sorted out before we start calling for expansion anywhere else. We want the social infrastructure changed. We do not want an atomic world where life is cheap.

Mrs de Backer-Van Ocken (PPE). — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we welcome the Larive-Groenendaal report. We think it is a very good report that reflects the concern of those who have been concerned by this problem for many years.

Many people have asked us in the last few weeks how it is possible that a problem of which everyone is aware and, as it were, cries out for attention has assumed such proportions. Major studies have been carried out, regulations drafted, projects planned, but in practice there has been very little change. Good intentions are not being put into practice. The main reason is that there has not been one umbrella organization to get these regulations and recommendations accepted by governments and federations. Unesco cannot do it, and the Council of Europe does not have the authority. Let us hope that this will now change. If the Commission now takes up the suggestions made in this report and if a Community directive on safety at sports stadia is at last adopted, considerable progress towards improving the situation will have been made. But the most important thing will always be to teach both players and spectators to treat others fairly, with respect and in friendship.

I should just like to add one comment on the report. We hope that in the final report Mrs Larive-Groenendaal will not only talk about football. The violence that occurs in football is also to be found in every other sport that attracts large crowds. Ice hockey in Canada is an example.

I should also like to emphasize, as I have done before, that the best way to curb violence among spectators is to replace spectator sports with participatory sports. In that respect, I entirely agree with Mr Ulburghs. That would do more to combat hooliganism in sport than the many well-intended, but expensive preventive regulations concerning infrastructure. But I would

de Backer-Van Ocken

warn against glossing over indefensible acts on so-called sociological grounds and above all against a fresh reaction against unpleasant but necessary measures that is now threatening to emerge and in the past has been to blame for the frequent failure of governments to take any real action. We know that repression does not solve everything, but every society has a duty to protect innocent spectators against others.

Mrs Jepsen (ED). — (DA) Madam President, there is hardly any doubt that we have all followed the recent acts in violence among spectators, particularly at football matches, and their tragic outcome has deeply affected all of us.

It is only natural for us here in the European Parliament to take initiatives which may help to prevent repetitions of what we saw in the spring of this year. I think, however, that it would be overdramatizing matters to produce a European directive which all countries in the Community had to apply. I urge you to consider that the peoples of the various Community countries have very different temperaments. I fully understand my British colleague, Mr McMillan-Scott, who spoke from the British point of view. It is not reasonable, or even expedient, that countries which have good traditions and which have found it possible to keep their more spirited elements under control should suffer because other countries have failed to keep order among some groups in their populations.

The report has some good points, such as the planning and construction of sports facilities. It would make sense if these guidelines were followed in the construction of new facilities, but to impose them as generally applicable provisions would be such a costly exercise that not many would be able to apply them. To impose a complete ban on alcohol, in my opinion, would simply make it exciting to drink in secret. In Denmark we have some excellent traditions where the father of a family has a few beers at sporting occasions, and indeed the rest of the family might very well join in. Most are able to keep things under control, however. A total ban would do much more harm than good.

With regard to the behaviour of young people, there is no-one better placed to exert an influence here than the sports coach, who is very close to young people. Here too, we have some very good traditions and good experience in Denmark.

Let us hope that all those responsible in the police and among the sports promoters have learned much from the events which took place recently. Let each country deal with the problems as the need arises, and indeed there is nothing to stop countries from exchanging good experience among themselves.

I would therefore say, on behalf of the four Danish conservatives, that we cannot support the report

before us here, since we feel that too many bans and controls will simply mean that people stay home in front of the television, where everything is still allowed.

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — Madam President, it is a sad development that we in the European Parliament should have to discuss this subject at all. Obviously, the national parliaments will also have to talk about the protection of the vast majority of sports-loving spectators. I agree with the last speaker. I do not think it is appropriate that there should be a European directive on this. Parliament has already expressed an opinion agreeing with the banning of British football teams.

I regard the Liverpool, Everton, Manchester United, Norwich and Southampton players as exemplary sportsmen. It is a rather cruel fate on them individually and on their clubs that they should be banned from taking part in international sport. All these clubs have distinguished records. Indeed, that probably applies also to all those clubs which, as long as the ban goes on, will qualify and yet be debarred from taking part in international sport.

There are many reasons for violence. When the rapporteur refers to vandalism and violence in sport — 'hooliganism' is the word I first saw — vandalism or hooliganism is just the outward evidence of inward violence and has many causes. It can be caused by the behaviour of the players taking part in the sport. It can be caused by the bias of referees and officials controlling the sport. Indeed, anybody who follows boxing will know what chance you have if you are fighting a Bulgarian with Eastern European referees. You have two chances. Knock them out or go home! The Americans took an example from that in the last Olympic Games. It is very sad, but it is violence. It is violence to the players. So you have violence *by* players and you have violence *to* the players by officials.

Then you have political violence of the kind already mentioned but also of the kind fomented by and personified in this Assembly by Mr Paisley. I was present when Linfield played Shamrock Rovers in Dalymount Park about ten years ago. A fight broke out between the Protestants, who had been brought up by Paisley and his like to hate Catholics. Unfortunately, that was a vandalism and a hooliganism that emerged from inward hate fomented by a Member of this Assembly.

Of course, there is also the basic Community problem of unemployment.

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

I have tried to be as brief as possible. I have said very little. I could say a great deal more.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, hooliganism and violence in sport

Kuijpers

are principally due to the administration and management of sport. Those who form a crowd in society, whatever the event, attract commercialization and anomity, while the philosophy of sport is aimed at precisely the opposite. Violence follows on from anonymity. For years actual sales methods and all kinds of corrupt activities, like doping and physical exploitation, almost had the protection of law in sports that attracted spectators in large numbers. The outcome is what happened at the Heysel Stadium. The politicians and organizers concerned should begin by learning a lesson from this. In the normal course of events, the politicians involved in the Heysel tragedy would quietly resign, draw up a report on their former duties and submit proposals to the legislative assembly on the basis of what happened.

Mr Selva (PPE). — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I think that there is one point on which we are all agreed in the wide debate that has taken place this morning, and that is the need for the parties involved, starting with the European Parliament, to do something effective to eliminate violence in sport. There has been disagreement only on the manner of achieving this objective; and there are some present who consider the measures contained in the Larive-Groenendaal report are too severe. I am of exactly the opposite opinion. I find that this report, which is an interim report, says those things that public opinion expects, so that the dramatic incidents of Heysel and other such occurrences are not repeated.

Finally, what is this report about? It is certainly not about restricting the freedom of those that go to stadiums to enjoy, in a tranquil frame of mind, a football match or some other encounter. It is, ladies and gentlemen, simply about taking steps to ensure that the apostles of violence, the hooligans, the drunks and those with evil intentions — of a political character, also — cannot have easy access to the stadiums, and cannot commit criminal acts.

I therefore cannot in any way see in these measures what has been referred to as a kind of 'militarization' of the stadiums. Of course, ladies and gentlemen, we should all prefer it never to be necessary for severe measures, but, in this case, I think that severe measures are necessary.

So much therefore for the work that we are called upon to do immediately, or to indicate immediately to governments. Then we have undoubtedly to undertake a deeper task — the moralization of sport. I am in agreement with those who have said that, in sport today, there is a concentration of vested interests that frequently have nothing to do with sport. This moralization is up to the governments; it is also up to us as the higher European body, as far as political representation is concerned, and I think this is the line to which we have to commit ourselves, if we want sport to be both formative and educational.

Then we have to consider the action of the media and the schools. There is no doubt that certain headlines, certain comments — that always highlight the conflict, as you might almost call it, between one man and another and one team and another, always praising simply the game's result, however achieved — should to some extent be monitored and, if you will allow me, corrected.

Whilst expressing, therefore, my complete support for the excellent report presented by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal, I will say again what I think: measures such as are here proposed do not affect honest sportsmen, they concern instead those and only those whom society needs to isolate, educate and, whenever necessary, punish.

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* I should like to stress the inconsistency of the Council's position on this subject. On 19 March, well before the events at the Heysel stadium, I put a written question to the Council asking for coordinated measures to be taken to try to put an end to violence in sport in general and at football stadiums in particular.

Deplorable events had already taken place in the United Kingdom between British clubs and in Luxembourg and France at matches between British and continental clubs — though fortunately not on the scale of brutality we were to see later at Heysel.

Mrs Thatcher had then decided to set up a working party — there were in fact two in different government departments — and so on 19 March I suggested that there should be coordination between the relevant ministries and authorities since, of course, the problem was not restricted to the United Kingdom but concerned several Community countries.

Two days before the events at the Heysel stadium the Council replied — the answer is precisely dated: two days before the events at Heysel — to say that it had no authority to deal with a problem of that kind.

I imagine that now, in view of the thoroughly justified feelings aroused by the events at Heysel, the Council will take further look at its reply, which was not only terse but inadequate and absurd, and will ensure that fresh steps are taken for inter-governmental cooperation to be coordinated so that the ministers concerned may act together. I say 'together' and do not presume to use the expression 'in consultation' since it might be thought that in the wake of yesterday's debates about the European Union, I am wanting to inveigle the Council into using powers not provided by the Treaty.

Mr Ducarme (L). — *(FR)* I should like to say on behalf of my group how much we appreciate the interim report presented by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal, which is all the better because it does not restrict itself

Ducarme

to listing the problems arising in connection with violence in sport but goes further in suggesting preventive measures which are absolutely indispensable and in calling for the strengthening of and coordination between policing and sentencing policies.

Some people think the document goes too far in proposing fairly strict measures against those taking part in mass entertainments. We feel that it is important not to lose sight of the objective and that the responsibilities of the public authorities must be most carefully borne in mind. When there is hooliganism, when there is vandalism, the duty of the public authorities, either at national or at European level, is to provide for protection. And when we speak of protection after the events at Heysel, we mean not only protection of property but also protection of persons. Can we say that the public authorities are acting efficiently when organized gangs can make an attempt on the life of so many? — 38 dead at Heysel and 200 injured; things have simply gone too far and in our view sheltering behind the so-called need to guarantee certain liberties is not compatible with the need for security. From this point of view the steps proposed for the strengthening of and coordination between policing and sentencing policies seem to us to be an essential minimum requirement. When one realizes what legislation exists, particularly in the United Kingdom, as regards protection at stadia, it is certainly not possible to claim that Mrs Larive's report goes too far and we hope Parliament will follow her recommendations.

Let me stress, too, the preventive aspects. Europe is not used to such outbreaks of violence. I think that led us to under-estimate the behaviour of fringe groups threatening the safety of mass entertainments. In this respect we must make a great effort to take stock of the situation.

I should like to end, Madam President, by saying that when we have a final report it will be wrong to restrict ourselves to violence in sport, but that we must include all gatherings — that is, wherever a large number of people are gathered together in a public place and there is a risk of organized fringe gangs. The essential thing is to ensure safety of persons. Of course, we shall vote in favour of this report.

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Madam President, I speak as an individual, not on behalf of my group. Some considerable time ago, I put down a motion under Rule 47 on the subject of increasing violence in sport. I feel that Mrs Larive-Groenendaal's interim report is, perhaps somewhat surprisingly for her, rather authoritarian. It is a matter that I regret.

I also regret that Mrs Larive-Groenendaal has made certain omissions from her report, and I would like to suggest for her future report that she considers including the following points. First of all, she makes no reference to the responsibilities of the football auth-

orities. The football authorities in my country are a reactionary bunch of dead-beats who are responsible for the deterioration of British football to the stage it is in today. One of the things that I particularly regret — and I would like to apologize on behalf of the British football establishment today — is that after the Heysel incident there was no expression of apology, no expression of regret from the British football authorities, merely a pathetic attempt to blame other people. I hope therefore, Madam President, that Mrs Larive-Groenendaal will take this into account when she produces her final report.

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) Madam President, a commission of inquiry of the Belgian Parliament has just published its conclusions, and of course they are damning — damning for those who caused the disturbances, damning for the organizers of the match, that is, the sports clubs, damning for those who sold the tickets and damning too — and in no uncertain terms — for the police and in particular the gendarmerie.

There was a lack of preparedness, there was incompetence and there was also — and this it seems was extraordinary in this commission of inquiry — a certain shedding of responsibility in so far as the higher the rank the more failures and errors were blamed on subordinates. So, unlike Mrs Larive-Groenendaal, I do not think that it is by strengthening police repression and by the first steps towards such an authoritarian society — and this worries me when I listen to my Honourable Friend Mr Ducarme — that we shall solve all the problems. I think that if the police and the gendarmerie in our countries played their part with a minimum of competence and intelligence a number of things could be avoided.

I must say that as a political conclusion from the report of this commission of inquiry there are many of us — my party in particular — who wonder whether the Belgian Minister for the Interior can remain in office. He has demonstrated that he could not perform his duties; nor has he even been able to show other countries that he had the dignity required for his office. I think that the least he can do now after the presentation of this report is to resign.

Finally let me add that the problem of the groups of the extreme right has not been mentioned at all. Fringe groups and young unemployed are mentioned, but there is no mention of the extreme right, which is very well organized. At Heysel flags with Celtic crosses were seen, members of the National Front — who are very well organized — were seen trying to make trouble. And this has not been said here. There are people who would like to destabilize society and ensure that policing measures and authoritarian measures are strengthened. It can be seen that such tactics are working since a considerable strengthening of authoritarianism is being proposed here.

Dury

For my own part I should like to see sport resuming its own role, and I do not mean only as an entertainment but as participatory sport. And if a European policy is needed, as has just been said, what we need is not only a European policy for the administration of justice but also a European sports policy.

Mr Ducarme (L). — (*FR*) I think it is great pity that the report of the parliamentary commission should be interpreted in that way and in particular that it should be said on the one hand that the police and the gendarmerie have not done their duty, but that on the other hand we should declare that we do not want too many police or too many members of the gendarmerie. I think that is inconsistent.

(Mixed reactions)

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — I would like to say at the outset that I have welcomed this debate and the contributions which have been made, and in particular the interim report.

It is useful, I think, to address ourselves to what is a topical and very important subject, although it is regrettable that it sometimes takes events such as the tragedy which occurred at Heysel to act as a catalyst for this type of debate. I should preface my remarks by confirming, of course, that that is not the case of this Parliament, which was voicing its concern before the events which took place at Heysel; but it is, perhaps, the case of the Member States and their concern at this type of tragedy.

The Commission, of course, shares the concern of Parliament. I think we have already evidenced it by the recent approval for the payment of emergency assistance to the families of those who died. I, myself, was present at Heysel Stadium on the night in question and can confirm from my own personal experience what a horrifying occasion it was.

The incidents have raised very fundamental questions, some of which have been approached from different perspectives during the course of this debate. The resolution before us must serve as a good catalogue of the kind of issues which must now be addressed. I should like to take up some of the main ideas contained in it, and I would loosely categorize them under the following headings. First of all, there are practical suggestions; secondly, there are proposals on police coordination; thirdly, proposals aimed at the sporting federation and suggestion for increased international efforts to solve the problem in the longer term.

On the practical suggestions, such as banning the sale of alcohol in sports grounds, I can only indicate that the Commission naturally supports any efforts which might reduce the risk of violence. We are, of course,

aware of the effect pointed out by Mrs Buchan, amongst others, of the Criminal Justice Act of 1980 in Scotland and the more recent legislative changes which have been put before the House of Parliament in Westminster.

There is, however, an issue as to whether Community mechanisms are the most appropriate means for action. Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken refers to the desirability of a directive. The problem, I think, is not so much the desirability, but the feasibility of such a directive and its compatibility with the Treaty.

One field in which there might be some prospect for Community action is that of European safety norms for the design of stadia. My understanding of the problem is that the difficulties lie less in the norms themselves than in their enforcement. However, if there were felt to be some use in a Community code of standards or inspection criteria, then the Commission would be willing to look at this.

On the specific point of alcoholic drinks, I would point out that the sale of any drinks in glass bottles should probably be excluded, because the bottles themselves — as anybody who has been at matches of this kind will know — can be lethal whether they originally contained orange-juice or whisky.

Concerning the points which are raised about police coordination, I think this is very important and must be actively pursued. From my previous responsibilities, I am fully aware of how significant a role good coordination between different police forces can play in avoiding trouble before its starts. I think that many of the points outlined in the resolution should be studied at Community level, and I would suggest that you ask the Presidency about the possibility of examining these points in the framework of political cooperation, as was referred to, I think, by Mr Glinne in his contribution. But I understand there has already been some discussion on improving cooperation between the police forces of different Member States.

As has been outlined during the course of this debate, a delicate balance has also to be maintained between the effective prevention of crime and the maintenance of fundamental individual rights and liberties. We must be extremely vigilant, as I know this Parliament would be on this point.

Of course, Mrs Ewing is also correct in saying that an excessive preoccupation with the issue of liberty in this context might result in a denial of the most fundamental rights of all, the right to life and the right to bodily integrity. Nonetheless, the vigilance of Parliament here has, I think, been amply exemplified by some of the contributions that have been made today. One has to take very great care not to invoke powers which damage the basic rights of the individual.

Many of the points contained in the resolution would require implementation by sports associations them-

Sutherland

selves. Mr Cassidy has referred to the role and responsibility of the football associations. I am thinking of such issues as the control of ticket sales, travel arrangements for supporters and entertainment before, during and after matches, where I, like Mrs Buchan, would have some difficulty in understanding how they might be implemented.

There is, however, a new awareness — and it certainly has to be stated to be a *new* awareness — amongst the associations of their responsibilities in these matters. I noted with great interest that UEFA participated in the Council of Europe discussions. I think that is a very good thing. Indeed, part of the Council of Europe's conclusions involved a commitment to further dialogue with UEFA on this issue.

On the general issue of where we go from here, I think it is premature to reach any firm conclusions, especially as regards the question of a Community legislative initiative. I do not deny the possibility of such an initiative: this is an avenue which we must be willing to explore, but we also must look carefully at the balance of advantage between different spheres of action, whether municipal, Community or Council of Europe. I have noted during this debate — from Mrs Jepsen — the concern voiced about the responsibility of the Member States and the fact that a Community initiative might not be appropriate. I think it is important, therefore, to have some clear understanding of the responses or possible responses of the Member States before proposing an initiative in which there may be considerable difficulties in respect of competence. I would propose that we at least try to establish what the attitudes of the Member States might be to such an initiative before proposing something which otherwise might not be acceptable. I think we have to recognize that there are some difficulties in this area, so without in any sense rejecting the rapporteur's suggestion — in fact, accepting that it may have considerable validity — I would like initially to have an opportunity of airing the matter further with the Sports Ministers in order to get a clearer idea as to the probable response of the Member States.

There is, therefore, a necessity to explore the situation. This is a problem, of course, which goes beyond the boundaries of the Community. We must also be aware that once we enter fields where some Member States have not accepted a Community competence we may find any new initiatives, especially those based on Article 235, encountering procedural opposition which would mean no prospect of early action on a Commission proposal. So, laying the ground would be of considerable importance, and this debate may well serve that purpose with regard to the question of some Community initiative.

There have been extremely useful and productive discussions in the Council of Europe, and I consider that the draft European Convention on spectator violence and misbehaviour at sports events, in particular at

football matches, which is now open for signature, is an important contribution, as has been recognized, I think, during the course of this debate.

In this regard, notwithstanding the oral question of the rapporteur, which was tabled before the outcome of the recent Strasbourg conference was known, if the political will which has so far been clearly demonstrated by all the member States of the Council of Europe is maintained, I believe that the draft Convention will enter into force quickly and will be followed by equally rapid adoption of implementing legislation in each country. This is likely to be an efficient and speedy operation in the circumstances and might ultimately be more effective than the opening of Community discussions. But we must see how things develop.

The Commission, for its part, will follow this issue closely, and should an area be identified where the Community can make a particular contribution, we shall not fail to react.

To return to the rapporteur's oral question, you will know the Commission does not presently have any staff exclusively dealing with matters of sport, but we are considering the question in the light of the activities of the Council of Europe in sport as well as in the framework of the 'people's Europe' discussions. We shall follow with great interest Parliament's continuing examination of the problem, and should the Presidency decide to take up your idea of a meeting of Community Ministers responsible for sporting matters, the Commission would be more than willing, indeed anxious, to participate and contribute to such a meeting.

Before I finish, I would like to deal with one specific point raised in the resolution. This concerns the matter of the free movement of footballers throughout the Community, under Article 48 of the Treaty. This is a matter of direct Community concern and responsibility, but I do not wish to deal with it in detail today because I consider that it would be wholly inappropriate to link this matter with the issues of public outrage at the recent tragic events which are under discussion at the moment. However, I should say that the position is that the Commission has urged the removal of all restrictions on the free movement of professional footballers. I have recently received a new proposal from the UEFA side which I wish to study, and I shall have occasion, I hope, in the near future to inform Parliament on developments.

In conclusion, therefore, I consider that this resolution has provided the opportunity for a very helpful debate. I believe that the Council of Europe discussions are proceeding well and, while I do not see any immediate need or use for a Community legislative initiative, the Commission will continue to follow the issue closely and does not preclude the possibility of pursuing such an initiative.

Mr Stewart (S). — Madam President, I am rather concerned at this report as it stands at the moment and at what has been said. It is rather unfortunate that I represent the city of Liverpool, a city at which a finger has been pointed in connection with the Heysel Stadium issue. I was at the Heysel Stadium that night, and I object to a system whereby a representative of that city . . .

President. — Mr Stewart, I have to interrupt you inasmuch as, now the Commissioner has spoken, the debate is closed except for possible points of order. This does not seem to be the case of what you are saying.

I therefore declare the debate closed. The vote will take place at the next voting-time.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DIDÒ

Vice-President

4. *EEC-Hong Kong economic and trade relations*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Seeler, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the future development of economic and trade relations between the European Community and Hong Kong (Doc. A 2-54/85).

Mr Seeler, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. On 27 May the Agreement between the United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China on the future of Hong Kong entered into force. This Agreement was called 'Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong'. Its intention was to embody the legal standpoint of the People's Republic that Hong Kong has never ceased to be part of China, since the fundamental treaties were 'unequal' treaties and as such were never recognized by the People's Republic. In terms of international law this view is irrelevant, because treaties whereby one State is forced to relinquish territory, for instance after losing a war, generally are unequal, but they are still valid.

To put it briefly, the content of the treaty is that on 1 July 1997 Hong Kong will once again be subject to Chinese sovereignty, but it will retain its social and economic status for a further fifty years. The Central government in Peking will have responsibility only for a few areas, such as defence and foreign affairs. Hong Kong will *de facto* be a virtually autonomous region under Chinese sovereignty, an island of capitalism in a

sea of Communist State-controlled social and economic policies. Those who are interested will find further details in the explanatory statement to my report.

In it I have described the agreement as a masterpiece of diplomacy. The United Kingdom was able to secure treaty guarantees for the economic and social status of Hong Kong for a further fifty years after 1997. The bargaining position was far from strong where these claims were concerned, since even without any treaty arrangements the major part of the Crown colony would have had to be returned once the lease expired. It would have been impossible for the residual part of the Crown colony to survive in isolation.

For the People's Republic of China, however, the initial position was at least as difficult. On the one hand the Chinese position was clear: as a result of the three unequal treaties the territory of the Crown colony had gradually been lost during the 19th century. One of these treaties — as I have said already — was due to expire in 1997. China could not allow there to be the least doubt of its intention to regain full sovereignty over these territories.

But on the other hand the present economic and social status of Hong Kong has immense economic and commercial importance for China. To reintegrate this territory by drawing it into the Communist political and economic ideologies would be to destroy the value of Hong Kong within a few years, long before 1997. Capital would have moved out. Investment activity would have dropped to a minimum. Many people would have emigrated and the millions who remained, chiefly the poorer elements of the population, would have been reduced to poverty. China would therefore have had to take over an economic chaos with millions of unemployed and poverty-stricken inhabitants. Chinese policy therefore had to aim to preserve the economic and commercial value of Hong Kong intact. China needs Hong Kong's economic power if the development of its reform plans is to have any continuity over the next few decades.

The People's Republic has found an extremely elegant solution to this problem. Firstly it was able to maintain its legal position by agreeing the aforementioned joint declaration, instead of concluding an agreement with the United Kingdom on the transfer of the territory. The economic desirability of the status quo in Hong Kong is safeguarded primarily by retaining practical social and economic independence for the territory within the People's Republic and preserving its status as a special administrative region with its own basic law in accordance with the Chinese constitution. Hong Kong thus continues to be something in the nature of a Western capitalist enclave within Communist China.

This status of Hong Kong's has quite considerable repercussions for the European Community's trade relations with Hong Kong and the People's Republic,

Seeler

and with the western Pacific in general. Hong Kong will gradually acquire a new role in addition to its present role of market place and service centre. Hong Kong will become the largest port in the People's Republic of China, with the entire land mass of China in the hinterland. Hong Kong's special status will act as a spur to this development, rather than a check. With the increasing industrialization of China Hong Kong will be in a position to act like a magnet, as a focal point for the country's increasing export potential and so play a key role in the EC's trade with China. The Community must adjust to this.

For the European export economy this means that anyone who wants to exploit the Chinese market in the next century, in fifteen years time, has to maintain a presence in Hong Kong now. In terms of European foreign trade policy this development means that in future it will become increasingly impossible to view Hong Kong's role in isolation, it will have to be seen in conjunction with economic developments in the People's Republic of China. This applies to the negotiations which will have to be held over Hong Kong's membership of the GATT and the International Monetary Fund, as well as the extension of the World Textiles Agreement and the system of generalized preferences.

I expressly urge that Hong Kong continue in the GATT and the International Monetary Fund after 1997, but its membership will be of a different quality, and one must realize that. And there is something else that must be remembered: over the next few years the increase in the importance of the Chinese market will depend on the extent to which her political leaders succeed in advancing economic development without overheating and — let me add — without indebtedness. This country's cautious borrowing policy deserves widespread recognition. It has protected China against the fate of many developing countries, from having to work and export solely for the benefit of their creditors, instead of for their own economic development. With China as its hinterland it will be possible for Hong Kong to become the most important supplier of simple consumer and technological products, and probably to outstrip Japan, South Korea and Taiwan in this sector.

This will provide further impetus to the economic development of this area of the Pacific, which is already pretty impressive. It is to be hoped that European foreign policy will adjust to the developments in the Pacific. For example, it is not enough for the European Community to have representation in Tokyo and then no more until Bangkok. We also need a delegation in Hong Kong as soon as possible. Let us also hope that the European economy will recognise the opportunities for trade relations which these developments will offer, and that it will exploit them accordingly.

Finally let me express my hopes that Europe's economy will not one day be as surprised by the develop-

ment of the western Pacific area as it was by the development of Japan's export potential some years ago. The essential purpose of the report which I lay before the House, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, is to make a contribution towards this.

(Applause)

Mr Zahorka (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. The European People's Party supports Mr Seeler's very objective and considered report and I can therefore confine my remarks to certain aspects: hitherto Hong Kong has been a privileged trading partner of the European Community in the Far East, if one considers the size of the country in relation to the volume of its trade with the Community. We hope that in its future association with the People's Republic of China this country will continue to be part of the international economic institutions, particularly of GATT and the International Monetary Fund. We also hope that the excellent transport communications between Hong Kong and the rest of the world will be maintained — another aspect I wanted to mention — and let me remind you that until recently civil aviation, for example, was in dispute between the two negotiating parties, Great Britain and the People's Republic of China. The Treaty has, quite rightly, often been called a masterpiece of diplomacy, but Hong Kong today is one of the most important trading and financial centres in the world. Its people are dynamic and freedom-loving. Life in Hong Kong pulsates with activity and radiates vitality, and that is how it should remain if the people of Hong Kong so wish, and I have no doubts on that score.

In the long-term the endurance of these features will be the yardstick by which people will judge whether the treaty really was a masterpiece or not. According to a British government Green Paper Hong Kong is to become fully democratic, which we particularly welcome. In this way it can also become a model for other countries in this area. Let there be no doubt, we in the European Parliament will be watching very carefully the policy of the People's Republic of China in Hong Kong.

What will happen in the People's Republic after Deng Xiao Ping? That is the touchstone for one important aspect of Chinese policy, where we are concerned as well, and I believe that particular emphasis has to be placed on the report's call for an independent EC representation in Hong Kong. Hong Kong is to be China's gateway to the world, and for the world an important gateway to China. In terms of trade policy therefore Hong Kong is potentially at a new beginning. We welcome the report.

(Applause)

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED). — Mr President, I congratulate Mr Seeler on what I consider to be a very

Shelagh Roberts

constructive report. Earlier this year Mr Seeler and I visited Hong Kong, and I think I speak for both of us when I say that we were immensely impressed by the resurgence of confidence amongst the people of Hong Kong following the conclusion of the agreement regarding the post-1997 situation.

For reasons which I shall explain, I think it is important that the Community should do all that it can to help maintain that confidence among the people of Hong Kong and also to encourage confidence in Hong Kong's future among other countries throughout the world. Of course, as both Mr Seeler's report and Mr Zahorka have commented, there can be no certainty that the treaty will endure, but I believe it is only right to point out that the Chinese Government has honoured all its agreements with the British Government since the last century, notwithstanding that there have been times when relations between the two countries were not as happy as they are at present.

Hong Kong has a great significance as a trading community, not only in its own right, but because, of course, it is the gateway to China and it has had a quite remarkable development over the years. Hong Kong has really only two fine natural assets. One is a superb sheltered harbour and the other is the industriousness of its people, to whom hard work seems to be a joy. It has very little in the way of natural resources and very little in the way of arable land. Its manufacturing sector is heavily dependent on importing raw materials, and it also has to import much of its food. Notwithstanding these difficulties and the colossal population explosion that has taken place in Hong Kong in recent years, next to Japan Hong Kong has the biggest *per capita* income anywhere in Asia.

It is important, I believe, to all of us that we should maintain the economic stability of Hong Kong. It is right that the report stresses the need to have freedom to travel in the post-1997 situation and this I know that the British Government is firmly attached to ensuring. The joint declaration already makes provision for some of the Hong Kong citizens in this respect, and the British Government will be negotiating to acquire for those who obtain a British national overseas passport the same access to other countries as is enjoyed at present by holders of British dependent territories citizens' passports.

It is also important, as Mr Seeler stressed, that Hong Kong should be able to continue to participate in the GATT, and here again the British Government have told me that it is their intention that this should be the subject of early discussions in the joint liaison group.

The Community is not amongst Hong Kong's largest trading partners. In that respect we have to give way to China, Japan and the United States, in that order. Nevertheless, both China and Hong Kong are committed to economic expansion. There is great potential in both those countries for the Community to expand

its trade with them. I hope that we shall not lose this opportunity, as we have unfortunately done in other parts of the world. The key to a continued expanding trading relationship with both Hong Kong and China lies in the post-1997 situation. I do not think it is too early for the Parliament and the Community to be addressing themselves to the measures which are required in this respect. I think, therefore, that Mr Seeler's report is timely as well as welcome, and I wholeheartedly endorse his recommendations.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, I should like to make some political comment on Mr Seeler's excellent report. We are not asking whether the political standard is advancing, or the reverse, as was the case in the 18th century. Rather, as my colleague said just now, we are simply concerned that because of their special importance for Hong Kong developments in China are lending a new quality to relations between the European Community and this great Far Eastern power.

As the Commissioner, Mr De Clercq, is here, I should like to say a few words about the political interest of the European Community. We must take care — and this is not a warning, but a remark, albeit a meaningful one — that for us the varied nature of our relations with the south-east Asian area continues to be a *sine qua non*.

If we look at Hong Kong we can also see that another important enclave in this area, namely Singapore, is a symbol of much of what I understand by 'varied nature'. At present we are being visited by a delegation from the ASEAN States. Its members will tell us that — despite the necessity of continuing to extend the relations with the People's Republic of China, which have had such a fortunate beginning — we must not concentrate on this question alone. In the area of south-east Asia there is still Australia, New Zealand and a whole series of other countries, as well as the ASEAN countries — not to mention India.

In other words, the political importance of the development of economic relations with Hong Kong and China — and Mr Hindley's report which is to be discussed next shows this clearly and explicitly — must not lead the European Community to forget what I have described as varied.

(Applause)

Mr De Clercq, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, the Commission has noted with interest Mr Seeler's excellent report on the future development of economic and commercial relations between the European Community and Hong Kong.

We welcome the agreement on economic and social systems in Hong Kong that was concluded by the

De Clercq

United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China last December. I would remind you that the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation issued a statement to this effect on the conclusion of the negotiations. I feel that the words that have been used in the debate to describe this agreement have been in no way excessive and that what we have here is indeed something unique. We must all hope that this unique agreement will be followed by other experiments and above all that this experiment will work.

The Commission is aware that at the beginning of 1997 Hong Kong will become a special administrative region and notes with interest the guarantees on which agreement has been reached in the Joint Declaration. It welcomes in particular the fact that current legislation and Hong Kong's present economic and social system will be retained almost unchanged after 1997. The place Hong Kong occupies in the western part of the South China Sea as one of the world's leading economic and financial centres is clear. The Commission would also refer to the increase in trade between Hong Kong and the Community and to the special part this country plays and will increasingly play in the external economic relations of the People's Republic of China.

Hong Kong's role as a transit area, its quality as a link between the People's Republic of China and the European Community and between the People's Republic and other countries and regions of the world will undeniably grow in the future. The Commission knows that it is very important for Hong Kong to continue to participate in GATT and other international organizations. The Commission will therefore follow with interest the further development of this problem and consider all the implications in due course. The Commission agrees that the solution found for Hong Kong can be seen as an example. The Commission will also pay the very close attention to the proposals which the rapporteur has set out in the motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

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

5. Trade cooperation between the EEC and the People's Republic of China

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Hindley, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. A 2-74/85), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-39/85 — 4745/85) for a regulation concerning the conclusion of a trade and economic cooperation agreement between the EEC and the People's Republic of China.

Mr Hindley (S), rapporteur. — Mr President, may I begin by saying a few words about the nature of this report. The report is a commentary on the trade and economic cooperation agreement. Consultation did take place with Parliament on this agreement, but it was a hurried consultation and one which was certainly not in the best interests of good working practices. At all events consultation did, in fact, take place, which has not, unfortunately, always been the case when Parliament should have been consulted on new agreements.

It is only, however, a commentary; this report will act as an interim report pending a further report which is being prepared by the Committee on External Economic Relations and will be presented later this year on trade relations between the Common Market and the People's Republic of China.

The fundamental premise of the agreement is that the needs of the EEC and the People's Republic in terms of economic cooperation are complementary and not competitive. The feeling is that the People's Republic cannot make the qualitative advance it desires for her people without foreign investment and foreign technological know-how. This new agreement is more precise than the one which it replaces in that in Chapter II, under Article 10 and 11, there is a list of sectors and methods for future cooperation.

In the first instance, investment and technology from abroad are needed in the People's Republic to exploit fully China's natural resources. We are thinking mainly of offshore oil and mining. The People's Republic of China has still great problems of internal transport and communications, and it is significant that the deals done with individual Western companies have lately been in the area of telecommunications.

China's need for improved internal transport is complementary to the needs of the Common Market to get out of our own recession affecting hard-hit industries. Aerospace, rail and road transport have been run down in our own countries, and these industries could receive a very welcome boost by satisfying the needs of the People's Republic of China. The People's Republic is quite rightly anxious to avoid running up massive debts as have other countries wishing to expand quickly, and would be well advised to continue that caution. Hence the interest in the People's Republic in developing joint ventures. China has always had great natural resources and an over-abundance of manpower. What is now needed is to bring in foreign investment to fully exploit those resources. Joint ventures are an ideal way of doing so, because they ensure that, unlike foreign investment in the past in China, the profits from those enterprises remain in China and benefit the Chinese people.

An interesting aspect of the modernization programme of China is the decentralization of economic planning to regional level. If that is to happen, if the regions of

Hindley

the People's Republic are to be given greater scope for concluding their own agreements, it will have to be accompanied by a necessary servicing of those agreements to ensure that people in the EEC who do take part in that kind of agreement are fully briefed, fully serviced and fully looked after.

The advantages for the West are obvious. I have mentioned the enormous boost in production which could come about. It has been described in newspapers as the dazzling vision of a thousand million customers! It has been calculated that even modest increases in the purchasing-power of average Chinese families could be an enormous boost to bringing us in the EEC out of our economic recession.

There are problems as well. First of all should be mentioned briefly the desire of the Chinese, which is understandable, to be regarded as a country which is still developing. The *per capita* income of the Chinese is very low. It is only the massive potential that China offers that differentiates her from other countries which we would more naturally designate as developing.

The second question is of some immediate concern to myself, as I represent a textile area. It is the problem of incorporating the massive output that is envisaged in China into a world trading pattern. Unless that is properly accommodated within a Multifibre Agreement, it could cause major disruption in the future.

China is opening up to the world. In contrast to former occasions, this is being done voluntarily by the Chinese. In the past China has been ruthlessly exploited and forced to open up by commercial interests from outside. The United States and Japan have realized much quicker that we have here in Western Europe the potential that exists in this opening up and have seized this opportunity with greater vigour and thoroughness than we have in the EEC. Although vast, the potential that China offers is not infinite. It is finite, and we are in a competitive situation in exploiting the Chinese market with the Japanese and the Americans. Unless we grasp that opportunity, we shall fall further behind.

Finally, I would like to mention that the trade agreement can have a very positive effect as a contribution to world peace. This Parliament should welcome the agreement as indicating a serious commitment by the EEC to intensify its cooperation with the People's Republic and as one that can only result in mutual benefit.

(Applause)

Mr Bombard (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, our relations with the People's Republic of China have fortunately been well-established for the past six years. As you know, the first trade agreement dates from 1978 and has been tacitly renewed every year.

We must progress to a higher stage. So far China has had the benefit of a considerable increase in exports as a result of the lifting of certain quantitative restrictions, for example 8 quotas for France, 19 for the USSR, 13 for Bulgaria and 18 for Poland. This has benefited the People's Republic of China above all. In 1980 the surpluses in China's favour amounted to 173 million ECU, in 1981 to 290 million ECU and in 1982 to 390 million ECU. In September 1984 a new agreement was signed and came into effect on 21 May 1985. Article 13 stresses the Community's intention to continue to promote China's development.

However, China is not really a developing country. It is a nuclear power, it is a member of the Security Council. We are not therefore called upon to regard it in the same way as other developing countries even though the development of China is something we keenly support.

It did not seem desirable to us in view of the disproportion between the population of China and the Community's resources to regard it as a normal developing country. Let us hope that in this fresh framework we shall be able to obtain from the Commission a better account of the programmes for cooperation which up to now have been pursued on an *ad hoc* basis. I may say that so far the only account we have had from the Commission was a page of 20 lines setting out the titles of the programmes set up.

Mr Zahorka (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, the European People's Party is in favour of this report as well. Parliament was in fact consulted in this instance, but neither adequately nor early enough, and I must express our group's wish for improvement here. The new trade agreement has undergone qualitative improvement, it is an example of a purposeful follow-up of existing agreements, and consideration could be given to renewing some other agreements with third countries along the lines of this one.

Initially the Chinese market should be a long-term prospect where we are concerned. The introduction of efficiency oriented criteria as the basis of wages and price structures and the decentralization of decision-making have had a favourable effect on China's economic development.

We can see the limitations of China's internal and external economic development in weaknesses in her infrastructure and in the transport and energy sectors. This opens up a wide field for Euro-Chinese joint ventures. But we can also see the limitations of the ideologically-determined bureaucracy, and I hope that the People's Republic of China will also learn from the experience of neighbouring newly-industrialized countries.

We do not want a new China euphoria; we want a sober, realistic, but optimistic appraisal of the oppor-

Zahorka

tunities and risks, and I believe that the trade agreement is a significant step in this direction — that is why we are voting in favour of it.

Mr Moorhouse (ED). — Mr President, naturally we warmly welcome this agreement. The rapporteur, Mr Hindley, has done a useful job in highlighting the key points in his commentary. The economic scene in China is certainly changing in dramatic fashion and at a spectacular rate. This new agreement, particularly on economic cooperation, helps formalize the remarkable opportunities open to both parties whether by joint production, joint ventures, transfer of technology or common exploitation of resources. Of course, this is a two-way business.

Let me just say a few words, if I may, about the opportunities in China itself. It was quite evident to me when I was in the Shenzhen special economic zone of China just about a month ago — admittedly on a very brief visit — that developments there are moving fast, very fast indeed. A new motorway was under construction. New regional airports and regional airlines are swinging into action. A luxury hotel said to be jointly financed by the Chinese and by Hong Kong businessmen was newly opened and brimming over with tourists. Across the border from Hong Kong, new highrise blocks of flats were springing up all over the place, and, incidentally, Japanese cars and trucks were to be seen everywhere with hardly a European car in sight.

Offshore one knows that Western oil companies, with, of course, Chinese permission, are actively looking for oil and apparently with some signs of success. Opportunities, then, for Europe, yes. But let us all be aware of the fierce competition from Japan and, of course, from our American friends. Anyone like me who has been in Hong Kong of late will know full well of the success of the Japanese not only in selling their manufactured products, albeit in relatively narrow but supremely well-targeted sectors, but also in commerce and in the civil-engineering field.

Indeed, in civil engineering the Japanese are sweeping all before them at the expense of European firms. They built the mass transit system in Hong Kong. They appear to be poised to win the contract for a second fixed link across the Hong Kong harbour, and of course they won the second Bosphorus Bridge contracts. The Japanese contractors were competitive, but the reason why they won the business may well have been the handsome soft loans made possible by the Japanese Government, and that is one of the measures of the intense competition we face and will face in China.

Let us, therefore, be under no illusions about what we are up against as Europeans and determine to make a supreme effort to help European firms to grasp these fresh opportunities for new business.

Mr Rossetti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, it is now seven years since the first cooperation agreement with China was signed, and the first positive thing to note is the considerable impetus that has been given to trade relations between this country and the European Community. The volume of trade has practically doubled and, even though the absolute figures are still not very large compared with the potential of the two economic systems, nonetheless we must emphasize the positive trend that shows further possibilities for developing relations with this country, which represents an immense market, and one which until recently was practically closed.

But the most outstanding feature of the new agreement on which we have to give our verdict today is undoubtedly the decision to widen cooperation to include the economic sector. Now, if we consider the kind of thinking that has been going on in the Chinese People's Republic for some time on the problem of economic development, it can well be believed that quite considerable opportunities may open up for the European Community — but obviously, not for the European Community alone — for cooperation in all sectors.

Why this conviction? The turning point in China which justifies it goes back, in fact, to 1978; and some reforms — the latest of which, which were highly significant, being those of October 1984 — make this conviction more reasonable. Very briefly, the turning point came with the realization, by the Chinese government, that planning on centralistic lines such as had been in force up till 1978 had led to stagnation, the reduction of consumption and a fall in individual incomes. The conclusion reached in the most recent debate in China is that the economy, even in a socialist country, can only hope to develop and modernise itself if the means of production are developed and certain instruments, such as the market and the laws of value, continue to operate, and if the significance of the technological challenge that is coming from the international situation can be understood and acted on. This kind of thinking, and the reforms that followed it, have had major significant international implications for China: from a philosophy of isolation there has been a changeover to integration in the international system, in the conviction that development on modern lines was impossible outside this context. And this was done in no abstract manner, but with precise objectives — namely to fill the technological gap and to obtain foreign investment within the framework of cooperation, so as to meet the difficulties of the Chinese State in making independent provision for growth without drastically restricting internal consumption.

Chinese readiness to deal with the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the European Community, as well as the agreement with Hong Kong and even the tacit trade relations with Taiwan, which we shall talk about later, should be seen in this light. It is,

Rossetti

in my view, in this perspective that we should see the new agreement, and we can see all its enormous potential for the European Community, if we can get there in time.

We therefore support the Hindley report and urge for a further examination of this problem by Parliament in the near future, so as to put ourselves in a position to cover all the possibilities that may present themselves for cooperation with this country, before such possibilities are covered by others.

Mr Fanton (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, the first official contacts between the People's Republic of China and the Community took place a little more than ten years ago. These contacts found expression in bilateral agreements which expired at the end of 1984. Then the Community informed the People's Republic of China of its wish to conclude a trade agreement which, whilst implementing a common policy, would replace the previous bilateral agreements.

Thus the agreement of 3 February 1978 made it possible to give favourable consideration to imports from the Community, whilst the Community was to aim at an increasing liberalization of imports from China.

The interesting thing about that agreement is that this was the first time such a clause had been incorporated in a trade agreement. Since that agreement came into force trade has developed well. Traditionally the Community's trade balance has been in surplus. Today it may be said that the balance is positive as regards direct investments in particular and, as regards the establishment of joint ventures for example, in the transport sector. Thus oil exploitation is likely to be subject to a strong participation of foreign companies.

To sum up, the agreement has made possible a certain amount of cooperation between the Community and China, primarily in agriculture, energy and light industry. It has mainly taken the form of technological assistance and technology transfers and covers also occupational training.

The new trade and economic cooperation agreement was signed on 26 September 1984. Trade cooperation is more or less identical with that under the 1978 agreement. On the other hand economic cooperation takes an entirely new form and it must be remembered that industry and mining, agriculture, science and technology, energy, transport and communications most particularly should be developed. This new agreement creates a formal framework for development in the field of economic cooperation, which is still only in the early stages.

The Community and China meet the conditions for a successful cooperation based on complementary interests. The Community has the technological know-how and capital, whilst China has plentiful natural

resources and manpower. But, quite apart from the economic and technological nature of the agreement, we must not forget the political aspects arising from the agreement. This new agreement is a clear indication of the intention of both parties to strengthen and further develop their excellent relationship. For that reason our group will vote in favour of this report.

Mr De Clercq, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I should first like to emphasize the economic and political importance of the new economic cooperation agreement signed by the Community and the People's Republic of China a few weeks ago. We are justifiably pleased with this agreement and believe it will lead to major new developments. I welcome the excellent report drawn up by Mr Hindley, who appreciates the full importance of this agreement and has expressed this appreciation clearly in his report. The new agreement forms a suitable framework for the further development of our relations with China. The report summarizes the most important features of these relations, the complementary nature of the trade interests of the two sides, the size and potential of the Chinese market and the importance of cooperation.

I am convinced that this new trade and cooperation instrument represents a turning point in the relations we have had with China for many years, which have become increasingly balanced and favourable. Last May, as you know, we celebrated the tenth anniversary of diplomatic relations. That occasion was used to sign the new agreement, which will form a new basis for the continuation, expansion and reinforcement of our trade relations and cooperation. It was rightly stressed during the discussions at the Commission that the excellent nature of our relations at political level is not, or at least not adequately, reflected in the economic sphere. In fact, although trade with China has grown constantly, it represents only a small percentage of the Community's total trade, only about 1%, which is next to nothing. The volume of our instruments in China is still small. This is a remarkable fact, and not a favourable one, especially if we consider the economic potential of the two sides. But as the prospects for the development of trade are favourable, we can regard the new agreement as a new and decisive stage.

But I would remind you that considerable financial resources will, of course, be needed. It must be said that the appropriations available hitherto have been very limited. We must take account of this if we want to achieve the agreed objectives and to reach our goal. So resources are limited at present. On the other hand, it must be emphasized that we have used the limited resources in the best possible way and that satisfactory results have been achieved. There are, for example, the training programmes, like the Community's participation in the Peking management centre, the training of, so far, 1 200 executives in programming in the energy

De Clercq

sector, the research sector and the very promising prospects in the areas of data processing and telecommunications.

Another example of something that will bear fruit is the visit by the Vice-President of the Chinese state commission for science and technology. The Vice-President, who was accompanied by a large delegation, spent three weeks in various Member States of the European Community. He discussed and studied major energy, telecommunications and data processing projects with these Member States and the Commission and returned to China with details of the projects. We expect this to have positive repercussions. I would also point out that a new business week will be held towards the end of this year, this time in Brussels, with a view to improving the hitherto unsatisfactory level of our relations and the unsatisfactory volume of trade.

As I have said, the new agreement creates a suitable legal framework and so offers fresh opportunities for extensive and close cooperation. But I have also pointed out that the financial problems must certainly not be overlooked. More resources will undoubtedly have to be made available if the data processing and telecommunications programme is to be implemented.

I therefore call on Parliament not to overlook this aspect. We all agree, I think, that we can occupy, maintain and strengthen what is our rightful place in China. The competition will be tough and fierce, but where there is a will, there is a way. The will certainly exists in this case, and I therefore welcome this report, this debate and the contents of the resolution.

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

6. Customs debt

President. — The next item is the report by Dame Shelagh Roberts, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. A 2-29/85), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 739 final — Doc. 2-1543/84) for a regulation on the entry in the accounts and terms of payment of the amounts of the import duties or export duties resulting from a customs debt.

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, this report deals with a Commission proposal which has two objectives. The first is, in effect, to harmonize the conditions of entry in the accounts and the terms of payment of import or export duties. At present, some cases are determined by Community legislation and others by national laws. This proposal gathers together all the necessary definitions.

The procedure for implementing the proposal would still be left to the discretion of Member States, but there would be clear time-limits within which entry of the amount due must be made.

The second objective is to provide for customs authorities to charge interest when payment is overdue or when time is allowed for payment by instalments. I understand that interest is already charged in six of the Member States, so this is not exactly a revolutionary proposition.

The Committee on External Economic Relations considers the proposal to be a reasonable one and sensible in that it is a tidying-up operation. We examined the requests made by the Committee on Budgets, and we were assured by the Commission that the proposal meets their point of view.

Three amendments have been tabled by Mrs van Rooy which were not tabled in committee. I cannot, therefore, give the House an indication of what would be the committee's view on them. Two of the amendments seek to make the requirement to give security discretionary rather than mandatory. I understand from Mrs van Rooy that this is because she is of the opinion that the mandatory giving of security might impose onerous burdens on small businesses. I would like to ask the Commission for its opinion on these amendments so that the House can make a judgement upon them when we come to vote.

The third amendment raises the limit at which an entry of duty becomes necessary from 2 ECU to 10 ECU. If I might venture a personal opinion, I would have thought that was reasonable on the grounds of administrative convenience, and I am inclined to think that if the amendment had been put before our committee, we would have adopted it.

With those few comments, Mr President, and subject to what the Commission may be able to say in respect of the amendments, I commend the proposals to the House.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, I am grateful to Dame Shelagh Roberts and to the Committee on External Economic Relations for their support for this proposal.

The proposal is an important step in the harmonization of customs law and the completion of the customs union. It will be of benefit to traders in all Member States. As Dame Shelagh Roberts has said, the proposal aims to establish common rules governing the entry in the accounts and common terms of payment of amounts of import duties or export duties resulting from a customs debt.

At present, the conditions under which entry in the accounts must take place are defined in Community

Cockfield

legislation only in the case of deferred payment of import or export duties.

Otherwise, the conditions are determined by Member States in accordance with national laws, the content of which is far from uniform. Lack of harmonization in this area results in major divergences in the application of various specific customs rules, such as those governing release of goods for free circulation and temporary importation, and in differences of treatment being accorded to traders in different Member States.

In order to reduce to a minimum such disparities of treatment, the proposal determines — amongst other things — first, the time at which payment must be made; secondly, the types of payment facility which may be granted and the circumstances in which credit interest is due; thirdly, the consequences — for persons liable for payment — of late payment or non-payment; and, fourthly, that repayment by customs authorities of amounts of duty levied unduly should not be coupled with payments of interest.

I come now to the three amendments tabled by Mrs van Rooy, to which Dame Shelagh Roberts has referred. The first two of these amendments, namely, those concerning Article 13, do give rise to some difficulty because of the principle laid down in Article 13(1) of Directive No 79/695 on entry for free circulation. That article provides that the customs may only release goods if the duties have been guaranteed or paid or have been the subject of deferred payment under the conditions laid down by Directive 78/453. Because of this point, which is essentially a legal one, I must, I fear advise Parliament not to accept those two amendments.

The third amendment — that is, the amendment to Article 21 which Dame Shelagh Roberts said she felt she would wish to support — the Commission would also wish to support. We would be happy therefore to accept it.

I hope therefore that, subject to this, Parliament will be prepared to accept the proposal.

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

7. *Repayment or remission of import or export duties*

President. — The next item is the report by Dame Shelagh Roberts, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. A 2-43/85), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 737 final — Doc. 2-1542/84) for a regulation amending for the third time Regulation (EEC) No 1430/79, on the repayment or remission of import or export duties.

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, this report deals with the proposal by the Commission for a regulation to amend an existing regulation, which is No 1430/79. According to the existing regulation, import or export duties are repaid or remitted when goods are re-exported out of the customs territory or destroyed under the supervision of the competent authorities.

Up to now, the decision on the repayment or remission has rested with the Commission, who now propose to transfer that decision-making process to the Member States. The Commission also propose the addition to the list of goods on which repayment or remission would apply.

The Committee on External Economic Relations considered this proposal for an amending regulation to be a reasonable one on which we could recommend approval.

The Committee on Budgets, in their opinion, expressed the hope that the transfer of competence from the Commission to the Member States would not affect the Community nature of own resources, and I have included a clause to that effect in the motion for a resolution, which I hope the Parliament will approve.

There are two amendments tabled by Mrs van Rooy which were not considered in committee, and I cannot, therefore, offer an opinion as to what would be the views of the Committee on External Economic Relations on them. I would, however, invite the Commission to comment again on these two amendments so that Parliament can then judge what they should do about them.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, I am grateful to Dame Shelagh Roberts and the Committee on External Economic Relations for their support for this proposal. The regulation, as Dame Shelagh has explained, transfers the responsibility for taking a decision on applications for repayment or remission under Article 13(2) of Regulation No 1430/79 from the Commission to the competent authorities of the Member States themselves.

I am glad that the committee supports this move, which will speed up the repayment and remission of duties. This is in the interests of the citizen and enables matters to be dealt with by direct contact between the citizen and the administration. Where there is a failure to comply with the necessary procedural requirements of Regulation No 1430/79, the present regulation provides that the repayment or remission of import duties should be abated. The penalty thus imposed should encourage better compliance, and I am glad that the report of your committee supports this approach.

Your report also expresses the hope that the transfer of power from the Commission to the Member States

Cockfield

will not affect the Community's own resources. I can give you an assurance on this point. The amount of the abatement will be retained as part of the Community's own resources, and this is made clear in the recitals to the proposal.

I now come to the three amendments in the name of Mrs van Rooy, to which Dame Shelagh Roberts referred. These amendments propose the deletion of the 10% clause in Articles 4(a), 6(a) and 11(a). The Commission, I fear, could not accept these amendments. Perhaps I might explain this matter in some detail.

In the cases of the kind covered by this provision, there is a degree of negligence on the part of the person who fails to comply with the procedural rules. The total refusal of repayment in such cases would be a disproportionately severe penalty. The Commission considers that the 10% abatement such as is provided in the regulation is necessary in order to secure proper compliance with the procedural requirements. Without this abatement it would make little sense to lay down procedural requirements, since anyone who did not comply with the rules would be treated in the same manner as the person who did respect them.

I would hope, therefore, that with this explanation, and with the assurance that I have given on the point Dame Shelagh Roberts herself raised, the Parliament will accept the proposed regulation.

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

8. Trade with Taiwan

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Van Aerssen, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on trade with Taiwan (Doc. 2-1765/84).

Mr Zarges (PPE), deputy-rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, colleagues. On behalf of my colleague, Mr van Aerssen, who is indisposed, may I lay before you today the report of the Committee on External Economic Relations on trade relations with Taiwan, a report which was discussed by the last Parliament, but which could not be passed in time.

Together with Hong Kong, Singapore and South Korea, Taiwan is one of the first generation of so-called 'threshold' countries, which have only limited natural and energy resources, but which through their innovativeness, imagination, talent for organisation and hard work have attained a degree of industrialisation and a level of income which are almost comparable to those of the industrialised

nations. They also have something in common with the second generation threshold countries — Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand —: firstly, a basic tendency towards a market economy, secondly, a pronounced effort towards industrialisation and thirdly, their integration in the world economy.

The island republic of Taiwan occupies a special position amongst these first generation threshold countries, in 1984 it headed the growth tables for all these countries, with a rise in real domestic product of 10.9%. It has absolute price stability and last year per capita income reached the \$3,000 mark for the first time. In 1984 Taiwan overtook Sweden and Switzerland, coming 11th in the world export tables with export turnover of more than 30 billion dollars. In the same year Taiwan stood 18th in the major banks' credit ratings — Italy was 16th and Denmark 17th.

This trading and economic development will continue, and alongside it the expansion of Taiwan's trade relations. The only problem is Taiwan's heavy dependence on the USA. The Taiwan dollar is tied directly to the US dollar. Taiwan is now firmly committed to reducing this dependence. Which is why it is in the interests of both Taiwan and the Community to step up trade with the EC.

There is a variety of opportunities for us here too. Taiwan's market has particular interest for European technological exports, especially nuclear power stations, railways, aircraft production, chemicals, computers, biotechnology, telecommunications and mechanical engineering, since Taiwan expressly wants to diversify its trade relations and to loosen its close links with the USA and Japan. This could help towards eliminating the EC countries' trade deficit with Taiwan as well.

As far as the EC's relations with Taiwan are concerned the EC has never recognised Taiwan diplomatically and has therefore never maintained official trade relations. For many years the Community has used autonomous measures to regulate the existing trade between Taiwan and the Member States of the EC, especially on the import side, without any kind of consultation or exchange of information, simply as it saw fit. Consequently Taiwan considers, quite rightly in my opinion, that it is subject to discrimination, particularly where its main competitors, the countries of Asia, are concerned. One of the many examples of this was the drastic reduction in textile quotas between 1978 and 1981 within the framework of the Multi Fibre Arrangement. In addition Taiwan has no part in the system of generalised preferences, even today.

Without going so far as to demand the establishment of official relations, Taiwan is asking for a series of pragmatic measures, which could be implemented, if the Community were to adopt a more realistic attitude, and yet would not affect relations with the People's Republic of China. In the view of the Committee

Zarges

on External Economic Relations, which unanimously endorsed this report, the following measures should be taken: firstly, informal talks whenever the EC is planning new trade arrangements and starts negotiations with the countries concerned. Secondly, equal treatment with Far Eastern countries which are at a similar stage of development, whenever the EC is planning new trade policies or wants to alter its existing trade policy. Thirdly, consideration should be given to the question of how Taiwan can best be brought to recognise the obligations and responsibilities of an important trading partner within the international economic system, with particular regard to the mutual observance of internationally recognised agreements regulating fair trading, such as GATT and the ILO.

Fourthly, the functions of the existing EC trade delegations in Taiwan and of Taiwan's trade offices in the Community should be extended. Fifthly, a system should be evolved for the exchange of information through informal contacts and reciprocal visits by representatives of trade and industry. Sixthly, the existing arrangements on travel between Community countries and Taiwan should be improved, so that more airlines can fly to Taiwan, and seventhly, a comprehensive expansion of the banking sector is desirable, possible and appropriate. More banks from the EC should be represented in Taiwan. These are the principal considerations of the report, for which, colleagues, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, I ask you to vote.

May I just make a few remarks on behalf of the European People's Party: my group welcomes the desire for increased relations between the EC and the island republic of Taiwan and is therefore solidly in favour of this report. In particular it advocates full recognition of the island republic of Taiwan and is extremely concerned to see a qualitative improvement in relations on both sides. We are also debating today the Council Regulation on trade relations between the EC and the People's Republic of China. The group of the European People's Party — as you have heard already — has firmly said yes, even though the latter country has applied pressure in various directions, for example to torpedo the Taiwan report. But pressure has never been a reason for us to change a view which we consider to be right. If we say yes to trade with the People's Republic of China, a totalitarian Communist regime, it is in accordance with our thinking on the criteria for the Community's trade with the rest of the world.

But that thinking then requires not only that we trade with the island republic of Taiwan, but also that we call for the recognition of and equal treatment for this country and thereby free it from its partial isolation. The tenacious, industrious and laudable people of Taiwan deserve that.

Finally I should like to add a frank personal comment regarding Taiwan. I myself support this report for

particular political reasons, because I see Taiwan as a long-standing friend and partner of the Free World, one which stands like a rampart against Communism in Asia. I have always considered that the United States of America was wrong simply to drop a long-standing ally overnight. That is not the way to treat one's friends!

I shall try all the harder to do everything I can to bring about full relations between the European Community and the island republic of Taiwan, and one thing has to be said clearly: as this report shows, Taiwan today is an element for stability in the Pacific area within the framework of Western cooperation. The European Community should take more account of this fact and I hope that the report provides an appropriate way of doing this.

(Applause)

Mr Seeler (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the present report on trade relations with Taiwan concentrates firmly on trade and economic matters. You have just heard the rapporteur say that the European Community does not maintain any diplomatic relations with this country. There is however a considerable volume of trade. There is also a lively trade between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan, or — as it calls itself, the Republic of China — generally via Hong Kong.

These trade relations — as one must realise — have generated a number of problems in recent years. Particularly because of its low wage costs Taiwan has been a sensitive, a dangerous, competitor for the European economy. In the meantime Taiwan's economy has been able to exploit modern technology and has achieved notable progress in the development of its industrial productivity. A visit to the shipyards in the south of the country demonstrates this very clearly.

Taiwan is also a source of imitation, counterfeit products. The Taiwan government has however had to take very drastic steps here, because it has realised that it is spoiling its image.

Finally, Taiwan is one of the largest suppliers of textile products and shoes on the world market, but at the same time it takes a very protectionist line in its own market where these goods are concerned. Next to Japan, South Korea and Hong Kong, Taiwan is at present the most significant economic factor in the western Pacific. I am convinced — as I explained when I introduced the report on Hong Kong — that the Community's trade with these countries will change substantially over the next few years.

At the beginning I said that because of the well-known political situation our report concentrates on trade and economic matters. But trade policy is part of the overall foreign policy. Therefore one cannot overlook the

Seeler

fact that the People's Republic of China has repeatedly tried gradually to overcome the division of the country into two States. As a German I know what this means to a country, although I do of course realise that the division of China has a different historical dimension from the division of my own country. In connection with the agreement between the People's Republic of China and Great Britain on the future of Hong Kong the Chinese side repeatedly made it clear that in the event of reunification the future status of Hong Kong can provide an example for Taiwan.

Even if it is not possible to envisage such a rapprochement between the two parts of China in the near future, it is conceivable in the medium-term, especially if the rigid subordination of Chinese economic policy to ideology and dogma continues to be loosened in favour of a more pragmatic economic policy. We in Europe would do well therefore to think about such developments where our medium-term foreign policy and the development of the western Pacific are concerned. Taiwan will play an important part in that development.

In conclusion let me give a brief forecast for our economic policy. Trade with the USA — an important factor at present — is a mainstay of our economy. But the uncertainty of the dollar is also a weakening factor in this economic relationship. Trade with the third world — Africa and Latin America — is suffering from these countries' level of indebtedness. No great expansion of trade with the OPEC countries can be expected, since the oil price trend is stationary at present and prices will fall rather than rise. Trade with the Comecon countries is afflicted by the paralysis of State control and the structural weaknesses of these countries.

The only market which offers considerable future opportunities is the western Pacific, although despite all the promises the Japanese market is capable only of limited expansion where the European economy is concerned. The ASEAN States, Hong Kong, China, Korea, and probably the islands of the south Pacific as well, will be the development area for world trade in the coming decade. Because of its geographical location and its economic potential Taiwan will play an important role in that development. We in Europe should bear that in mind when we are discussing trade with this politically disputed country.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS
CASSANMAGNAGO-CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr De Clercq, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Madam President, the Commission has noted

with interest Mr van Aerssen's report on trade relations with Taiwan. This report was adopted by the Committee on External Economic Relations and undeniably contains many suggestions which deserve and have indeed received our attention.

The Commission would, however, point out that the European Community has recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China as being the only legitimate government of China. The Community does not therefore have any official, formal relations, including diplomatic relations, with Taiwan, and it has no plans to establish such relations. The Commission is also particularly pleased to say that it celebrated the tenth anniversary of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China last May and that, as everyone knows, a new agreement on economic and trade cooperation was signed in Brussels on that occasion.

Having said this, we cannot, as the rapporteur says, deny the economic reality of the situation. European companies have an increasingly wide range of contacts with the Taiwanese market, thanks to its rapid and constant economic development.

It is also pointed out in this report that major efforts have been made to increase trade with this market, whose potential has grown from year to year. As the report says, Taiwan has taken steps to prevent imitation. We are very pleased with this, and in view of the disastrous repercussions which imitation can have, we want to see these measures systematically enforced. We shall also urge Taiwan to obey the rules of the international trade system in the economic contracts that have developed.

To conclude, Madam President, the Commission will be mindful of the suggestions which the rapporteur has made in his motion for a resolution.

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

9. Welcome

President. — On behalf of the European Parliament, I welcome the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Chamber of Deputies of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, who have taken their seats in the official gallery.

(Applause)

I offer them a cordial welcome and hope that the exchange of views they will have tomorrow with various Members of this Parliament, in particular with members of the Political Affairs Committee and the Committee on Institutional Affairs, will be particularly

President

profitable and will help to strengthen our cooperation with the parliaments of our countries.

(Applause)

10. *Luxembourg Presidency: Council statement*

President. — The next item is a joint debate on

- a statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the term of office of the Luxembourg Presidency;
- the oral question, with debate, tabled by Mr Poettering and others, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament, to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, on European security and European political cooperation (Doc. B 2-594/85); and
- the oral question, with debate, tabled by Mr Poettering and others, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament, to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, on the political and economic aspects of security (Doc. B 2-595/85).

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council is traditionally taken as an opportunity for a sweeping survey of all the issues arising in the European context. However, since a lengthy enumeration would run counter to the precision necessary in a parliamentary debate, I shall try to concentrate on what I feel are the most essential points.

First and foremost, I wish to pay tribute to the Italian Presidency for the efficiency and skill with which it has steered our Community through a period that has proved difficult but rich in lessons and achievements. If, as I speak to you now, the Community seems once more all set to look purposefully towards the future and the fresh prospects which it holds, a large part of the credit indisputably belongs to the Italian Presidency and the remarkable work which it has done.

The Luxembourg Presidency will endeavour to continue the close dialogue which has been initiated with the European Parliament. It is our intention that that dialogue should be frank and wideranging. Armed with its mandate from the European Council, the Presidency will shoulder its responsibilities and will be submitting proposals to strengthen the role which you play in the Community decision-making process. In the meantime, we shall make the best use of existing provisions.

For the first time for some years, we no longer need to devote all our energy and abilities to seeking solutions

to a profusion of internal problems. Enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal is now an established fact. New 'own resources' and a corrective budgetary mechanism have been adopted. The financing crisis has been resolved for the time being. Rationalization and reform of the common agricultural policy are under way, as is the process of implementing the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes.

Admittedly, there are some clouds on the horizon. The new ceiling on the Community's own resources, for instance, is too low to give the Community financial security over a long period. Relations between our two institutions over the budget also remain difficult, but I hope that the process of clarification in which the two branches of the budgetary authority have been engaged for the past few months will clear the way for constructive cooperation in examining the 1986 draft budget. I am hopeful that at the end of the term of office of the Luxembourg Presidency the Community of Twelve will indeed have a budget: the Presidency, at any rate, intends to spare no effort to achieve this end.

It seems to me that the time has come when we should again be able, together, to address ourselves to the major problems of the day. Our Community can once more look to the future. If we do not do so now, when the way ahead is clear, then we may never do so at all!

The Milan European Council laid down major guidelines. Its President has presented its conclusions to you, especially those concerning the institutions. Yesterday evening, you adopted a favourable opinion on the convocation of an intergovernmental conference. For me this is gratifying as a clear demonstration of your willingness to assist the Presidency in this difficult but important task.

For my part, I should like today to describe to you the main lines of the Community action which the Presidency hopes the Council will accomplish in this second half of the year.

Madam President, there is one major priority which the Presidency of the Council must tackle during these six months, a priority which the European Parliament was the first to have the perspicacity and courage to identify. I am, of course, talking about the fight against unemployment and a return to growth in the Community economy. I must admit that it is not without misgivings that I propose to consider, with your help, how the Community can from now on improve its efforts to deal with this major problem.

The first thing that strikes one is the fact that for more than ten years we have had at one and the same time a constant increase in the number of unemployed and a string of declarations about the need to reduce unemployment. Up to the end of the seventies, the Community, among the developed countries, seemed to be a haven of full employment, but the situation has been radically reversed since then: while the United States

Poos

and Japan were creating millions of new jobs, the Community was scrapping three million. Admittedly, there was a kind of lull in 1984 and the constant drop in the number of jobs available in the EEC seemed to have been stemmed; but this was an illusory respite, for the rise in unemployment has given way to a qualitative deterioration, measured by an increase in the average period of unemployment, especially among young people. With an ever-growing number of under-25's condemned to idleness for periods of over a year, our society seems cynically to be producing half a generation crippled by the lack of work.

In the past decade, therefore, our countries lived in the pious hope that unemployment would in the end cure itself. With the start of the eighties, however, these illusions were contradicted by the facts, and the various Member States, one after another, started making efforts to reduce inflation, control spiralling production costs and restore industry's margins. The results after several years show that these efforts were inadequate: in the past two years, economic growth in the United States has been running at over 10%, as against some 3% in the EEC. Since the end of the Second World War, Europe had always outstripped the United States in terms of growth: what a difference now! What is more, such growth as there is can be attributed chiefly to an increase in exports, itself basically the result of the American upturn. What will happen if the lightning growth of the US economy starts to run out of wind?

There is certainly no miraculous remedy for unemployment; but if we are not to succumb to this ill, which affects almost 13% of our active population, i.e., 15 million people in the enlarged Community, we must set ourselves objectives and decide exactly how to achieve them.

The aim is a significant reduction in the rate of unemployment in the Community within a reasonable time. Even if demographic change can make a limited contribution, the achievement of this aim requires first of all an increase in employment over a lengthy period.

Economic growth will certainly not be sufficient to achieve this, for rates of growth of more than 5% per annum now seem beyond our grasp. The expected growth in the next few years will not, therefore, in itself be enough to resolve the employment problem. While what we need is more dynamic growth, we must above all ensure that it is growth which generates more employment, so that the number of jobs created by each percentage-point increase in investment or gross domestic product is higher than before.

Is it possible to achieve this kind of job-generating growth? Although it cannot be accomplished by decree, we do know that the ratio between growth and employment as observed in Europe during the years 1970-81 is not an immutable natural law. During those same years, this ratio developed quite differently in

Japan and the United States. These examples do not mean that we in Europe should, or could, simply imitate these two countries, and in any case their two situations differed hugely; but since these examples prove that growth more conducive to employment is possible, they invite us to seek solutions appropriate to European circumstances.

These solutions depend both on macro-economic policy and on the flexibility of our economies. Admittedly, flexibility is not popular. It is hard to accept and to achieve in a slowly growing economy. It is a matter not only of recruitment and working conditions but of the whole organization of economic life. There is, therefore, absolutely no question of doubting our European system of social solidarity, to which we remain firmly committed. On the contrary, we must ensure that economic efficiency goes hand in hand with justice and the safeguarding of social progress, and that is not possible without a social dialogue which encourages European undertakings to be prepared to create jobs. The Commission has already taken steps to achieve this. These efforts must be continued and intensified.

Improvement of the social climate should therefore facilitate structural changes by adapting the labour market, as well as other markets, to the new economic conditions. An active, imaginative labour-market policy should include the promotion of vocational training and implement specific measures tailored to the less-favoured groups, sectors and regions. The same applies to the reorganization and reduction of working-time, which, without any threat to the competitiveness of European undertakings, could be negotiated essentially on a decentralized basis. At the same time, efforts to encourage the setting up and expansion of small and medium-sized undertakings should be stepped up, for the role of such firms is essential to job creation.

While some of these measures are largely the direct responsibility of the Member States, they nonetheless require a favourable environment and overall framework, and this it is highly desirable to develop at Community level. The European Council meeting of 29-30 March in Brussels and that in Milan pinpointed the main areas for action here: first, the achievement by 1992 of the single Community market referred to in the Commission White Paper; secondly, convergence of our economic policies and strengthening the European Monetary System; and thirdly, developing genuine technological cooperation on a Community-wide scale.

The more dynamic the economic development, the easier are the processes of economic and social adjustment. That is why I believe it is now time to add a dash of dynamism to the other ingredients of macro-economic policies aimed at monetary stability, moderating production costs and rationalizing public accounts.

Poos

Abrupt changes are anathema to the economy. A more dynamic policy is therefore certainly not possible without a continuation of wage restraint for some time to come, hence the importance of the dialogue between both sides of industry and the authorities, whether governmental or Community representatives. A counterpart to moderation in wage claims which should, however, be proposed is giving a greater boost to demand, thereby avoiding the deflationary trap which inevitably lurks at the end of a long period of austerity. If, as predicted, the United States cannot continue to the same extent as in the past year to be the driving-force of world economic revival, the dynamism necessary for growth in Europe must come from Europe itself.

Without disregarding the contribution to be made by private and public consumption to a more autonomous revival of the European economies, it is in the field of investment that there is the clearest need for an element of dynamism. This means first of all that, in the Member States, present and future margins for manoeuvre — even where they are narrow — must be exploited to the full to reinforce more job-generating growth. It also means that the Community as such must make its own contribution to the dynamic of growth.

The expansion of Community borrowing and lending mechanisms would make it possible to finance investments in small and medium-sized undertakings, technological innovation and environmental protection projects. But consideration must also be given to large-scale infrastructure investments which would help adapt European transport and telecommunications networks to the needs of a large internal market. Participation by private capital in the financing of such a coordinated programme of major infrastructures of European importance should also be encouraged. Several reports prepared at your request have amply developed these ideas and means of action. The Luxembourg Presidency believes that it is now urgent that positive action be taken on these proposals of yours, which the Commission has incorporated in its own work programme.

Such a combination of structural and macro-economic policies involving increased Community action is fundamentally different from past economic revival programmes, which have had short-lived results and have left us with higher rates of inflation without providing a lasting solution to the problems of growth and employment. What Europe needs is a real, joint, non-inflationary growth project relying on the multiplier effects of Community programmes and conceived as part of the vast project of European integration. The speedy development of a Community-wide internal market in goods, services, capital and labour is vital to the economic dynamic of the Community.

In the longer term, the fight against unemployment will succeed only if Europe again mobilizes its own

growth potential and its pool of resources. So far, however, the Community has itself slowed down its growth by its own lack of achievement. European integration, in fact, is marked by a very high level of commercial interpenetration and a very low level of integration of economic policy instruments.

Concerning the high level of Community trade interpenetration, more than half of the Member States' external trade is carried on within the Community. This means that as soon as one Member State achieves a growth-rate appreciably higher than the average of its neighbours, it imports more from them and exports less to them, which soon affects its trade balance and obliges it to introduce restrictive economic policies, thereby creating more unemployment. Because of this high level of trade interpenetration — which is, moreover, one of the Community's major achievements —, each of the Member States is in a position which the Albert and Ball report rightly describes as the 'impotence of States' permanently and sensibly to rectify their economic growth-rates.

As for the low level of integration of economic policy instruments, the Community does not have a common currency; its common budget, which is no more than 1% of GDP, is inadequate for the counterbalancing role which would be essential; up to now it has had no common policy for the future, in particular, of research and development.

This low level of integration of economic policy instruments is the reason why the Member States are forced down the sterile path of deflation. Whereas the faster development of California or Texas favours the expansion of Minnesota or Massachusetts because the Federation of the United States has a common currency and a powerful federal budget, a Community country is obliged to restrict its growth as soon as this growth begins seriously to exceed that of neighbouring countries and results in an imbalance of its external payments.

At this point, may I, as the representative of the smallest Community country, modestly endorse the conclusion of the two experts appointed by the European Parliament, that there is no longer any 'go it alone' solution for any Member State to the problems of economic growth. Any solutions must involve them all.

(Applause)

Twenty-eight years after the Treaty of Rome was signed, what should have become a great internal economic area is still riddled with barriers and obstacles to free movement. The cost of this non-Europe of barriers and divisions run into thousands of millions of ECU. The fragmentation of resources and national protectionism frustrate our capabilities and destroy competitiveness. The solution, as has been said over and over again, must be a Community solution or there will be no solution at all.

Poos

This freedom of movement, in my opinion, should not be limited to goods and services. It should also become a tangible reality for our citizens, for the flow of ideas is best promoted by the free circulation of information. By giving every European the possibility of access to the greatest number of programmes, we shall help to bring Europeans closer together and enable them to derive the maximum benefit from the cultural diversity of our ancient continent.

Strengthening the internal market will create a powerful impetus for the interpenetration of the economies of our Member States and promote the convergence of our economic policies. The great increase in exchanges of goods, services, persons and ideas will also be a factor of economic revival and thus of social progress.

The Commission's White Paper clearly sets out the full extent of the problem. Proposals for solutions have been promised, and a timetable for carrying them out in stages has been fixed.

The European Council has laid down the principles on which the Heads of State or Government wish the efforts for achieving a single Community-wide market by 1992 to be based. The challenge is there. A considerable effort is required of us all; I can assure you that the Presidency is determined to discharge its responsibilities fully, but we shall succeed only if the willingness declared at the highest level is followed by a commitment on everyone's part.

A more unified internal market will also lead to greater monetary convergence and strengthen the zone of stability created by the EMS. Although the present degree of integration of our monetary policies is very slight and the goal of true monetary union may seem distant, I consider that we must continually strengthen our monetary cooperation. First and foremost, we must work for equal participation by all Member States in the EMS, increase the role and extend the use of the ECU. The Presidency hopes that the current discussions on the medium and long-term prospects for the EMS will continue to be productive and will result in conclusions which can be put into operation. The Presidency will devote particular attention to enhancing the acceptability and negotiability of the ECU, to the conditions of its creation and the means which should enable it effectively to carry out the functions assigned to it.

With regard to technology, Europe as a whole is lagging behind its main industrial competitors. A considerable effort in the sphere of development and innovation is necessary at European level. Such an effort, moreover, cannot be viewed in isolation from the realization of the internal market, which is a precondition for its success. Only a really unified Community-wide market can ensure that scientific and technological progress is applied on a large industrial scale.

Taken in isolation, none of our countries is able to provide the financial means and human resources required by the technological revolution. I therefore acknowledge the importance of the Eureka project which France has launched, as well as the proposals submitted by the Commission to the European Council in Milan. The reaction of various major sectors of industry shows to what extent that project meets a need. The political leaders' meeting to be held in Paris in a few days time should outline the cooperation structures and procedures which derive the greatest possible benefit from the Community dimension.

On behalf of the Presidency, I should like to thank the *ad hoc* Committee on a People's Europe for its work. An impressive number of specific, constructive proposals have been made which all aim at bringing the Community, too often seen as an abstract and even anonymous entity, closer to its citizens and showing that it is not confined to the liberalization of movements of goods and services but must become a living cultural, social and educational reality for its citizens, thus creating a real feeling of belonging to a great community.

The Presidency considers that the most effective line of action is to concentrate on proposals already submitted to the Council for the reduction of regulations and practices and on a number of new fields which must be dealt with as a matter of priority. With regard to matters which fall within the Community's sphere of competence or for which responsibility is shared with the Member States, the Presidency expects the Commission, in line with the wishes of the European Council, to submit proposals. Five of the Member States — and I welcome the fact that Luxembourg is one of them — have already taken definite steps to open up their frontiers. What five Member States have been able to achieve can be achieved by ten now and twelve in the near future.

(Applause)

The iron-and-steel industry is certainly one of the sectors which have experienced the most serious socio-economic problems over the last few years. The Community has had to introduce an aid code, a system of production and supply quotas and a pricing system. These measures expire on 31 December 1985. In view of this time-limit, the Presidency will endeavour, on the basis of proposals submitted by the Commission, to carry out the task incumbent upon it up to the end of the year. I believe that the European iron-and-steel industry must be enabled to complete its restructuring under orderly market conditions.

In the field of energy, the Council has received an important communication from the Commission concerning new Community objectives for 1995. Discussions are already under way within the Council, and a detailed examination will be continued throughout this six-monthly period.

Poos

Community regulation of State aids to the coal industry will expire at the end of the year, and agreement should therefore be reached regarding the principle and nature of a system for the post-1985 period. That system will have to provide for the transition which is necessary for maintaining employment in this important basic sector of the European economy.

Other aspects of the Community's energy policy should also be discussed during this six-monthly period, in particular with regard to new developments in natural gas, electricity and new and renewable sources of energy.

In the sphere of transport, the Council is devoting its full attention to the judgement given by the Court of Justice last May. The Presidency has already taken measures to step up the Council's work. Priority will be given to proposals already submitted or to be submitted by the Commission concerning freedom to provide services in various spheres of international and national carriage of goods and passengers. Efforts will continue to be made in the spheres of land, inland-waterway, air and maritime transport in order to implement the common transport policy which is essential for the harmonious operation of a vast internal market.

Protection of the environment has become a major cause of concern. We can no longer continue, as in the past, to destroy with impunity the delicate ecological balance upon which our existence depends. There is now awareness of this problem, and considerable efforts have been made over the last few months to combat air pollution, especially that caused by motor vehicles. As you know, these efforts have been widely successful. Agreement was reached between nine delegations scarcely two weeks ago concerning the setting of European standards for the emission of noxious gases by cars.

We expect to give form to this political agreement before the summer recess. To be sure, some people may feel — and I understand them — that greater and more rapid progress could have been made; but it must not be forgotten that the compromise, which was achieved with difficulty, has enabled us to maintain the unity of the internal market at the same time.

The Community's action cannot stop here. The Presidency proposes concentrating in future on the problem of emissions from large-scale combustion plants. We will, moreover, take the steps necessary to put into effect the Commission proposal concerning forest protection in view of the challenge to the conservative of the environment which is set by the very complex phenomenon of acid rain and by forest fires.

With regard to consumer protection, the Commission has just sent the Council a communication — soon to be followed by proposals — which aims, ten years after the definition of an initial strategy — at giving

fresh impetus to Community action in this sphere. The European consumer must be able to derive full benefit from the scale of a real internal market. Along these lines, too, the Luxembourg Presidency intends to continue examining the proposals still in abeyance.

The Common Agricultural Policy is today dogged by an acute imbalance on the markets of most agricultural products, being faced with a rapid and continuing increase in agricultural yields while consumption is stagnating. And so it has to contend with burgeoning expenditure on market support as a consequence of an imbalance which is becoming less and less compatible with budgetary discipline.

Discussions have begun, and a wide-ranging debate is imminent on the medium and long-term prospects for the CAP and the adjustments it will require, allowing also for the accession of two new countries. The object must continue to be the development, through the gradual re-balancing of the agricultural markets, of a healthy and efficient European agriculture complying with the basic principles of the CAP as enshrined in the Treaties.

The Presidency awaits the Commission's communication with great interest, and will do its utmost to achieve progress in the examination of this matter. Following the signing of the Treaty of Accession, the Council will also have to adopt measures to implement the transitional arrangements agreed on for various agricultural sectors.

In the social sphere, the Luxembourg Presidency is determined to see progress made on all the initiatives and proposals offering an effective means of combating the problem of unemployment — a scourge of society if ever there was one and an issue I have already dealt with at length. It will endeavour to break the deadlock on certain important questions, in particular on the directive on informing and consulting the employees of undertakings with complex structures. A large majority of the Member States believe that this directive offers a valuable means of achieving important progress on a Community scale.

The examination of directives designed to bring about equal treatment for men and women (parental leave, occupational social-security schemes, self-employed activities) will be continued and, if possible, concluded.

In the field of external relations, four subjects in particular call for our attention.

First, the overall Mediterranean policy, which the Community intends to formulate and implement now that enlargement has been agreed on. The accession of Spain and Portugal will bring a new dimension to the network of privileged relations which the Community maintains with its partners around the Mediterranean. It must create a real incentive to consolidate and sta-

Poos

bilize the cooperation links established while adapting them to the new circumstances resulting from accession. On the basis of proposals awaited from the Commission, the Presidency will seek to ensure that the future Mediterranean policy of the Community of Twelve meets these demands. It is in this spirit that the negotiations for adapting the various Mediterranean agreements must be approached.

Secondly, the establishment of more highly structured relations with Central and Latin America. I shall have occasion to return to this subject in the section of my speech devoted to political cooperation.

Thirdly, the consolidation of our relations with the ASEAN countries, where the political dialogue is now regularly and permanently established. Representatives of the 'Troika', at ministerial level, and of the Commission will, from tomorrow, be taking part in Kuala Lumpur in dialogue meetings with the five Pacific countries. A further step will be taken in economic cooperation with the meeting — the first of its kind — of the Ministers for Economic Affairs of the EEC and ASEAN in Bangkok in October. Together they will consider ways and means of further strengthening and intensifying economic ties between the two groups of countries.

Finally, a review of the framework of multilateral trade relations and the development of our relations with the two great industrial powers, the United States and Japan.

The world economic crisis of the last decade has revived the alarming spectre of protectionism, with its pernicious concomitant of market isolation and the drying up of trade-flows. Protectionism is a temptation which threatens to stifle the recovery of the world economy. It strikes first at the poorest nations and those which have just reached the threshold of development. It is the essential role and duty of the European Economic Community to guarantee the maintenance of liberal practices in world trade.

In this connection, the new round of multilateral trade negotiations should be an important stage on the road to strengthening the multilateral trading system and the expansion of international trade. It is essential that our Community, the largest trading-power in the world, should play its natural role here. These negotiations should produce balanced results which serve the interests of all the parties, developed and developing countries alike.

Alongside the trade negotiations, concerted initiatives will have to be taken in the appropriate fora to improve the operation of the international monetary system and guarantee the flow of financial and other resources to the developing countries.

In the recent past, our trade relations with the United States have been marked by certain tensions which

have given rise to specific measures. The Community deeply regrets this state of affairs and will endeavour to restore the traditionally friendly and liberal climate of relations between the two largest trading-powers in the world. It is in no one's interest to get caught up in an escalade of unilateral measures at a time when, on both sides of the Atlantic, efforts are being made to strengthen the structures of GATT and to liberalize world trade in the new round of multilateral negotiations. I trust that our relations with the United States will continue to evolve in accordance with principles to which we are the first to subscribe.

Our relations with Japan are still dominated by an ever-growing imbalance. Japan shares with its Western partners the responsibility for safeguarding and strengthening the multilateral trade system of which it has been the great beneficiary. The Community will continue to demand easier access to the Japanese market, particularly in manufactured goods and processed agricultural products. It will also attach great importance to the liberalization of Japan's financial markets and to internationalizing the yen.

You will be aware of the recent initiative taken by COMECON. The Council has asked the Commission to investigate its significance, and the Council's reaction will be decided on in the light of the Commission's report.

As you know, a new dimension was added to our relations with the EFTA countries by the declaration adopted in Luxembourg in April 1984. This declaration must now be given practical substance. The Commission has recently informed the Council of its approach to this matter, which should enable some progress to be made on the creation of that 'dynamic European economic space' which is the aim of the Luxembourg Declaration. In addition, the Community will, in the coming months, have to negotiate with the EFTA countries the adaption of the free-trade agreements following the accession of Spain and Portugal.

In development cooperation, priority will be given to aid by the Community and the Member States to the African countries so severely affected by drought, desertification and famine. The objects of the Dublin Plan have been achieved and, given the gravity of the situation and the enormity of the needs, their implementation has so far been satisfactory.

Unfortunately, a repetition of this disaster cannot be ruled out, and it is essential that the Community and the Member States adopt a preventive and consistent strategy of also helping the recipient countries to develop greater food security. Specific proposals were put by the Commission to the European Council in Milan. The Presidency intends to have these examined without delay, and first of all the proposal concerning a special reserve allocation. It will also see to it, in collaboration with the Commission, the the programming provided for in the third Lomé Convention — symbol

Poos

of the continuity of a model of cooperation unique in the world — is carried out as soon as possible.

Having looked at external policy questions of a largely economic nature, I should like now to tackle the other facet of this policy, that is to say, the so-called 'foreign-policy' matters which are dealt with in European political cooperation. I shall not, however, abuse your patience by detailing here the positions of principle taken by the Ten of all these issues. This would, indeed, be reminding Parliament of positions which are also, in substance, its own. I shall therefore deal with foreign-policy questions only in relations to the work we propose to carry out over the next six months.

The improvement of East-West relations, in particular progress in disarmament, will, of course, be the Luxembourg Presidency's primary object. Like the Parliament, the ten governments have expressed their full support for the US-Soviet negotiations in Geneva. They approve in particular the scale and the ambitiousness of the objects which the Americans and the Soviets have set themselves, i.e., 'to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear arms and at strengthening strategic stability'.

The second round of these negotiations, which promise to be long and difficult, will be ending in the next few days, probably without having achieved any appreciable progress. It is up to the Ten to encourage the two parties not to neglect any opportunity for achieving substantial results.

Five days ago, the sixth session of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe came to an end in Stockholm. The East European countries have finally begun to show greater interest in practical confidence- and security-building measures, but at the present stage their proposals are inadequate in content and, in part do not concord with the terms of the mandate. We hope that these positions will evolve and that it will then be possible to reach agreement on the detailed procedures for renewing the commitment not to resort to force or to the threat of force.

In mentioning the Stockholm Conference I have already broached the subject of the CSCE process, which is of such great importance for our governments, as it is for Parliament. Another meeting convened in this framework has just ended in Ottawa — namely, the meeting of experts on human rights. This conference gave an opportunity for a frank and open examination of the observance by each of the participating States of its commitments on human rights as they result from the Final Act and the Madrid closing document. It was unable, however, to fulfil the second part of its mandate, 'to draw up conclusions and recommendations to be put to the governments of all

the participating States'. Indeed, it ended without any closing document being adopted.

We are thus unquestionably faced here with a semi-failure which will cast a shadow over the commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act, due to take place in Helsinki on 30 and 31 July and 1 August. Some will say, what's the use of celebrating this anniversary, since balanced progress on each of the components of the CSCE process no longer seems to be guaranteed and the East European countries appear determined not to honour their commitments under the 7th principle of the Final Act? However, I am at one with my colleagues from the other countries of the Community, and with those of other Western countries, in believing that we must not miss the Helsinki anniversary. The CSCE process must be maintained at all costs.

Even though the results over these last ten years have been extremely disappointing as regards human rights, some small progress has been made in other fields covered by the Final Act.

Lastly, the Final Act, supplemented by the Madrid document, remains a means of exerting pressure which will enable us to work towards improving the rights of individuals in the East European countries until the day comes — unfortunately, probably a long time hence — when the authorities in those countries finally understand that 'socialism' which has no regard for basic freedoms is no true socialism. This anniversary will therefore enable us to reaffirm the value of the work done ten years ago, to confirm our attachment to the 'Charter for East-West Relations' which the Final Act represents and to emphasize the need for every part of that document to be applied on a parallel basis.

In the same spirit, marked both by disappointment and the will to persevere, we shall be celebrating the 40th anniversary of the UN Charter in New York this autumn; all too often the basic precepts of this document, too, have been violated, although it is still the essential basis for the peaceful and orderly co-existence of the peoples of this planet. This will provide us with the opportunity to draw attention to the extreme importance which we attach to respect for human rights throughout the world.

During the next six months, the Ten will be pursuing their firm policy of establishing relations which are as constructive as possible not only with the Soviet Union but with each Warsaw Pact country. In this connection, I feel I have to state how extremely disappointed we feel with developments in the situation in Poland, where the last remaining attainments of the period prior to the declaration of martial law are now being eliminated. The Ten will have to consider the conclusions to be drawn from these negative developments.

Before moving on from the field of East-West relations, I wish to reiterate most strongly that we still

Poos

demand that the occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union and the occupation of Cambodia by Vietnam be brought to an end . . .

(Applause from the centre and the right)

. . . and that an immediate stop be put to inadmissible incursions into the territory of neighbouring countries.

In the Middle East, the hope which sprang to life in February, when the Jordano-Palestinian platform for a peaceful and just settlement to the Israeli-Arab conflict emerged, is still extant. It has led to an impetus regarding which Egypt and the United States have expressed their interest and support.

The Ten, for their part, feel that every opportunity which may arise as a result of the Amman declaration should be studied and that no effort should be spared to maintain and intensify the present stage of movement in the peace process. At the same time, they intend to facilitate the opening of a dialogue between all parties to the conflict. Since a degree of movement may be observed in the positions taken up, it should be possible to expect the region as a whole to show willingness to encourage and increase such movement.

The question of a forum capable of contributing to a genuine reconciliation remains open. Could not the United Nations Organization, and more specifically the Security Council, offer all interested parties the possibility of contact and valuable guarantees as regards a fair balance?

Israel's decision to withdraw its army from Lebanon, unfortunately not yet completed, is essential if the internal conflict dividing that country is to be resolved. However, other conditions must be fulfilled before there can be any real question of such a solution, in particular general acceptance of a balanced situation in Lebanon and the opening of a genuine dialogue between the Lebanese communities. When will the Lebanese be willing or able to take stock of the damage and put their heads together about their common interests with a view to agreeing on a peaceful future?

War is not predestined; nor is it in the conflict between Iran and Iraq. What, now, is the purpose of that bitter war? The Ten are seriously concerned about the situation in the Gulf and will support any attempt to mediate in the conflict, particularly the efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General. In their own contacts, the Ten will press for an honourable negotiated solution which is acceptable to both sides.

As a result of enlargement and of the declaration on relations with Latin America annexed to the Treaty of Accession, the development of the Community's relations with these countries, most of which have considerable economic problems, will take on increased importance. Our relations with the Central American

countries will certainly be in the forefront, as the conflicts dividing that region are of international significance. The Presidency intends to pursue and enlarge on the talks entered into at the Conference of San José de Costa Rica. The negotiation of an economic and political cooperation agreement in good and due form between the Community and the countries of Central America should play a part, as Parliament expressly hoped in a resolution passed at its June part-session,

. . . in safeguarding lasting peace in the region, combating poverty, achieving human rights, social justice and democratic structures and extending the economic relations of the European Community.

We remain convinced that the peace initiative of the Contadora Group is the only way towards peace and greater stability in the region. We shall continue to give our active support to that initiative and its objectives. With that end in view, we shall make every effort to arrange, under the Luxembourg Presidency, a second conference along the lines of the one held in San José. In the meantime, the Luxembourg Presidency would call on the countries of Central America not to wait for the signing of the Contadora Act before bringing into effect the provisions of that Act which relate to the observance of human rights. I am sure that this would have a profound effect on the political climate in the region and beyond.

The situation in Africa, the famine, delayed economic development and the great suffering of so many of the inhabitants of that continent have prompted an encouraging supportive reaction from many Europeans. As Parliament's debates on measures to combat hunger in Africa have shown, one big effort will not be enough, for the emaciated faces of the famine victims will haunt us for a long time to come. The measures taken by the Ten in this connection will therefore have to be followed up, particularly with regard to the structural causes of the famine.

From a strictly political point of view, the spotlight is still on Southern Africa and especially South Africa. The Ten regret the negative developments in the region. They condemn all acts which run counter to dialogue, such as South Africa's incursions into neighbouring countries. They refuse to recognize the validity of the unilateral decisions taken by South Africa in Namibia.

With the Europe of the Ten, a vigorous movement of opposition to the policy of *apartheid* rightly continues its battle for the recognition of human rights. The European Parliament has debated the situation in South Africa and has condemned the wave of repression and violence which has been flowing through that country for many months now. The governments of the Ten will, as in the past, stand firm in their rejection of *apartheid* and remain fundamentally opposed to that regime.

Poos

The question of reviewing the code of conduct for South African subsidiaries of European firms will be discussed among the Ten with a view to increasing its scope and efficacy. During the months to come, special attention will also have to be paid to the positions adopted by spokesmen for the black community in order to judge what scale of action by the Ten to combat *apartheid* would be appropriate.

Finally, I would like to stress that the Ten are deeply concerned at the resurgence of terrorism and aircraft hijackings. No political cause can justify murders, bomb attacks, the hijacking of aircraft or the taking of hostages. In particular, we demand the immediate and unconditional release of all the hostages still held in Lebanon.

The Ministers for Justice or the Interior meeting in Rome on 20-21 June 1985 adopted a series of conclusions which we have noted with satisfaction. It is now up to the Foreign Ministers, meeting in political cooperation and in collaboration with other Ministers concerned, to examine as a matter of urgency the possibility of drawing up more strict international standards for security at airports and aboard aircraft.

Madam President, the outline I have just given of the Luxembourg Presidency's programme had to be confined to what I felt was essential, yet it is doubtless still open to criticism as an over-lengthy list of diverse subjects.

To hold the Presidency of the Community today is a task as difficult as it is exciting. This is even true for the smallest of the Member States. Luxembourg's European conviction and commitment are well known, and we shall be taking on the task which awaits us over the next few months with enthusiasm and real motivation.

The support and drive of the European Parliament will be indispensable to us. Only by working together and in harmony shall we progress towards a more united, integrated and human Community.

(Applause)

Mr Poettering (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, colleagues. This is an important day for the European Parliament, because for the first time there is a debate with the Council within the framework of European Political Cooperation on questions of security; following an initiative of the Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament. I believe this to be a very important step towards evolving a joint European position on defence policy.

I should like to express my sincere thanks to the President-in-Office for the Luxembourg Presidency's readiness to reply to our oral questions this afternoon. But, President-in-Office, I should also like to add quite

unequivocally, if you will permit me, as I am sure you will, that we shall not regard your answer this afternoon as a 'mark of favour' from the Council. Instead we wish to emphasise that by virtue of the Stuttgart Declaration of 19 June 1983 the Council is also obliged to give Parliament an answer on questions of security.

I should like to quote the text word for word, so that it goes on record. In the Stuttgart Declaration by the heads of State and of government of 19 June 1983 it says not only that the Council will consider questions of security in as far as they involve political and economic aspects, it also says of the European Parliament, 'The European Parliament shall discuss all questions of European union including political cooperation. In addition to the consultation procedures provided for in the Treaties the Council, its members and the Commission shall, according to their terms of reference, answer oral or written questions from the Parliament as well as resolutions on questions of major importance and general significance on which Parliament asks for clarification'.

That is a clear legal basis and we shall also insist that in future the President-in-Office of the day answers our questions. We shall also carry it over into Parliament's debates.

As the Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament we wish to leave no doubt that in future questions of European security will have just as much place in this Parliament and in the Institutions of the Community as do important questions of economic or agricultural policy.

The basis for both these questions is provided by two reports from the last Parliament; a report of January 1983 from Mr Haagerup on European political cooperation, and, secondly, — our question relates to this — Mr Klepsch's report on general questions of European security. We are asking the President-in-Office what conclusions the Presidency has drawn from Parliament's report? We see natural variations and differences on the subject itself. That is natural. But this must not be allowed to prevent us from defining a joint European position.

I should like to say on behalf of myself and my group, and I believe I can also say it on behalf of the great majority of the Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament, that our idea of a European concept of security within the Western alliance is as follows: any European security policy which is contrary to the United States is inconceivable. Rather, a common European security policy must give Europe more weight in the Western alliance, must make Europe an equal partner with the USA. Nevertheless Europe must not become separated from the USA as a third power, independent of East or West. In that sense there can never be an equal distance between western Europe and Moscow and Washington. I should add that as long as the USA

Poettering

and the European Community are democracies and the Soviet Union a totalitarian and expansionist state, there can for western Europe be one security partnership only, with the United States of America.

(Applause)

With the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries — who are also Europeans — we must try to secure arms control, disarmament and increased trust within the framework of cooperative security.

On 1 January 1986 Spain and Portugal will become members of this Community. That means that there will be 320 million people in this Community. That is 50 million more than in the Soviet Union, 80 million more than in the United States and 200 million more than in Japan. We must render Europe capable of action in matters of security and external policy. We must at last find an answer to the American President's strategic defence initiative. One way or the other — I shall not go into detail now — we, as Europeans, must find an answer.

I ask the House — I am now speaking for my group — to support the motion proposed by my group, which contains very concrete demands for the Council. The motion has been formulated in a way which should make it acceptable to a broad majority in the House.

Europe must have credibility where its own people are concerned and must appear decisive to the outside world. The Community has to become an equal partner with the USA and to act jointly against the Soviet Union. Only as a reliable and predictable partner can the European Community make an effective contribution to peace and freedom in Europe and in the world.

We expressly call upon the Council jointly with the European Parliament to set out along this path which, I believe, has been advocated by the great majority in the interest of our 320 million citizens.

(Applause from the centre and the left)

President. — At 3 p.m., the President-in-Office of the Council will answer the questions tabled by Mr Poettering and others, and this will be immediately followed by the debate on the programme of work of the Luxembourg Presidency.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)¹

IN THE CHAIR: MR FANTI

Vice-President

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers. — *(FR)* Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am grateful to Mr Poettering and colleagues for putting two oral questions which enable me as President to clarify the Council's stance as regards European security and political cooperation. These oral questions, which refer to resolutions adopted at different times by the European Parliament, are actually on the same subject — that of the role of the Ten in safeguarding international security and in particular European security.

Honourable Members are certainly aware that the question of international stability and security is an essential factor in European political cooperation. Thus European political cooperation had from its outset to face the challenge of the negotiations relating to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe until the Final Act was signed on 1 August 1975.

The success of European political cooperation brought the Community recognition in both East and West as a factor for balance and stability in Europe. There is no point in listing here the various statements made and positions adopted by the Ten directly concerning security or affecting problems such as the Middle East, Central America, southern Africa, Afghanistan, Kampuchea, disarmament and arms control which have considerable significance for international stability.

These statements taken as a whole have helped to determine a joint stance of the Ten on this subject, which is assuming greater and greater importance at world level. In this connection the action of the Ten concerns only the political and economic aspects of security, as is stressed in the Stuttgart declaration mentioned earlier by the Honourable Member.

Realistically their role in this field and their contribution to the strengthening of international peace and stability must be acknowledged to have increased with the passage of time. The position adopted by the Ten now carries undeniable weight within the CSCE process and, ever since the beginning of 1984 in particular, in negotiations within the Stockholm Conference on measures for creating confidence and security and disarmament in Europe.

At the same time, the voice of the Ten is a factor of great importance in the work of the United Nations. As I pointed out this morning, the Ten welcomed the resumption of Soviet-American talks on nuclear arms in space. They fully recognize the importance of a permanent dialogue with the United States on these questions, which come within the sphere of European poli-

¹ For objections to the list of subjects for the next topical and urgent debate, see Minutes.

Poos

itical cooperation. They therefore maintain regular contacts with the USA in particular through the intermediary of the Presidency-in-Office.

It is to a considerable extent in recognition of the role of the Ten in international affairs that countries such as Japan, the People's Republic of China and India, in addition of course to the ASEAN countries, have requested regular contacts with the Ten covering also international peace and security. Even the Soviet Union may perhaps be becoming aware of the political role of the Ten on the international stage.

Moreover, wherever the subject came within its sphere, European political cooperation has not neglected the link between international stability and the problems of economic growth in developing countries.

At the instigation of one member, considerable progress has been made towards the convening of a world conference within the United Nations Organization on disarmament and development. At regional level it is enough to recall the attention which was focused, within the context of European political cooperation, upon the emergency situation in the Horn of Africa or upon the still unsolved politico-economic problems in southern Africa.

The Ten have repeatedly reaffirmed their support for the UNO role of peace-keeper and have expressed the wish to see that role strengthened. Moreover, Member countries have provided personnel and made financial contributions to UN peace-keeping operations. The Ten are ready to examine any measures which might help to strengthen that role of the United Nations.

(Applause)

President. — I have received the following motions for resolutions, with request for an early vote, to wind up the debate on the two oral questions:

- by Mr Vandemeulebroucke and others on behalf of the Rainbow Group (Doc. B 2-630/85);
- by Mr Le Pen and others on behalf of the Group of the European Right (Doc. B 2-631/85);
- by Mr Poettering and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Doc. B 2-632/85); and
- by Mrs Piermont on behalf of the Rainbow Group (Doc. B 2-685/85).

The vote on these requests for an early vote will be taken at the end of the joint debate.

Mr Abens (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I was very pleased and indeed rather moved to hear in this hemi-

cycle, situated in this city where the first Community met 33 years ago, the speech of the new President of the Council of the Community on the forthcoming programme. I could not help recalling what Jean Monnet said in his memoirs for the morning of 10 August 1952: 'Europe had an appointment in Luxembourg, which has become the crossroads of Europe'.

Today we certainly have another appointment with Europe. After years of difficult negotiations and resounding failures the Community of the Ten — soon to be of the Twelve — is on the brink of a new phase. It is the task of the Luxembourg Presidency to initiate these changes which will provide fresh impetus for the building of Europe.

The President of the Council has mentioned one major priority, namely the struggle against unemployment. The struggle for employment is of paramount importance for my group, the Socialist group.

Until the beginning of the 1970's the building of Europe was synonymous with economic dynamism, social progress and full employment. Today there are 13 million jobless Europeans including millions of young people left to their own devices with the bitter impression that they are rejected by our society. For young people the idea of Europe is losing its meaning, leaving the way open to a despair which is a danger to our democratic systems.

The Community needs once more to take the offensive and to recapture its imagination. It must regain that constructive spirit which was its strength in its early days.

The Presidency has presented guidelines for an economic policy and for an employment policy which, by backing the Community dimension and Community solidarity, could give a new lease to life to our institutions and our economies and open up a fresh path to the creation of jobs.

Courage will of course be needed; we shall sometimes have to leave the beaten track but since we know that it is not on injustice and social regression that our economies will be built there is an inescapable link between a more integrated economic area which has recaptured a new economic, technological and monetary force and the creation of a social area based on the vitality of social relations and solidarity.

We need more investments to modernize our industries, to remain in the technology race, to improve the environment in which we live in our urban areas and to protect our surroundings. Who would deny that public investment must play a key role in these policies for the re-establishment of economic activity and employment?

The Socialist group has always spoken in favour of such an investment by the United States of Europe,

Abens

just as it has always upheld an active employment policy involving also a redistribution of work. Europe, which was the source of technological progress, must now train its young people and produce research workers, but this new surge forward must not be at the price of millions more unemployed and social regression.

Consideration must of course be given to the old industrial regions — our countries' economic strength of former times, now taking the full brunt of the crisis. Unemployment, living conditions which are all too often difficult and a future which seems more and more like a dead end make up the day-to-day lives of hundreds of thousands of families in industrial areas, whether coal or steel regions.

The restructuring and modernization of these industries are essential tasks which must be carried out within the framework of the Community, but we should not forget that beneath the calculations for economic efficiency there a real people with a legitimate right to employment and well-being.

Community solidarity should be shown here as a matter of priority and, Mr President, I should like to mention the case of the steel industry which I regard as particularly important.

Significant restructuring efforts have already been made, involving, of course, considerable sacrifices. Today the European steel industry is finding its feet again thanks partly to that Community policy. We must be careful not to destroy what has been achieved by abandoning the emergency measures too suddenly. Recovery is here, but it is still fragile. Conversion measures have been set in motion but are still often inadequate. It is clear that the success of this new project for interdependent growth, which has the full support of my group, presupposes also a Community which is in working order and can take decisions. The institutions are certainly not an end in themselves but must necessarily be the instruments for our plans. The institutional reforms now planned are therefore aimed primarily at giving the Community the power of decision and the cohesion which it needs, and which moreover we need too, to meet the urgent problems now facing us.

I am glad that this Parliament has made a broad contribution to this awareness and this new willingness to break with certain disastrous practices of the past. This Parliament, with its democratic legitimacy, has provided an essential spur. I am certain that the vast majority of my colleagues support the efforts which the Luxembourg Presidency proposes to make for the successful conclusion of this difficult task. And to all those who still harbour any doubts about this undertaking I would say: rest assured, Europe is not being built against the interests of its peoples. When Europe unites, when it progresses and gains strength it is often the Europe of achievement.

The Socialist group is ready, Mr President, to join in the building of a Europe based on solidarity both internally and towards the outside world. It is ready to share the responsibility and assume fully the role incumbent upon a democratically-elected institution.

Today we have the means, Mr President, to realize that vision which Victor Hugo had when he was in exile: 'In the twentieth century there will be an extraordinary nation. It will be great, but that will not prevent it from being free. It will be illustrious, rich, thoughtful, peaceful, friendly towards the rest of mankind; its name will be Europe'.

(Applause)

Mr Estgen (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like first of all to extend both my personal congratulations and those of my group to the Luxembourg Presidency on the general approach it is proposing to adopt in the coming six months as regards Community policy.

Both the speech made by the Prime Minister, Mr Jacques Santer, and that made by the Foreign Minister, Mr Jacques Poos, have convinced us that the Luxembourg Presidency will not undo the progress made in the Community as a result of the efficiency and ability of the Italian Presidency.

They have also made it clear that the Luxembourg Presidency and the European Parliament are on the same wavelength as regards what is required in the short and medium-term. We regard the Community's current situation in the same objective and critical way, although without losing hope.

In the first two minutes of your speech, Mr Minister, you made three statements which are of paramount importance for our Assembly and which in themselves constitute a whole programme. By those statements alone you have, Mr Minister, won the support and respect of this Parliament and my group would assure you that you have our confidence — make no mistake about that.

In fact your statement on the outcome of the Milan Summit is relevant where you express the view that the Community is now in a position to embark with resolve upon the future and open up fresh avenues. It is reassuring that you have put that into words, even though we should have liked a little more clarification of the future prospects.

Your second statement, Mr President of the Council, was in the form of an undertaking which we take very seriously. You stated your intention of maintaining a close, frank, open, and wide-ranging dialogue with this Assembly. The six months of your presidency will give you ample opportunity to carry out your promise.

Estgen

Then you promise that you will make specific proposals for increasing the European Parliament's participation in the Community decision-making process. We look to you to turn this attractive proposition into a determination on your part in the form of an urge, I might almost say a compulsion, to persuade your colleagues who might have other ideas.

Next you expressed the wish that the attempt at clarification made by both branches of the budgetary authority over the past few months might pave the way for more constructive collaboration in the examination of the 1986 budget.

You expressed the wish, Mr President. Let me say that although it is permissible for our electors to express wishes, politicians cannot be content with mere wishes. They have to set to, and the means are there. We want to see a new style of cooperation with the European Parliament from the Luxembourg Presidency before frowns are already set. We appreciate your analysis of the progress recently made by the Community. We share your views on the ceiling for new own resources which are already insufficient to guarantee financial security for our Community even in the short-term. As is so often the case unfortunately, the Council will simply note the fact, even lament it, but will not provide the remedy. Thus we scarcely dare hope that the Luxembourg Presidency will make headway in this matter. National elections in various Member States will obliterate all your colleagues' courage and wisdom. That will certainly be the case too for the strengthening of the European Monetary System.

You have set priorities in your programme and the major priority for you, Mr Minister, as well as for us, is the fight against unemployment, in particular youth unemployment. You quite rightly note that for over ten years we have been witnessing both a continuous increase in unemployment and a continuous stream of declarations of intent to combat unemployment.

Although the United States and Japan have nevertheless, Mr Minister, created millions of new jobs over that same period it is perhaps rather too easy to say that we cannot imitate them. If we do not wish to imitate them we should do well all the same to learn from their example. In any event I admire your determination to step up our efforts in this struggle. I sincerely hope that your words will not be added to the sheaf of ineffective declarations.

In this respect a very European solution would certainly be to give considerably greater strength to small and medium-sized firms which always create jobs — and what is more, stable jobs.

I shall not go into detail on the other points covered in your speech since other members of my group will deal with their own special fields when they speak later.

I should just like to make three points. You now hold the reins of the Community for the next six months. It is for you to supply fresh drive and determine the details of the mandate of the inter-governmental conference. The European Parliament must be given legislative power of decision jointly with the Council for those areas of responsibility which have been transferred to the Community and withdrawn from national sovereignty. Within the Council of Ministers majority voting should be the normal rule, with the exception of those cases which must be expressly and restrictively laid down, account being taken of areas in which the Member States have vital interests to protect.

The Commission's excellent work as regards realization of the internal market must not simply remain a dead letter; Benelux might be taken as an example from which to start.

The European Community must be given the powers it needs in particular within the fields of research, technology and protection of the environment.

Finally, and this is an important point, we must look to our external security unless we want to see Germany one day suffer the same fate as Afghanistan.

Yesterday, Mr Minister, you heard Mr President Delors. His words were worth hearing and following. You will have noticed the frequency with which we gave him our enthusiastic support in this House. It has been said that our generation lacks men of the calibre of the founding fathers. In my opinion Jacques Delors is one such. I hope, Mr Minister, that you may take a worthy place in the line of succession to that great Minister for Foreign Affairs, Joseph Bech.

Jacques Santer, Jacques Poos and Jacques Delors: the bells summoned the 'Frères Jacques' to matins in Milan. We know that one of their number has been awake for quite some time and hope that the others will not sleep.

You will have the support of my group, Mr Minister, in the task before you but the group will certainly rouse you should that ever prove necessary.

(Applause)

Mr Prag (ED). — Mr President, may I, before I speak, reiterate to the people of Luxembourg the sincerest sympathy of my group on the death of Grand Duchess Charlotte. She was the symbol of the spirit of resistance and independence of this hospitable and beautiful country and the embodiment of its identity.

May I now welcome the wide-ranging and informative statement by the President-in-Office, and in particular his assurances that he intends to sustain the momentum towards closer unity begun by this Parliament, and

Prag

that he will give top priority to reducing unemployment.

My group also welcomes the determination of the Ten to establish international standards for security at airports and in air travel. I hope the President-in-Office will forgive me if I now concentrate on the question of security and political cooperation, which were the subject of our two oral questions with debate.

Adlai Stevenson once said that repetition of the obvious is more important than elucidation of the obscure. I am afraid the obvious is that despite the existence of the Eurogroup in NATO and the Independent European Programme Group, one with France, the other without France, and despite the coordination within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and in the United Nations negotiations in Geneva, the Community is still without a clear unified voice in matters of security and disarmament.

The case for a greater role by Western Europe in defense and disarmament is overwhelming. My group strongly welcomes the resumption of the arms control negotiations in Geneva in March. Of course it does. And it welcomes the possible revival of the long-dormant negotiations on neutral and balanced force reductions in Vienna, and also the work being done in Stockholm in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on confidence-building and disarmament.

But no one really believes, Mr President, that Western Europe is yet speaking with a strong voice in matters of defence and disarmament. Because to be strong, that voice must be a single voice. The real negotiations, we all know when we are not fooling ourselves, are taking place between the two superpowers. The paradox is that intermediate-range ballistic missiles are being discussed essentially between the United States and the Soviet Union, in spite of the fact that over two-thirds of the total number of Soviet SS-20s are targeted on Western Europe. Nor, indeed, were European leaders consulted before the launching of the United States' strategic defense initiative, despite our obvious and vital concern in such matters.

At the moment two particularly vital questions are under discussion. The first is the European fighter aircraft which should replace our existing fighters sometime in the 1990s. Here the major powers of Western Europe are in disarray over what, to the layman at any rate, appear to be relatively small differences over the size and weight and sophistication of the aeroplane. Surely, for the sake of a strong European voice and the joint defence concepts that we all want to see, France could make the effort to bring her conception of this plane into line with that of the other states involved!

The second of these matters is the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, the third review conference on which

is due to open in September. I would like Mr Poos to tell me if there is to be a coordinated European Community view in this conference.

We all know the difficulties in attempting to establish European security concepts and a strong European voice in security matters: the problem of Irish neutrality, the absence from the Community of certain NATO allies, notably Norway and Turkey. But we cannot, Mr President, go on fudging the matter of security. The development of unified security concepts and of a collective voice in the North Atlantic Alliance determine both the effectiveness of our defence and the degree of success we achieve in disarmament.

I was glad to hear Mr Poos list this afternoon the numerous common declarations of the Ten. Joint declarations are not without use, but they are not joint policies and they are not joint actions. That is what we want to be hearing in the not impossibly distant future in this House.

(Applause)

Mr Segre (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, we Italian communists have no cause for disagreeing with the general philosophy underlying the statement by the President of the Council on the programme for the six months of the Luxembourg Presidency, as far as foreign policy is concerned. On the contrary, we welcome its commitment to the improvement of East/West relations and, in particular, to progress in the sphere of disarmament, to which it is giving priority.

However, there seems to us to be a certain gap between the statements of a general nature and the concrete initiatives to be undertaken.

At Milan, on international matters as a body, there was silence; but international policy cannot wait for Europe to define its own positions or decide on its own initiatives.

I will give just one example: in Washington recently the European Parliamentary delegation for relations with the United States Congress was told, emphatically, at the Department of State how important it was for the Ten to make a positive commitment in support of the peace process exemplified by the Jordanian-Palestinian initiative. If we remember — as we well do — the suspicion with which the Venice declaration was received in Washington we have to acknowledge that, whilst Europe has for the most part stood still as regards initiatives, the situation has developed, and there has also been a change in the position of many others.

We cannot stand still: otherwise, we run the risk of progressing backwards. This is the danger with which our Community is constantly faced. The same is true as regards questions of security. I will say very clearly

Segre

that, as far as we Italian communists are concerned, Europe needs to make quicker progress with a common foreign policy. If it really wants to make a contribution to peace in a world that is so uncertain and insecure, it must draw up its own conception of security and define better and implement its own interests, which are closely linked to a policy for *détente* and stopping the armaments race, as well as building new East/West and North/South relations.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) Mr President, in a break with tradition and with the spirit of the institutions, I should like to address my comments to you personally and not to the nebulous figure of the President-in-Office of the Council.

I wish to address my words to you personally since you will have to assume very important responsibilities and the question of who takes on these responsibilities as representative of one country or another within the Council is not merely a matter of indifference. We count on you to find the way out of the maze, to disentangle the skein in which the various European questions are at present caught.

I do not wish to revert to yesterday's debate or to the conclusions of the Milan Summit, but I do not see how it is possible when speaking of the Luxembourg Presidency to avoid mentioning first of all the action to be taken following that Council meeting.

You yourself said that tradition required the presidency to make a survey of those Community questions pending. You yourself have set the priorities — one of which is the problem of unemployment. As you pointed out, two conditions are required for combating unemployment: the realization of the internal market and meeting the challenge of technology — a challenge in which Europe has already lost so much ground.

The position today is that the Milan Summit is already having an effect, since these are the two priority problems which the Council has dealt with in the guise of institutional matters.

Those are your priorities as regards internal affairs; for external matters you yourself have set out all the questions arising as regards political co-operation, whilst stressing the need for the achievement of joint policies. In both cases we come back therefore to the action to be taken following the European Council of Milan.

You have, moreover, a special mandate for this presidency: the convening of the inter-governmental conference, and I am rather surprised that you did not mention that yourself.

I will take the liberty therefore of saying what we expect from the Luxembourg Presidency in this field,

since we are already aware of the two essential problems of technology and realization of the internal market which Mr Delors has also mentioned. In the case of technology it is essential to clarify the situation. For realization of the internal market we need certain amendments or adjustments to the Treaties; and if we wish to make progress we urgently need to be able to take decisions within the Community.

I hope you will allow me to leave aside all those undoubtedly very important questions such as steel, agricultural policy and many others so that I might concentrate upon matters recognized by everyone as priority areas, which must, I think, be treated as such by the Luxembourg Presidency.

Your presidency is not like other presidencies. We must not resort to platitudes, but I might almost say that you have a unique opportunity: the situation is so difficult and complex that no-one could blame you for making less headway than one would like. But you have the opportunity to achieve real success if you earnestly impose solutions with tenacity and resolution upon questions as yet unsolved.

You may make your presidency highly symbolic. Twenty years ago the Luxembourg compromise, whilst relieving the Community of certain difficulties, gave rise in its turn to others. Now, twenty years later, the Luxembourg presidency must pull us out of the quicksand by giving us the ability to take decisions.

Some people thought that the Milan Summit was a mere political show. It certainly was something of a show, but things did move and that is what counts. That in itself proves that we are not still bogged down as we were at Athens.

I would point out that your presidency will be a short one, since contrary to the laws of mathematics, the second six-month presidency of the year is always shorter than the first. The rush to the sun in August causes more disturbance than the bands of Carnival.

There is therefore no time to lose and we hope that this debate will help you to implement the mandate entrusted to you, vague as it may seem.

With all these fields from which to choose you will need to be selective. Some matters of course cannot be left out in view of their timing and importance; these are technology, the internal market and the Conference. No-one expects all the problems to be solved, but initiatives must be taken now to prevent any mishaps or delays which might later prove to be irreparable and to pose a serious threat to the future of the Community.

First of all I should like to make one or two brief observations with regard to technology, since you yourself mentioned the Conference to be held in Paris. I am surprised at the venue; I should have liked to see

Veil

it held here. I should have liked above all to know — and I ask for further information on this point — whether the Ministers for Foreign Affairs will take part in this meeting and whether the Luxembourg Minister responsible for technology will take the chair. I hope you will be able to give us assurances on this point, since that would confirm that the Eureka project really is to be given a Community dimension — and we are looking for such confirmation.

We are most concerned about this matter since we are well aware that if that is not done there is a real risk that this point will divide the Community and above all make it impossible to find the finance required.

The Community dimension would not of course prevent other countries such as Sweden, Austria and Switzerland from taking part if they so wish — and we already have such experience with the JET project. I regard this Community dimension as a guarantee for everyone — a guarantee that it will be effective and above all that it will be implemented.

There is no need for me to linger over the internal market. The Commission's proposals have been spelt out and the schedule for implementation drawn up. But I would remind you that Mr Delors himself told us that some of the most important provisions would depend upon certain changes, some slight, some perhaps less so, which may be made either by amendments to the Treaties or by additions. That brings me to the intergovernmental conference, since that seems to me to be the major event of your presidency which must be settled by the end of the year if we are not to risk getting bogged down.

We do not underestimate the difficulties. It was decided on a majority vote and it is now for everyone if possible to take part in the discussion. It will then be necessary for as many as possible to support the amendments required, but above all we need to achieve practical and genuine results. Practical results because we cannot imagine that the conference can give a fresh mandate to some committee or other body or to some personality or other. Nor can we accept vague and general formulae which do not give the European Council a basis for taking a decision. Genuine results since this is an even more serious question. Many people still have the feeling of uncertainty and confusion engendered by the Milan Summit. This must be cleared up. Certain heads of State or of government have already said that the moment of truth was approaching. We are awaiting this moment of truth — for everyone — since there are some people — even those who have spoken of the moment of truth whilst seeming to cast aspersions upon the truth as seen by others — who have perhaps their own brand of truth to reveal since their plans give us some cause for concern. Whether we consider the Eureka project or the plan for Franco-German political co-operation it is clear that what is sometimes involved

is not Community projects but strictly intergovernmental co-operation.

We must be absolutely clear where we stand: that is what we expect of the intergovernmental conference, since in such a case it would not be a question of strengthening the Community but of making changes with serious consequences for us.

We cannot accept — and we must be on our guard — that the institutional reforms should not have the purpose of strengthening the Community. This would be the case, for example, if there were to be fresh powers instituted at intergovernmental level within the context of political co-operation, which actually could only weaken the Community. That would lead not to progress but to regression. Regression in solidarity, in effectiveness and in democracy, since the Parliament would be dispossessed.

Mr President-in-Office of the Council, this seems to me to be your priority rôle for the coming six months — the only one on which you will be judged. The Europeans who gathered in Milan are awaiting your reply. Perhaps some of them were too enthusiastic! Do not disappoint them, do not keep them waiting or their disillusionment will be even greater. To avoid the fragmentation of the Community you must prevent the structures from collapsing. As a matter of urgency you must safeguard its autonomy by defending the Commission's prerogatives. You must make it effective by enabling it to take decisions and by seeing that decisions are taken on this point. You must champion democracy in Europe by defending the Parliament's powers. That is a noble rôle for which it is worthwhile taking some risks during your presidency!

(Applause)

Mr Lalor (RDE). — Mr President, I want first of all to congratulate the Luxembourg Presidency on spelling out clearly that the fight against unemployment is the major priority for their six months' term of office. This is, as I see it, a realistic acceptance of a basic fact. It is also the one subject to which our electors and the people of Europe generally want us to pay 100% attention. Personally, while I do not doubt for a moment the concern of Mr Pöttering, an honourable gentleman and a very likeable man, and his security subcommittee, I want to say that the oral question they put today to Mr Poos will again have the media capturing opportunities to distract attention from the main issue of unemployment. Mr Prag's concentration on the question of security is an example of what I mean. I agree that security and defence are important, but why must we continually talk of making war and improving defence and security?

Over 25 years ago, Robert Schuman and the founding fathers signed the Rome Treaty. Their guiding thought was, let us have peace, not war! Let us have

Lalor

economic development and convergence and the breakdown of economic barriers, they said. Tremendous progress was subsequently made. The first oil crisis in the mid-70s arrested this progress and brought the first economic setback. Now, when other nations have started to resume progress, we, apparently, are determined to get bogged down in side issues and play at making war. As I have already said to this Parliament, the greatest problem that we in Ireland presently face is our still growing number of unemployed. We now have almost a quarter of a million such people, and were it not for emigration, statistics would show that the figure is much higher. A little short of 25 years ago, the then Irish Government with which I was associated had overcome the need for emigration and was expanding employment to such an extent that our exiles were returning home to take up newly-created jobs.

On entry to this Community over 12 years ago, we were promised and we confidently expected further expansion of employment and the additional opportunities that would ensue for ambitious and enterprising young people from an emerging young state, all most anxious to be part of, and to contribute to, the development of a progressive economic Community. What have we now? As the President-in-Office himself has said, we have had a constant increase in the number unemployed. We have scrapped three million jobs at a time when, as Mr Estgen pointed out, the United States and Japan have created many millions of new jobs. They have done this and at the same time made the fullest use of their new developed technologies. We, on the other hand, have been wasting time, blaming our increasing unemployment on these self-same developments.

As the President-in-Office has said, Europe needs first, a higher ceiling on its own resources and then properly coordinated reflation. All the Twelve must be involved.

Finally, I would like to join the President-in-Office in paying tribute to the *ad hoc* Committee on a People's Europe for its work. Its purpose was to bring the Community closer to its citizens. This committee has now put forward the proposals to us, to the Commission and to the Council on how this should be done — special rights for citizens, culture and communications, information, youth, education, exchanges, sport, etc., and generally strengthening the Community's image and identity. A people's Europe is far removed from a defensive Europe, and may I ask the President-in-Office of the Council to press on with this practical conception of a people's Europe.

Mrs Piermont (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, in contrast to the previous speakers I have good reason to voice our dissent. Hypocrisy is rife even in the EC. In reply to two questions — one concerning WEU and the other linking Spain's accession to the EC with her

continued membership of NATO — the foreign ministers meeting within the framework of EPC informed me that such matters were not within their spheres of competence. And yet the heads of government of the Ten, even Gaston Thorn, the former President of the Commission, proclaimed up and down the Community EC accession and NATO membership, the Europe of the negotiator and the Europe of the soldier are all most closely linked. Faithfully following the pecking order President Gonzalez passed on to the Spanish people the pressure exerted by the Ten.

We are still waiting for the referendum which was promised in 1982. Instead of a clear decision on continued NATO membership, yes or no, the question has now been reduced to membership as hitherto or full integration in military structures? A truly decisive victory for a supposedly non-existent sphere of competence! The allegedly non-existent sphere of competence has a tendency to spread like a malignant tumour. Parliament debated and decided how shipping routes and supplies of essential raw materials for EC industry would be protected militarily if necessary, in other words there is a theoretical readiness for imperialist intervention.

The Council, the Commission and the three motions for resolutions which are before Parliament are delightedly seizing upon a project, evocatively christened EUREKA, which it is alleged will form the foundation of European civil research, but which according to 'Le Monde' is a mantle for numerous military or militarily useful favourites, of France in particular, such as the space shuttle HERMES or a manned space station for military surveillance.

Not to mention the first concrete beginnings of a European nuclear capability, such as the powerful forces within the Federal CDU/CSU have wanted for a long time, and which is now beginning to take shape with the announcement by the French defence minister, Mr Hernu, that in the field of deterrence neighbouring countries, and the Federal Republic in particular, are to be drawn into the *force de frappe*. Add to this the fact that the insidious militarisation of the EC, through defence cooperation etc at the instigation of the parliamentary Subcommittee on Security, is now leading to institutional contacts with the WEU and — who knows — probably with NATO next, and any unprejudiced observer with an ounce of commonsense must realise that this will produce not détente, but a stepping-up of confrontation.

Their plans for European union are now to reconcile the Rome Treaties with the security and defence realities created by them, in the interests of a military/industrial complex.

Our motion for a resolution points in the opposite direction. We want to reverse the concern with security problems, to reconcile reality with the existing civil

Piermont

treaties. The vote will show who really wants a civil Europe which generates trust and guarantees peace.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — (FR) Mr President, I followed with interest the excellent address given by the President-in-Office. I heard him on my return from the Lebanon, Beirut and Djezzine. I realize the extent of our own difficulties and concerns, but they are no doubt slight in comparison with the suffering and tragedy faced by the Lebanese Christians.

You made several interesting and positive suggestions, Mr President, in the sphere of unemployment, agricultural policy and the integrated Mediterranean programmes and the social policy which we ought to follow. You pointed out that the United States of America, Japan and other economically advanced countries were producing more jobs, whilst we were destroying them. One was reminded, without your expressly alluding to it, of that old Christian idea that the development of science and technology should serve mankind but not shape its destiny.

This idea was the inspiration of the founders of the Common Market, but we should perhaps ask ourselves in this debate what the position is today.

My group has the impression that unless we recover ourselves, unless we adopt fresh policies, unless we return to the sources of Christian inspiration which formed the basis of Europe, we shall simply drift aimlessly. We feel today as though we were trying to plough the sea since we no longer have faith in a common enterprise and we no longer speak the same language.

Even more serious, we are allowing the situation to deteriorate in an extremely dangerous way in the Mediterranean basin, that sea enclosed by two straits and into which extend the Iberian, Italian and Balkan peninsulas. Its shores have given birth to this old Europe, Christianized, Romanized and subject as regards intelligence to the discipline of the Greeks, in the phrase dear to Paul Valéry. Worse still, in Lebanon and in the Middle East there is a third world war — I am choosing my words carefully — which is every day more evident, and we seem to be indifferent to the situation.

What rôle should Europe play in face of such a danger? It should in the first instance take stock of its responsibilities, bearing in mind that the Mediterranean is of importance to Europe and when one million eight hundred thousand Christians are threatened with genocide it would be fitting for it to come to their aid with forces sufficient to intervene, peace-keeping forces capable of ensuring their opponents' respect and of making them withdraw from that unhappy country.

I am one of those who believes that if Europe does not in the near future assume its responsibilities in the

Mediterranean, and in particular in Lebanon, it will soon have civil war on its own territory. It is because my colleagues and I want to see peace, the economic development of Europe and a return to the sources and inspiration from which the Treaty of Rome sprang that we say: Stop all this talk of European Union. Prove that you have the will to be European by bringing assistance to those who founded Europe from ancient Mount Libanus to come and bring us civilization.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, I believe that major new steps must be taken in the area of security and peace policy in Europe. How high will the spiral of violence continue to rise? To the stars: we have already reached that stage. All we can look forward to is a sad end.

When Earth has been destroyed, not by a natural disaster but by a cultural disaster, we cannot even say: we did not know. There will be nobody left. Not even anybody to say: I won. There will be no winners and no losers. We therefore propose, Mr President, a Europe that has no ambition to participate in the insane arms race, a Europe that wants to make a contribution to world peace with an economy and technology based on peace, fair redistribution, which must benefit the weakest first, with solidarity with the Third World countries, with an economic policy that is not based on the superiority of weapons, but an economy for peace, located between the two superpowers, as a sign of hope for all the oppressed throughout the world.

Mr Hänsch (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not find the President of the Council's reply to the oral question from the Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament very satisfactory.

(Applause)

He cited a number of instances in which European Political Cooperation worked. He did not reply to the questions which had been asked: take the question of the evolution of a European concept of security. You have said nothing about that. To the question about the development of a Community position at meetings of the North Atlantic Council: no reply! And no reply either on the introduction of effective consultation between the EPC on one hand and the United States of America on the other; I hope the Minister is going to produce replies to these questions.

For the Socialist group the position is perfectly clear: we do not want additional military power for Europe. We do not want any power — whether in heaven or on earth — which intervenes as a military power between the United States and the Soviet Union. But

Hänsch

one thing we do know: if we Europeans continue to pursue our uncoordinated security policy, if we do not recognise our common interest and fail to exploit our own potential, inevitably the consequence will be that we shall change from being a partner of the United States to being a satellite. This is not a reproach against the United States, it is a reproach against ourselves — the Europeans. Security can only be won through partnership. But we can only be partners if we gain status for ourselves, if we define our own European interest, if, through cooperation, we evolve European priorities and recognise a Community preference in arms production. We are far from achieving all this, as everyone in this Chamber well knows. But even the longest march cannot begin until the first step has been taken!

Whoever — and rightly so — laments the fact that we Europeans are not represented at the conference which may decide our future, and which in any case does decide our security, namely the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and that we leave the two superpowers to negotiate over us and our future, has to ensure that Europe produces its own independent security policy.

Anyone who wants in future not to go along with all the twists and turns of the USA's military policy, has to construct a European position. The non-existence of a European policy — in the NATO council for example — is jeopardising our security, not strengthening it. Anyone who wants to prevent our continent from becoming an experimental area, a munitions dump, a plaything of the superpowers, must want and must foster European cooperation on security policy. Let me add: it is precisely the people who want disarmament and arms control in Europe who must evolve a common European approach on arms control and disarmament. How else is it to be done, if not by strengthening European Political Cooperation? Let us exploit the instrument of EPC and let us strengthen it! We Socialists want this to be one of the subjects for the governmental conference, which, thank goodness, has now been called. I know full well that there will be considerable differences of opinion between my group and a large part of the House over what the content of European security policy ought to be. But those differences can and must be decided in democratic argument, we are committed to that. We want a united Europe which is able to present its interests with confidence by securing peace through disarmament and cooperation.

(Applause)

Mr Penders (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, I feel it has now been said often enough that the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation — EPC — and thus the European Parliament can and must consider the political and economic aspects of security. It is high time the EPC Ministers got down to work. The

resolution tabled by Mr Pöttering and others is absolutely clear on this point, but unfortunately Minister Poos's answer was a complete disappointment.

The EPC Ministers have two jobs to do. Firstly, they must inventorize and analyse the risks, requirements and interests that play a part in Europe's security. Secondly, on the basis of their findings they must establish a concept for the best way of ensuring Europe's security. And perhaps that is too onerous a task to be tackled in the EPC context, given the attitude of such countries as Ireland, Greece and Denmark, which have difficulty, for different reasons, with the security dimension of our Community. But that should be clearly stated.

What is the problem at present? It must be said that things are getting out of hand at the moment. A great deal is going on as regards the future shape of Europe's security: the reactivation of WEU, the Franco-German draft agreement on EPC, a draft agreement proposed by the British, remarks by Giscard d'Estaing and French Socialists about the enlargement of a sanctuary. But all this is a sign of confusion and uncertainty, which have been caused by the problems connected with the security link between America and Europe. This link is and remains necessary, but it is changing and unfortunately being weakened. This will also play a part when my own country, the Netherlands, takes a final decision on the possible deployment of cruise missiles on 1 November. As a member of the European Parliament's delegation for contacts with the United States Congress I was recently able to see how America and Europe are threatening to drift apart. I was also able to see how confusing Europe looks to American eyes, by which I do not mean that the Americans are always right. But the chaos that has emerged in Europe since the American invitation to participate in the SDI research speaks volumes. Another reason for the EPC Ministers to get to work.

There is another serious danger in all this confusion, the danger that the neutralists and pacifists among us will seize on European security as a peg to hang their ideas on, and these ideas may, perhaps against their will, eventually lead to our becoming part of the Soviet sphere of influence. For this third reason too, action is urgently needed from the EPC Ministers, and for this reason too I hope that in future the Foreign Ministers will adopt a more satisfactory attitude towards the pressure we bring to bear.

(Applause from the centre)

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — Mr President, there is a strong indivisibility between commercial economic policy and policy for defence. Look at the United States. Its technology prospers on the basis of its defence effort, its research, its inventions, its production of armaments. From this springs an expertise which

Jack Stewart-Clark

gives the United States a technical lead which encourages new business ventures, new ideas and new products, and these, in turn, create jobs. If we talk about a true internal market in the European Community with common standards and with open public procurement, this should apply as much to military as to commercial matters. It is vital that member governments and individual national industries should increasingly pool their resources so as to create a strong defence industry which increasingly supplies the needs of NATO within Europe and which lessens, without replacing, our reliance on the United States and on our imports of armaments. I ask the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission to do all they can to achieve what I am asking for.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, I too should like to thank the President-in-Office of the Council for having cited the problem of unemployment as a priority matter in his address to us this morning.

But, Mr President of the Council, there is one aspect of what you propose which gives me cause for concern and that is the scant resources you are proposing to devote to that cause. That, in addition to the potentially dangerous nature of some of the ideas you put forward, such as that of so-called flexibility of the labour market, which means, according to the terminology of the European Trade Union Confederation, nothing more than a further reduction of the social progress which workers have already achieved, with the makings of the threat of a dual society.

Since I have not much time I shall restrict my comments to two matters. First the problems of European defence and secondly the question of human rights, which you did touch upon, but in such a way that I cannot help feeling some disquiet.

On defence problems the Dooge report, which is to form the basis for the forthcoming intergovernmental conference, expressly suggests that defence questions, including problems of strategy, should be integrated into Community activity. On the other hand several ministers in Member countries have clearly made their participation in the Eureka project subject to the existence of military applications or even to participation in the American 'star wars' project. On the French side there is talk of the building of bridges. There are no military taboos for the Germans. I would mention here that Mr President Andreotti recently stated more or less that the SDI and Eureka should be complementary. At the same time the President of the Commission is suggesting a joint reply to the SDI project under the ægis of the Commission. Finally, I note that, for the first time in the Community's history, the Commission's programme for 1985 expressly mentions the need for European co-operation in the joint production of arms.

These facts, which are unfortunately not the only ones, lead me to put this question to you: do you undertake during the course of the Luxembourg Presidency to reaffirm the civil objectives of the Treaty, to keep it on course and to ensure that, within the limits of your powers, it is respected? You will understand, Mr President, that in this field Europe would have everything to gain by presenting a picture of peace — a factor for disarmament and for the implementation of a large-scale civil technology research programme.

My second question is on human rights. Your list of countries has one disturbing inclusion and one disturbing omission. The ASEAN countries first of all. At this very moment several political activists and Indonesian trade unionists, condemned to death fifteen years ago, are facing the threat of execution from one day to the next in prisons in Jakarta. The international community has prepared for action. Several European governments have decided to bring pressure to bear. And you tell us that representatives of the Council and the Commission are to take part tomorrow in meetings with the ASEAN countries in Kuala Lumpur. I would ask you explicitly to ensure that the delegation is charged to raise this problem with the Indonesian representatives to try to save these men from the threat of execution.

On the other hand in your list of countries in which the Community criticizes the violation of human rights you oddly enough omitted Turkey. Two people have just been condemned to death, bringing to 48 the number of death sentences since the beginning of the year. What is more, everyone knows about the new law on the police force just adopted in Ankara, giving absolute power to the Turkish police and covering people's private lives as well.

Parliament has already taken the initiative of freezing loans granted to Turkey by the Community. Following these events, I think you should reiterate the Council's commitment to follow the Parliament's lead as long as human rights are being so systematically infringed in Turkey.

Mr Christensen (ARC). — *(DA)* The Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community continues to uphold the principle that foreign, security and defence policy is not the concern of the European Communities and that Denmark has never relinquished its right to self-determination in these areas. We are against the establishment of a new superpower in Europe. There is a need for détente and peace, for dialogue between East and West, North and South. The appropriate fora for this are the UN and its organizations for cooperation, as also the Council of Europe and the Nordic Council. Our model is not that of power blocs and unions but that of voluntary cooperation between independent nations on questions of common interests. That is the way the Danish people want it.

Christensen

For that reason we reject all motions for resolutions which seek to give the Community a role which it is not equipped to play and for which there are much better alternatives, a role for which the Community has no powers under the treaties and which it has no right to take on according to the Danish Constitution. The most important event of the coming half-year will be Denmark's total isolation in opposing European Union. It will prompt a reappraisal of Denmark's relationship with the Communities, and the new element will be, not the split between pro-EEC and anti-EEC factions, but that between the tiny minority who want Denmark to be incorporated in the Union and the great majority of Danes who do not want that.

A treaty providing for a common foreign and security policy, as far as Denmark is concerned, will require a referendum. The same applies to the treaty amendments discussed at the Milan summit. The Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community will contribute actively to the debate on alternatives to Union, which the Danes want no part of.

Mr Newens (S). — Mr President, of all the extremely pressing and vital issues facing the people of Europe and of the world as a whole, none is more vital than that of peace and security. An outbreak of world war today, or even of a limited war in which nuclear weapons were used, could destroy our civilization and possibly wipe out the human race in its entirety.

Europe is particularly vulnerable. More and more nuclear weapons are being deployed and targeted onto our continent every year that passes. The majority are not under effective control of European governments at all, even when sited on European soil. All those who are genuinely concerned about the safety of our peoples must welcome the Geneva talks and all other steps which provide opportunities to halt the arms race and take positive steps towards disarmament. I include under this heading the SALT agreements and the review conference on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which a number of signatories in Europe have breached by not reducing nuclear stockpiles.

It is quite appalling, however, that European representatives should not be in a position to play a major part in Geneva in making decisions on the disposition of nuclear weapons in Europe or against European targets. It is totally unsatisfactory that this should be in the hands of the superpowers. A major share of the blame must be laid at the door of those EEC government which have permitted the United States to deploy Cruise or Pershing missiles on their territory and which are failing now to reject outright United States appeals for cooperation with the Strategic Defence Initiative, which is utterly deplorable.

I certainly do not exonerate the Soviet Union from its responsibility for the nuclear arms race, but it must be

recognized on the basis of SALT II testimonies, American Defence Department figures and all other reliable estimates that the number of United States deliverable strategic nuclear warheads exceeds those of the Soviet Union. The latest figures available are 10 973 at the minimum for the United States and a maximum of 6 769 for the Soviet Union. In these circumstances, no further advance in Western nuclear arms is justified. Indeed, such an advance would only give a boost to Soviet efforts to catch up or overtake.

I personally believe our objectives should be to secure the removal of all nuclear arms from European soil and create a European nuclear-free zone. I commend efforts like those of the present Greek Government to promote the idea of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans. I believe it should be matched by Western Europe.

I am very concerned that many who have raised the issue of cooperation between EEC governments are not so much interested in disarmament as in a common military research programme, harmonization of weapons and a common defence system which would give a new impetus to the arms race in Europe and in the world at large. In the long run, we need to recognize that it is an outrage for countries which have attained great economic potential to use it to develop and deploy ever more weapons of mass destruction while thousand of millions of people live in abject poverty and hundreds of millions are threatened by death from starvation.

As a Socialist, a democrat and an internationalist, I believe it is time we spoke out and demanded an end to this.

(Applause from the Socialist benches)

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, Question Time was on the agenda for 4.30 p.m. and we have now passed that time. We have two possibilities therefore. We can either take the next five speakers, whose total speaking-time would be about 10 minutes, or else we can begin Question Time immediately and continue the debate later or close the debate.

If the President-in-Office of the Council is agreeable, I shall put to the vote the first proposal, namely, that we continue with the debate for 10 minutes and start Question Time at 4.50 p.m.

Is the President-in-Office in agreement with this proposal?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) Madam President, I should like to reply briefly to the various speakers and should be glad if you could decide when I might take the floor.

President. — This means that we would still have speeches for ten minutes followed by a reply from the President-in-Office, so that Question Time could begin at 4.50 p.m.

Does the House agree to this?

(Parliament agreed to the President's proposal to postpone Question Time until 4.50 p.m.)

I am very grateful to the House for its cooperation in this difficult situation and also to the President-in-Office. I would ask the remaining five speakers not to exceed their speaking-time.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette (PPE). — (FR) As a member of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, I should like briefly to make several very specific comments on behalf both of my committee and my group.

Mr Poos made no mention of health questions this morning. We wish to remind him that we have long been awaiting the meeting of a Council of Health Ministers since there are so many topics to be discussed with which we have been dealing for some considerable time. I might mention just briefly alcohol, drugs and tobacco. Then there is genetic engineering with its many implications. There is a real need, Mr Minister, to persuade the Health Ministers to hold a meeting and I earnestly request you to do so.

Moreover the public, as consumers, are awaiting firm decisions on foodstuffs. They wish to be able at last to buy within the Community meat guaranteed free of hormones. They also want more guarantees and safety when buying various products in the Community, just as they no longer want to buy the skins of certain types of seals, and I would therefore also ask you to extend the ban on imports of the skins of baby seals beyond 1 October of this year.

Yesterday our Prime Minister, Jacques Santer, spoke of the everyday Europe, since every day it becomes more polluted and thus dirtier. And we should like to see it becoming cleaner every day.

I know that you have only six months and that in six months one cannot do everything, but there are just a few points I should like to make.

Make a reduction at last at European level in the amount of pollution arising from large power stations. There is only one island nation still opposed to this project. Persuade it to join the other nine.

Only two weeks ago the Council of Environment Ministers finally managed to move in the right direction as regards the fixing of maximum levels for car exhaust gases. Although the direction is right we find the pace too slack; things need to move more quickly and in accordance with the Parliament's opinion. That indicates the right direction since we consider that a period of five to eight years for medium-sized and small capacity engines is really too long to wait to produce a cleaner atmosphere and consequently a reduction in acid rain.

Mr Minister, the decision on the second directive on PVC and PTC has been taken. Make sure that it is implemented, in particular as regards the ban on the marketing of new articles or second-hand goods.

Another problem which much concerns us is the very significant increase in the levels of nitrites and nitrates in water and the soil.

Ministers for the Environment will never be unemployed. There is so much to do. Unemployment in particular can be partially overcome by the creation of jobs for the recycling of all types of waste in the Community.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Madam President, we too would have wished to congratulate the President-in-Office of the Council were it not for certain anxieties caused to us especially and above all by what he said and did not say about political cooperation. It has become routine in the presentation of the programme of each presidency for the international political situation to be tailored to the Community's requirement, with selection of violations of human rights or with such violations being uncovered where none exist. Yet again we have heard the usual about the Soviet Union, Poland, Afghanistan and Kampuchea etc. I would like to ask the President of the Council why he said not a word about Cyprus, when Cyprus has an association with the Community and when a month ago a president and parliament were elected totally illegally in the so-called 'Turkish Cypriot state'? Why did he not mention the violation of human rights in Turkey which has an association with the EEC and which the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany has just recently honoured with a visit?

A second point of concern to us about the Luxembourg Presidency is the fact that at the Milan conference Luxembourg was in with the hardline majority of the Community, and we in Greece really do look on the prospect of the Luxembourg Presidency with great anxiety and hope that the Greek Government, which has not dared to ask for our country's treaty of accession to be revised, will not accept revision of the Treaty of Rome to the detriment of Greece.

Mr Mallet (PPE). — (*FR*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like very briefly in thanking the President-in-Office of the Council for his very full speech to make some observations on the problems of security with a view to a genuine political union of Europe, as proposed in the report of the Dooge Committee.

It seems to me that it is high time for the European Parliament to encourage an awareness on the part of the citizens of Europe whom we represent of the interests common to Europe in the matter of security and defence. It is necessary, urgent and difficult.

It is necessary and urgent in view of the growing threat to Europe posed by the Soviet Union's excessive rearmament. It is necessary because of threats of destabilization in certain areas close at hand, which may become worse in the future. Think for instance of the setting up in the near future of a Soviet base in Beirut. It is necessary finally in view of the new problems posed by the American SDI project which leaves us wondering whether it will strengthen or weaken the co-operation necessary between Europe and the United States. It is difficult because you know the diversity of the situations and views of the Member States in this field.

I think it is therefore essential — and the idea has already been mooted within the Sub-committee on security of which I am a member, and will be developed in particular in a report by my colleague Pierre-Bernard Raymond — for us to reflect together upon the specific interests of Europe, Europe's joint position in disarmament talks, its attitudes within the Atlantic alliance from the point of view of a Europe which is the second pillar of the alliance and also upon the appropriate consultations in areas not covered by the pact where our safety may be threatened.

It is too soon to give the answers and we found the answer given by the President of the Council very disappointing, but not surprising. At any event it is high time we put the questions clearly.

It is too soon also to propose institutional formulae. The one put forward by the secretary general of the European Council seems to me in any case to be the worst and would be a threat to the unity of the institutions. Nevertheless I perceive a positive trend in several countries, in particular France, where a broad consensus is emerging on problems of security and defence uniting the socialist party and the opposition but not, as the only exception, the Communist party.

I hope that this positive trend will be seen also in other countries. Events are gathering speed. Europe must make faster and further progress towards its political union which necessarily has a defence dimension.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Iversen (COM). — (*DA*) Madam President, one must judge the Community by what is actually achieved in the Community, not by grand words and symbols. It is therefore disappointing that the Community has been completely powerless in the face of the grave and threatening environmental problems with which we are confronted. I am thinking here in particular of the scandalous compromise entered into regarding lead-free petrol and pollutants from motor vehicles, which merely satisfies the wishes of the motor industry and is totally against the interests of the consumers and citizens of Europe. It emerged from the Minister's speech earlier that Denmark was expected within a short period to associate itself with the settlement reached. I do not know where the Minister got that from, but I hope it is not the case. I hope that Denmark says 'no', just as Sweden, Austria, Norway and Switzerland have said 'no' to the unsound standards which have been agreed in the EEC.

In the case of Nicaragua and the South African problem too — since we are talking about realities — it is not words and pronouncements which will bring the Community into credit. What matters is what the Community does. What does the Community intend to do about South Africa, apart from fine-sounding resolutions and words condemning the apartheid system? Are we going to suspend airline traffic to South Africa? Are we going to demand that all airlines in the Community countries suspend flights to South Africa, as Denmark, Norway and Sweden did recently? Are we going to make concrete offers of help to Nicaragua, in addition to what we have already offered, in order to check further incursions by the United States into Nicaragua? We should judge the Community by its acts. We shall make progress through realities, not through words. We have enough words in this system, words and symbols. But action is lacking.

Mr Filinis (COM). — (*GR*) Madam President, I would like to express our satisfaction with the very interesting statement by Mr Poos on assuming the Presidency of the Council. In the field of international politics he did quite right to refer to a number of countries in the world where there are acute problems regarding peace, independence and human rights violations.

Nevertheless, I would like, with sorrow, to point out that there was not even a hint about the serious issue of Cyprus. Yet Cyprus is today the only European state which has had 40% of its territory occupied by a foreign army, specifically by that of Evren's Turkey, for 11 whole years. And Cyprus is a country with which the Community maintains special relations. Given, Madam President, that we cannot, obviously, indulge in such fine talk about a Europe of peace and freedom while at the same time tolerating the naked violation of these principles on the Community's very own doorstep I would like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council to tell us what plans the Luxem-

Filinis

bourg Presidency has to support the efforts of Mr Perez de Cuellar to achieve a just settlement of the Cyprus problem in line with the resolutions of the UN.

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) Madam President, I should like first of all to thank all those who have taken part in this general debate on the programme of the Luxembourg Presidency for their views on the priorities I have set out on behalf of the Council and for the special comments they have made.

I notice that although the various political families represented within this Parliament have their own various preoccupations, nevertheless a great unity of views has become apparent on the general themes I presented to you. The Luxembourg Presidency regards that as very encouraging for the months to come.

Mr Abens and Mrs Simone Veil have each said in their own way and showing that affection for Europe for which they are well known, that Europe had an appointment in Luxembourg. In Voting Jean Monnet Mrs Veil said that the Luxembourg Presidency would not be a presidency just like any other. This is perhaps heaping too much honour upon it or raising great hopes with the risk of disappointment. But I agree with those two speakers when they say that the Luxembourg Presidency actually comes at a turning point in the history of our Community.

Luxembourg has always played the rôle of mediator, conciliator and honest broker in that Community since its inception. It is now for the smallest Member State, whose deep commitment to Europe is clear to all, to push forward those Community questions still pending and at the same time to convene and bring to a satisfactory conclusion the inter-governmental conference, whilst trying to avoid two pitfalls which were pointed out by the President-in-Office of the European Council. The first of these would be to mete out harsh treatment to one or other Member State and thus become embroiled in an inevitably profound and involved constitutional debate; the second would be that of letting matters drag on and allowing the inter-governmental conference to overrun or become as it were institutionalized.

I should like to thank you also, ladies and gentlemen, for the warm reception you gave to what I called priority to economic matters — priority to the economy for more dynamic growth and job creation — a policy for reducing unemployment. In this field too the Milan Council drew up certain guide-lines which we shall follow to the letter: a short-term directive to mould economic policy, taking advantage of the margin for manoeuvre granted to some countries in view of the economic convergence achieved over the past few months and a medium-term directive aimed at the Commission, which is to present to the Council meet-

ing in December, or preferably earlier, so that the directive might be discussed within the Council of Ministers, a detailed report on the real reasons for which Europe is lagging behind the great world powers such as the United States and Japan.

As to the question of specifying what we mean by a forward view, Madam President, I should like to say that for us, broadly speaking, that implies working towards realization of the internal market, allowing the Community to catch up in the field of technology and improving its mode of operating to suit the requirements of our times.

I should also like to stress once again our willingness to hold a dialogue with the European Parliament covering both budgetary questions and Parliament's participation at the stage of drafting of the various necessary amendments to the Treaty.

I agree that special attention should be paid to relations with the Commission. I have noticed that the Presidency and the Commission agree in many of their views and I can say that in principle I am in agreement with the broad guiding principles set out by the President of the Commission in his speech yesterday, to which I shall refer briefly.

In economic matters there are the finishing touches to put to European economic and social integration and, as regards the institutions, we need to break through the mental block about unanimity, safeguard the unity of the institutions and make the Community more democratic.

On the matter of foreign policy, which I noted was broadly speaking supported by the three large political families represented here, I should like to make two brief points. On the subject of human rights I wish to make it quite clear that European political co-operation is in favour of defending these rights irrespective of the country or system under which such infringements of human rights are detected. If I did not manage to mention them all that is because there are far too many of them. You are familiar with the Amnesty International report which mentions over a hundred countries in which human rights have been violated. I mentioned some of those countries and would like to add to that list Indonesia and Turkey, which were mentioned by one speaker.

I should like to give a brief word of explanation on security within the context of political co-operation. It is clear, as the House is aware, that security does not fall within the scope of current political co-operation. Defence policy and the whole military field fall outside our present political co-operation, which I regret as you do. The present Treaties would have to be changed to include security and in order to enable us to discuss purely military and strategic matters at Community level.

Poos

To reply briefly to Mrs Veil, who asked for further details on the technology Community, it is clear that we share Mrs Veil's aims. We must ensure that there is a Community dimension to European co-operation on technology. Here again I would say that emphasis was placed upon that European dimension in the Milan conclusions. I hope that when the technology meetings are held next week in Paris we shall be allowed to define the practical aspects of the Community dimension of that new collaboration.

Finally I want to say that I agree with the Honourable Member who asked the President-in-Office of the Council to ensure a return to what he called the original sources. A return to the original sources for us implies first of all a return to the Treaty and to the political, economic and social aims set out in the Treaty of Rome. All those who have joined this Community, even those who joined after the six founder countries, have put their signatures to those aims which are set out in the preamble to and Article 2 of the Treaty, to which I should like to refer for a moment.

They have put their signatures to our joint determination to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe and that is the very political aim which is stressed in your draft treaty on European Union and it is also the aim of the inter-governmental conference to be held shortly.

The second aim is the economic and social goal which sets as the essential objective of our efforts the constant improvement of the living and working conditions of our peoples. This is an invitation to move towards an economic policy calculated to eradicate the scourge of unemployment from our Community.

The third and final aim is an important one — the regional objective, worded as follows: to strengthen the unity of their economies and to ensure their harmonious development by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less-favoured regions.

Such is the purpose of the Treaty and such is also, in summary, the programme which the Luxembourg Presidency will follow over the coming six months with the full support, I hope, of this Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — We shall now consider the request for an early vote on the four motions for resolutions to wind up the debate on the two oral questions.

(Parliament adopted the request)

The vote on the motions themselves will take place at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

The debate is closed.

Perhaps I should announce now that the vote tonight will take place towards 6.30 and not at 6 p.m., so that you have your full one-and-a-half hours for Question Time.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Madame President, couldn't we have the vote this evening on these motions? We shall have less voting than we thought we were going to have.

President. — Sir James, I am merely abiding by Rule 42(5), which stipulates that when you have resolutions to wind up this kind of debate, you vote on a request for an early vote and the vote on the resolution itself always take place at the next sitting, which, of course, is tomorrow. So I am afraid I have to abide by the Rule.

11. Question Time

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-627/85). We begin with questions to the Council.

Question No 72, by Mrs Banotti (H-814/84):

Subject: European information centre on stolen works of art

Has the Council of Ministers responsible for the arts and culture made any progress towards the establishment of a European information centre on stolen works of art in Florence?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* In accordance with the proceedings of the Ministerial Meeting of 22 November 1984 the Italian Presidency submitted a draft showing the specific task which might be assigned to the European information centre on stolen works of art, to which the Honourable Member refers.

This matter was further considered at the recent meeting of Ministers responsible for the arts and culture, meeting within the Council on 28 May 1985.

The Italian Government informed the Ministers that it was ready to set up such a centre in agreement with the City of Florence and the Commission announced its intention of collaborating in the drawing up of a study on this matter which might be submitted to the Ministers at their next meeting.

Mr Hughes (S). — Does the President-in-Office not think it strange that on the one hand there is an understandable concern to prevent such theft and the Europe-wide circulation of stolen commodities while, on the other, the open theft and transfer of jobs and

Hughes

capital from deprived industrial areas is freely allowed and even endorsed in the latitude given to multinational corporations by the Treaties?

President. — I am sorry, Mr Hughes, but I cannot allow that supplementary question. It is not in any way connected with the theft of art and cultural works, so there is no reply to that particular supplementary.

As the author is not present, question No 73 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 74, by Mr MacSharry (H-72/85):

Subject: Success of the Danish economy

Can the Council account for the substantial improvement in the Danish economy given that output in the manufacturing industry rose by 11% in 1984, that investment rose by 20%-30% and that some 50 000 jobs were created, all in the private sector?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) The Council is following with interest the trend of the economic situation in Denmark as in the other Member States and welcomes any encouraging results obtained. It notes further that an evaluation of the present state of the Danish economy is shortly to be published by the Commission in the 'European Economy' series. In that analysis the Commission expressed the view that the results for 1984 and the outlook for 1985 are very satisfactory as regards both the trend in supply and the growth of the economy as well as employment, since unemployment is expected to go down by 10 000 during the year.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — I should like to thank the President-in-Office for his reply, but I was not specifically concerned about the future of the Danish economy. I wondered whether the Minister could say whether the Council will take action along the lines taken by the Danish Government to have similar improvements in the economies of the other Member States?

Mr Poos. — (FR) Naturally the Council follows carefully the economic situation in all the Member countries of our Community and as recently as last Monday the Ecofin Council carried out the second quarterly examination of the economic situation in the Community under the convergence decision and the Danish experience in particular was mentioned. The positive results of this experience have been quoted in the Commission report and it is for the officers of the Commission and the Member States in particular to draw the appropriate conclusions as regards their own economic policy.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) I must say that I did not really understand the answer given by the President-in-Office of the Council. Would the President-in-Office kindly confirm the following: that from 1978 to 1984 investment rose by 0.3% and that, despite an extraordinary rise in 1984, Danish investment at the present time is only at the level of 1978 in real terms?

Will the President-in-Office also kindly confirm that in 1983 there was a balance of payments deficit of 11 billion kroner, in 1984 a deficit of 17 billion kroner and that in 1985 a deficit of 20 billion kroner is expected. In the light of these figures, will the President-in-Office not agree with me that the Danish economy has never been in a worse state than it is a present?

Mr Poos. — (FR) Of course, in a country's economic balance-sheet there are positive items and negative items. The Honourable Member has supplied some extra information on the subject. I am not in a position to contest the figures he has just put forward but it is clear from a note from the secretariat that in fact Denmark's budget deficit, expressed as a percentage of the gross domestic product, went down between 1980 and 1984.

Mr Marshall (ED). — The President-in-Office said that the Council was following developments in all Member States. Would he therefore confirm that in the United Kingdom 600 000 new jobs have been created over the past two years and that the percentage of the relevant population in employment is higher than in most other Member States?

President. — I am sorry, Mr Marshall, on the same principle I do not think that that follows directly from the question that has been put to the President-in-Office.

As the author is not present, Question No 75 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 76, by Mr Elliott (H-202/85):

Subject: Social Fund

Under the rules for the operation of the Social Fund, 50% matching funding is normally required for any particular project from within the Member State concerned. In the UK, this matching funding normally comes from local authorities. However, is the Council of Ministers aware that under the present policies of the British Government such payments are counted as part of the authority's total expenditure and may therefore lead to the loss of a central government grant, if thereby the target expenditure set by the government for

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

President

the particular local authority is exceeded? This leads inevitably to a grave disincentive to the provision of matching funding and consequently loss of possible EEC Social Fund aid to projects of vital importance to disadvantaged groups in Britain.

Would the Council of Ministers therefore raise this matter with the British Government with a view to urging the exemption of local-authority matching-funding payments from the calculation of their total expenditure, so that a consequential loss of central government grants is avoided?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) The Council would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that the administration of the European Social Fund is a matter for the Commission. It is for the Commission to decide as to the implementation of the provisions governing the operation of the Fund.

Mr Elliott (S). — Of course that is technically the correct position, but I hoped that the Council of Ministers would be concerned about the operation of any Community policies within the Community and would be interested in the fact that in one particular country there is a serious problem. The administration certainly rests with the Commission, but this is a matter of principle and the action and policies of a particular Member government.

It is a peculiarly British problem — indeed, there are quite a number of peculiar British problems at the present time — but it relates to a situation where, in fact . . .

President. — I am sorry, Mr Elliott, would you kindly put questions?

Mr Elliott (S). — Yes, I will put my question. It is this, Madam President.

Would not the President-in-Office accept that it is undesirable for one particular Member government to operate policies such as that described in my question which have the effect of seriously interfering with the proper operation of a Community policy such as the Social Fund?

Mr Poos. — (FR) This is indeed a matter of principle and I should like to draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that under present rules supervision of local authority budgets comes entirely within the relations between the central authority and the local authorities of a member country of the Community.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Would not the President-in-Office agree with me that it is somewhat disingenuous to suggest to this House that the Commission is responsible for the operation of the Social Fund and, although that might be technically true, would he not agree with me that he could rectify this somewhat if the Council, as one of the joint arms of the budgetary authority of the European Communities, took a somewhat more rigorous view of the direction of Community expenditure by changing the direction from wasteful agriculture towards the necessary improvements in the Social Fund?

Mr Poos. — (FR) I do not think the supplementary question adds anything to the discussion. There were two questions, which I have answered. These are powers of the Commission, not of the Council; next, the most important thing is that relations between local authorities and regional or communal authorities do not fall within the Community's ambit. The President-in-Office of the Council cannot therefore add anything.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Whilst I accept what the President-in-Office is saying, would he not agree that the Social Fund is one of the most important funds for reconstructing Europe? Would he not also agree that there are not sufficient resources available in the Social Fund to fulfil all the purposes required? We get constant demands, as Members of Parliament, for help from the Social Fund and there simply are not the funds there. Would he not agree that something needs to be done to increase that particular fund?

Mr Poos. — (FR) I agree with the point of view expressed by the Honourable Member. Like him, I regard the Social Fund as one of our Community's most important funds, by means of which the Community can align standards of living between the different countries and the different regions of our Community. But that is not the subject at issue. In the Council's view the debate about funds allocated by local authorities and central authorities in addition to what is paid by the Social Fund must be settled within the United Kingdom and not in the context of relations between the United Kingdom and the European Communities.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) The President-in-Office of the Council is rather taking shelter behind the fact that this question refers to the United Kingdom, but there is a very definite question of principle involved, and I should like an answer on the principle involved. Does the President-in-Office of the Council believe that European Social Fund resources are additional to or a substitute for Member States' resources? If they are additional, then the procedure adopted in the United Kingdom is wrong. If they are a substitute,

Maij-Weggen

then the procedure Britain has adopted is correct. I should like an answer to this question of principle.

Mr Poos. — (FR) The question whether the contributions of the Social Fund are additional or supplemental to funds contributed nationally to a given social project must be settled case by case by the country receiving the aid. As regards the question you have raised there is no general rule at Community level.

President. — Question No 77, by Mr Marshall (H-234/85):

Subject: Recognition of Israel by Spain

In view of the Association Agreement between Israel and the Community, would the Council agree that it would be inappropriate for Spain not to recognize Israel?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) The Council would point out that the question of diplomatic relations between a Member State and non-member countries is not a matter for it but for the State concerned. I would add that in accordance with the principle governing accession negotiations — that of the complete acceptance by the applicant State of the *acquis communautaire* existing at the actual moment of accession — Spain, in acceding to the Community, will be called upon to accept the Mediterranean agreements, including the agreement with Israel, as these agreements are part of the *acquis communautaire*.

Mr Marshall (ED). — The answer given by the President-in-Office refers of course, to the Association Agreement between Israel and the Community and does not refer to the question of diplomatic recognition, which was part of my original question. Can I point out to him very briefly that when this matter was discussed in the European Parliament last month, the Parliament by a substantial majority called upon Spain to recognize Israel and that he ought to remember, as should the Spanish Government, that Israel is the only true democracy in the Middle East?

Mr Poos. — (FR) I think Parliament's wishes have been brought to the notice of the Spanish Government and it is now up to them to make the next move. I believe too that Mr Felipe Gonzalez, the Spanish Prime Minister, has stated that the problem of the recognition of Israel will be settled before the end of the year. The Spanish Government has therefore given a positive answer through the intermediary of the Press and I repeat that as far as the Council is concerned it will not interfere in this matter of the recognition of a non-member country by a Member State, since that does not come within its powers.

President. — Question No 78, by Mr Fitzgerald (H-12/85):

Subject: Emigration

Has the Council taken note of the resumption of emigration from Ireland and can it indicate what, in its view, are the reasons for renewed emigration?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) I can answer that question very briefly. The Council has not discussed the question of emigration from Ireland.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — While the Council may not have debated the subject, is President-in-Office not perfectly well aware that the emigration in question has increased? Would he not agree with me that the reason for this substantial increase is the growth in unemployment, a problem that has been neglected by the Council under successive presidencies?

Mr Poos. — (FR) The Council is fully aware of the serious situation in Ireland and also in other less-favoured regions of our Community. Further, it is expressly stated in the preamble to the Treaty, to which I referred a few moments ago, that the Community is anxious to ensure the harmonious development of European economies 'by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less favoured regions'.

To achieve that we have provided ourselves with certain tools. We have a Regional Fund and a Social Fund, and the EAGGF can also take action. I can assure you that in future these funds will be judiciously used to reduce the differences between the rich regions and the less-favoured regions of our Community and that Ireland too will benefit.

Mr Balfe (S). — Would the President-in-Office of the Council not agree that the monetarist policies of the Fine Gael government in Ireland, in contrast to the Socialist policies of the Luxembourg Government, might have something to do with the vast difference in unemployment between the Republic of Ireland and countries like Britain, where unemployment is enormously high, and a country like Luxembourg where, thanks to having Socialists in the government, it is remarkably low?

(Laughter)

Mr Poos. — (FR) Obviously during Question Time I have no time to give a detailed list of the structural differences between the economy of Luxembourg and the economy of Ireland.

The answer to your question will be found in a thorough analysis of the structural differences between

Poos

these two economies, one of which is an old-established industrial economy with stable social relations, whilst the other is a recently industrialized agricultural country where much more serious problems arise which are precisely what the Community regional policy must do its utmost to solve.

President. — Question No 79, by Mr Toksvig (H-175/85):

Subject: European decision about siting of radiation synchrotron

The government committee set up to take a decision on the siting of the European radiation synchrotron does not seem to have a chance of reaching a final decision. Siting this facility in Grenoble, as wished by France and West Germany, would be unfortunate as this site is not supported by the other members of the committee.

In the light of the foregoing, will the Council help ensure, with a view to strengthening European research, that a decision is taken at European level about siting this project, and will it both in the present case and in future decisions about siting international research centres in Europe help ensure that more account is taken of the need for a balanced shareout of projects so that countries, including the Nordic countries, that are seriously under-represented in this respect also benefit?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) The European synchrotron, the subject of this question, is a project set up under the auspices of the European Science Foundation! So it is not for the Council of the European Communities to take a decision about the siting of the synchrotron.

However, on 4 June 1985 the Council considered whether it would be advantageous to arrive at a Community view on this subject and with that in mind and taking account of the importance of this scientific project, it stressed the Community's interest in its implementation. It welcomed the choice of Grenoble as the site.

At its meeting on 4 June the Council also considered the general question of the siting of important scientific and technical centres in Europe and opinions similar to the Honourable Member's were expressed on that occasion.

As a conclusion to the discussion the Council agreed to consider ways of improving information and to arrange for an exchange of the views of the Member States and the Commission on scientific and technical centres of international significance, above all as regards their performance and siting so as to optimize employment.

The Council will probably consider this question before the end of 1985 but it is not possible at the present stage to forecast what the outcome might be.

Mr Toksvig (ED). — (DA) I just want to thank the President-in-Office for the answer he has given us. If these questions are discussed without preconditions, as implied by the answer of the President-in-Office, I shall be fully satisfied.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 80 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 81, by Mr Adamou (H-209/85):

Subject: Payment of additional tuition fees by foreigners in Belgium

Notwithstanding the decision taken by the Council of Education Ministers on 27 June 1980 and in contravention of the Treaty of Rome, Belgium continues to require students from other Community countries to pay tuition fees varying between BFR 95 000 and 250 000 per annum.

Given that the problem has become extremely acute, especially for Greek students, who have paid the Belgian state BFR 900 m since 1975, what measures does the Council propose to take to ensure that Belgium complies with the decisions of the Community Institutions and with the Treaty of Rome?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) In its judgment of 13 February this year in *Gravier v City of Liège*, the Court of Justice, confirming its judgment of 13 July 1983 in *Forcheri v Belgian State*, indicated that Article 7 of the EEC Treaty, which prohibits any discrimination by reason of nationality within the scope of application of the Treaty, applies to the charging by a Member State, to students who are nationals of another Member State, of an enrolment fee as a condition for admission to vocational training courses where a similar fee is not charged to national students.

It is for the competent national authorities to pursue the consequences of the judgments I have mentioned by bringing their legislation into line with Article 7 of the Treaty, as interpreted by the Court of Justice.

As the Council has pointed out many times, it is for the Commission to secure compliance with the Treaty and the provisions laid down by the institutions under the Treaty.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) I am not satisfied with the President of the Council's reply. It is a matter

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

Adamou

which has been raised before in the European Parliament. The Belgian Government is clearly discriminating against Greek students. The Council says it is not competent in this matter. I ask: at the end of the day which of the two institutions is competent to deal with the matter, the Council or the Commission?

Mr Poos. — (FR) Basically the questioner is entirely right in the light of the judgment of the Court which I have just mentioned; now it is for the Commission to ensure that the Kingdom of Belgium complies with the judgment of the Court.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) The Belgian Government has already reacted to this judgment by tabling a Bill in the Belgian Lower House and Senate. However, the Bill only concerns vocational training because that is what the judgment relates to. It does not concern university education. I must therefore say that the Belgian Government has taken no more than very limited action to give effect to the judgment. What does the President of the Council think of this? Does he not think that this ruling should also concern universities because the same situation is in fact involved?

Mr Poos. — (FR) The Council is aware that a draft Law has been submitted, but at present it does not know what is in it. It hopes therefore that the draft Law is in accordance with the judgment of the Court of Justice as regards non-discrimination; if that is not the case it will be for the Commission to make contact with the Belgian State and call upon it to comply with Community law.

President. — Question No 82, by Mr Raftery (H-218/85):

Subject: Monetary Compensatory Amounts

Will the Council provide assurance that it will adhere to the Commission's timetable for the final abolition of MCAs?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) At the time of the fixing of agricultural prices for the 1984-1985 marketing year the Council reorganized the agro-monetary system and drew up a three-stage timetable up to the beginning of the 1987-1988 milk year for the abolition of fixed monetary compensatory amounts.

So far the Council, confirming its political intention to abolish monetary compensatory amounts and to adhere to its own timetable, has effected the almost total abolition of negative monetary compensatory amounts and a two-stage abolition of positive monetary compensatory amounts of roughly 8 points for the

Federal Republic of Germany and 4 points for the Netherlands.

The Council undertook to abolish exemption for the remaining negative monetary compensatory amounts by the time of the fixing of prices for the 1986-1987 marketing year at the latest. As far as positive monetary compensatory amounts are concerned, the Council, in accordance with Article 5(1) of Regulation No 855/84, will proceed to the last and most difficult stage of the total abolition of the remaining positive monetary compensatory amounts during the period from the fixing of 1986-1987 agricultural prices to the beginning of the 1987-1988 marketing year.

It has been agreed that it is not possible to impose reductions of monetary compensatory amounts leading either to a reduction of prices in national currency or to an increase in prices in national currency which might entail difficulties for the economy of the Member States concerned. Thus it was not possible to arrange for the abolition of the remaining positive monetary compensatory amounts at the time of the recent fixing of prices for the 1985-1986 year.

Faced with these imponderables, the Council undertook to settle, before the beginning of the 1987-1988 marketing year, on the basis of a proposal from the Commission, the agro-monetary system to be applicable as from 1 April 1987, with special reference to the Community's economic and monetary situation, the market situation and trends in farm incomes as well as to the experience gained by then.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — I am happy to note the Council's determination to get rid of MCAs, but I would like an assurance that we shall not have a reintroduction of the MCAs should we have a significant fall in the value of the dollar, which, I believe, would be accompanied by a significant rise in the value of the German mark.

Could I have an assurance from the President-in-Office that MCAs will not be reintroduced if we have such a rise in the value of the German mark in future?

Mr Poos. — (FR) In the present state of affairs I can only confirm that the Council is quite determined not to re-introduce monetary compensatory amounts. But if I may be allowed, I would advise the Honourable Member to put further questions on this problem to the Committee on Agriculture of his own Parliament, where the Minister for Agriculture and the President-in-Office of the Agriculture Council will be able to give him an expert reply.

President. — Question No 83, by Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou (H-240/85):

President

Subject: Statements by the Austrian Government concerning the steps it proposes to take to reduce Community road transit traffic

Following the statements by the Austrian Government reported in the international press, concerning the steps it proposes to take to reduce Community road transit traffic through Austria, and since this affects the Community's interests, can the Council, particularly since the Council of Ministers of Transport of 23 May 1985, say what steps it proposes to take to prevent any such action being taken by the Austrian Government and whether the renewal of the Council's mandate to the Commission, decided on at the Council of Ministers of 23 May 1985, to continue negotiations with Austria on transport affairs does or does not also encompass extending that mandate to cover essential questions linked to the financing of infrastructure?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) The negotiations with Austria on transport matters on the basis of the directives adopted by the Council on 16 December 1981 were not particularly productive.

With a view to re-opening those negotiations and taking full account of the fact that there are problems of a practical nature causing concern on both sides as regards transit traffic through Austria, the Council, at its meeting on 23 May 1985, changed the guidelines for negotiation. The Council's view was that the solutions to be worked out should relate to all aspects of transport of interest to both sides and that they might be the subject of a general co-operation agreement in the sphere of transport between the Community and Austria.

The Council linked consideration of operations in the transport infrastructure sector with satisfactory results on the system for taxation of transport, capacity and co-operation in the field of rail transport and combined transport.

Following that meeting of the Council, the Commission undertook to get in touch with the Austrian Government to make sure that it would be possible to resume negotiations on that basis. As a result of its contacts with the Austrian Government the Commission informed the Council, at its meeting on 24 June 1985, that the Austrian Government was unwilling to pursue negotiations on the basis of the mandate of 23 May last, but that it was interested in considering with the Community arrangements for increased co-operation in the combined transport and rail sectors.

The Council noted that the Commission intended to suggest a framework for the discussions with Austria on such co-operation and requested the Permanent Representatives' Committee to take the necessary steps

to enable the Council to adopt such a framework in the near future and if possible before 31 July 1985 for the opening of discussions with the Austrian authorities.

Mrs Giannakou-Koutsikou (PPE). — (GR) I did not get a clear reply to my initial question so I would like to repeat it: if, as it announced on 23 May 1985, Austria goes ahead unilaterally and prohibits or reduces Community road transit traffic through its territory what steps does the Community propose to take to prevent such an action?

Mr Poos. — (FR) Up to now Austria has not made any direct threat to transit traffic crossing its territory, but I am only sorry that the political contacts we have had with Austria have been fruitless. I think that after the Permanent Representatives' Committee has discussed the matter the Commission, on the basis of a fresh formulation of the mandate, will be able to re-open discussions with Austria and that this time the discussions will result in an agreement between the Community and Austria.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) If Austria has declared that it is not interested in continuing negotiations on this point but on the other hand has said that it is interested in other ventures, particularly Eureka, cannot the Council treat these two matters together or in parallel so as to try to balance them against one another and tell the Austrians: 'If you are not interested in our problems we shall not take any interest in yours'?

Mr Poos. — (FR) I think that in a discussion with Austria it is perfectly feasible for the Commission spokesman to use such an argument, but I hope that the negotiations with Austria will proceed on the specific matter of transport problems and the mutual benefits which both Austria and the Community may reap from this transit traffic.

President. — Question No 84, by Mr Romeo (H-244/85):

Subject: Events in the Heysel stadium in Brussels

In view of the dreadful events caused at the Heysel stadium in Brussels on Wednesday, 29 May 1985, by Liverpool supporters, in which 39 spectators were killed and 200 injured, and bearing in mind that this was merely the latest in a long series of similar outbreaks of violence by British football supporters at international matches in other towns on the continent, does the Council not think that the time has come for joint measures at European level to make a repetition of such tragic events impossible?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) The Council keenly deplores the incidents which took place before the football match at the Heysel stadium in Brussels on 29 May 1985.

I must point out that the maintenance of public order on the territory of Member States is a matter for the competent national authorities. However, I should like to remind the House of the observations of the Committee for a People's Europe on the subject of sport and violence; further, the Council welcomes the agreement obtained on 27 June by the Council of Europe on a convention on spectator violence at sports events, particularly football matches.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — (NL) The violence in the Heysel Stadium was in fact a consequence of a change in standards in spectator sports. The right of the strongest counts for more than the ethics of sport. Parliament has drawn up a report on this subject. Would the Council not do well to join with the Member States in expressing its concern or organize a meeting at which the emphasis is placed on the ethics of sport both in the media and in the federations and teams concerned?

Mr Poos. — (FR) The Council fully shares the Honourable Member's concern. In addition the European Council which has just met in Milan took up the problem of violence in general and in particular violence at sporting events. It decided to strengthen and co-ordinate programmes which will have to include policies of a preventive nature and strict security measures covering effective control and severe penalties for offenders. These preventive policies are precisely the kind of step for which you are asking.

Mr Balfé (S). — I wonder whether the President-in-Office would accept that many of the football clubs themselves do take every step they can to combat violence. For instance, Millwall, in my area, has often been plagued by supporters and it is not just a matter of blaming a group of supporters as though it was the club's responsibility. Would he not agree that the recent report produced by the Belgian Parliament has shown that the responsibility for the Heysel disaster at least had to be shared and not just assigned to the supporters of Liverpool Football Club?

Mr Poos. — (FR) I think it is perfectly true to say that at Heysel responsibility was shared and that it would be wrong to put the blame on any one quarter. So it is quite correct to look for remedies for the situation at different levels: at the level of clubs, at State level, at the level of supporters and supporters' clubs, at the level of federations, the level of security in stadia, the level of police forces whose duty it is to supervise sporting events and so on.

Mr Patterson (ED). — On a point of order, Madam President. I may have missed something, but I am wondering why this question is being taken at all because it says in a footnote, 'Will not be called if Item 127 is kept on the agenda'. We had a full debate on this matter first thing this morning.

President. — Mr Patterson, nobody has raised this matter before you. We have now proceeded quite far with the question. Do you wish to put a supplementary question or not?

Mr Patterson (ED). — I asked this question precisely because I had read the footnote. I am still wondering why the question was taken.

President. — I am sorry, Mr Patterson, the question has been proceeded with. Nobody raised an objection up until now.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Well, I have.

President. — You have now, but we have already got quite far with the question. Many people have put supplementary questions, and I must now continue with the question.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) It is right to take measures to avert such manifestations of violence but I do not think that police measures can remove the causes which give rise to the violence. And I ask: has not sport strayed from its true spirit because the various sports bodies have become money-making undertakings or have links with various such undertakings?

Mr Poos. — (FR) It seems to me that the question was rather a clarification or elaboration to which I do not need to give a reply. I share the wishes expressed by the Honourable Member.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 85 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 86, by Mr Deprez, for whom Mr Herman is deputizing (H-251/85):

Subject: Consequences of enlargement of the Community for the ECU

In recent months, the ECU has become extremely popular and ECU accounts and loans are at record-breaking levels. In the first five months of 1985, loans issued in ECU have already exceeded the figure for the whole of 1984.

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

President

The ECU's success on private markets depends on the extent to which its stability is assured.

As a result of the enlargement of the Community on 1 January 1986, the ECU will eventually incorporate two further currencies, the Portuguese escudo and the Spanish peseta. This should take effect with the second revision of the ECU, planned for 1989 (the first took place in September 1984 and led to entry of the Greek drachma). The inevitable result will be to reduce the share of strong currencies in the ECU.

The ECU will then become weaker and the interest-rate — calculated as a weighted average of the interest-rates quoted for its component currencies — should logically increase.

The answer to the problem lies in the ECU's prospects for greater stability, which in turn depend on the stability of exchange-rate ratios within the European Monetary System. At present there are already two currencies included in the ECU which are not members of the EMS and thus not bound to observe the authorized fluctuation margins: the drachma and the pound sterling. Should the peseta and the escudo be integrated into the ECU but not the EMS, the development of the ECU could suffer. The transitional period (1986-89) should therefore be used to move towards real monetary union and thus towards greater convergence of the economic policies of the Member States.

What are the Council's views and what policies does it intend to pursue in this area?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) The Council shares the Honourable Member's opinion that the stability of the ECU depends on the exchange rate ratios of the currencies composing it; it is the result of a high level of convergence of the economic policies of the Member States.

The Council regards the convergence of economic policies as one of the Community's primary objectives which it is actively pursuing by means of the numerous co-ordinating procedures which have been laid down.

In this connection I would call attention to the fact that the Council regularly carries out an examination of members' economic situation apart from the formal decisions adopted during the year.

For example only a couple of days ago the Council undertook the second quarterly examination of the economic situation in the Community. As you know, the culmination of this process is the adoption of the annual report at the end of the year with its guide-lines for economic policy for the following year. The guide-lines are reconsidered and where necessary adapted in the spring.

Finally, at the beginning of the summer the Council, consisting of the Ministers for Economic Affairs and Finance, lays down the quantitative guide-lines for the draft public budgets for the following year and the guide-lines relate to trends in budgetary resources, the movement and level of balances and the means of financing or the use of those balances.

All these procedures and constraints have, taken together, enabled us to make significant progress in the direction of convergence. The Council is determined to continue with these efforts and to achieve fully satisfactory results.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (FR) I should like to thank the President for that reply, but since instances of convergence are well advanced today, could he tell us, bearing in mind the extraordinary expansion of the ECU on private markets, how the Council intends to support the system not only by means of convergence but also by a stronger affirmation of the European identity?

Mr Poos. — (FR) For my own part I may add that I entirely agree with the last paragraph of Mr Deprez's question in which he asks the Presidency to make use of the transitional period from 1986 to 1989 to move towards real monetary union and thus towards greater convergence of the economic policies of the Member States. I entirely approve that recommendation but I should like to remind the House of what the President of the Commission said in his comments yesterday on the statement of the President-in-Office of the European Council. Mr Delors referred to European monetary union as one of the great objectives which we must always have before us, but he also regretted that the time had not come for making substantial progress. In the opinion of the President of the Commission that is a short-term view. The time has not yet come to make substantial progress, but that will not prevent the presidency-in-office from keeping the problem of the European Monetary System on the agenda for the 'Economic Affairs and Finance' Council. It will also be on the agenda for the next informal meeting to be held in Luxembourg and everything possible will be done to make better use of the ECU on both public and private markets, I can assure you, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr Patterson (ED). — The answer to the supplementary is extremely encouraging. Would the President-in-Office confirm that three specific matters will be discussed by the Council during the Presidency? The first is the use or the holding of ECU by citizens in the Federal Republic of Germany. The second is the abolition of exchange controls, particularly by the Governments of France, Italy and Greece. The third, of course, is the participation in the exchange-rate mechanism of the monetary system by sterling. Will those three matters be specifically discussed during the Luxembourg Presidency?

President. — The answer is yes.

President. — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 87, 88 and 89 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 90, by Mr Musso (H-286/85):

Subject: *Laissez-passer* issued to Members of the European Parliament

Is the Council aware that the European Community *laissez-passer* issued only to Member of the European Parliament is not on the list of official documents notified to the French airport police and frontier authorities and thus has no official legal value? What does it intend to do to rectify this unacceptable state of affairs as soon as possible?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) Under Article 7 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities, *laissez-passer*, which are to be recognized as valid travel documents by the authorities of the Member States, may be issued to members and servants of the institutions of the European Communities by the Presidents of these institutions. The Presidency of the Council has brought to the notice of each of the Governments of the Member States the letter of 9 October 1981 from the President of the European Parliament so that if necessary it may give the necessary instructions for the full observance of the rights attached to the possession of the *laissez-passer* provided for by Article 7 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities.

Mr Musso (RDE). — (FR) Whilst thanking the President-in-Office of the Council, I should like to ask him whether he could once more remind the Ministers who are members of his Council of the position in this matter, as the necessary steps have not been taken in France.

Mr Poos. — (FR) The question and answer will be sent to all the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and it will be for each country to take the necessary action.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — (NL) May I point out to the Council that until recently visas were not issued on presentation of a European passport. There are a number of countries that require a national passport and will not issue visas on presentation of a European passport.

Mr Poos. — (FR) The Council is aware of the problem raised. It is for each of the Member States to com-

ply in good faith with the decisions taken with regard to the European passport. But I agree that certain difficulties which may be encountered in some Member States are simply due to the fact that at the moment these *laissez-passer* are — unfortunately, I would add, — used only by a very small number of people and that accordingly certain police forces are unfamiliar with these documents.

President. — Question No 91, by Mr Van Miert, for whom Mr Tomlinson is deputizing (H-288/85):

Subject: The Community's relations with Pakistan

Further to its reply of 17 April 1985 to Question No 122, by Mr Tomlinson (H-825/85), on the Community's relations with Pakistan,¹ will the Council state why it considers that the recent general elections in Pakistan were only a 'first step' towards the establishment of representative institutions and what further steps are necessary, in terms of the respect of human rights and the holding of truly fair and free elections, so as to make it possible to strengthen relations between the Community and Pakistan, in particular by the conclusion of a new Economic and Commercial Cooperation Agreement?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) The Council considers that the holding of elections in Pakistan is one factor of which a positive view may be taken. On 23 July the Council is to sign the Co-operation Agreement with Pakistan, which is similar to the one already concluded with India.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Will the President-in-Office now answer the question, which does state quite clearly that in a previous reply the Presidency of the Council said that the elections in Pakistan were only a first step towards the establishment of representative institutions. The question goes on to ask 'what further steps are necessary in terms of the respect of human rights and the holding of truly fair and free elections'.

Can we have a reply from the Council as to what the further requirements are? We have had the first steps. What does the Council consider will be a totally adequate response, bearing in mind the expressions of concern in this House about the abuse of human rights in Pakistan, about the ban on the proper functioning of the press in Pakistan, about the ban on the proper functioning of opposition parties in Pakistan? Can we therefore now have a reply to the question?

Mr Poos. — (FR) I can confirm that it is the Council's intention to ask for additional steps in the direction of democratization and respect for human rights in that

¹ See Annex 'Question Time'.

¹ Verbatim report of Proceedings of 17. 4. 1985, Annex, page 33.

Poos

country, with which we are proposing to sign a Co-operation Agreement.

In addition, I stress that we have provided for the European Parliament to be consulted before signature and that on that occasion it will be possible for this question to be raised again.

Mr Balfe (S). — A few days ago a man called Ayaz Samoo was hanged at dawn by the Pakistan military authorities — evidence yet again of the breakdown of the judicial system there. What the President-in-Office has not said is what further improvements he requires before the Council is prepared to sign the Cooperation Agreement. Is the Council prepared to sign it now, or do they still require further improvements before they sign it?

Mr Poos. — (*FR*) On the basis of a motion for a resolution tabled at the European Parliament by Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, we have received a lengthy memorandum from the Government of Pakistan in which it states its position, point by point, on the various objections raised in the motion for a resolution. The Pakistani memorandum is at present still being considered by the Ministers in political co-operation. I will inform the Parliament of the conclusions reached by the Community Ministers.

Mr Zahorka (PPE). — (*DE*) Mr President, would you agree with me when I say that we are indeed all in favour of respecting human rights — even in Pakistan — but that if we were to make this the sole criterion for concluding trade agreements, we could not have discussed a trade agreement with the People's Republic of China today, as it is a well-known fact that there are arbitrary executions and no freedom of the Press there?

Secondly, I should like to ask whether it is intended that Parliament should be consulted before the Agreement is signed? Signature is to take place on 23 July. The Committee on External Economic Relations was not consulted and is not meeting before the signature date.

That is an infringement of the Luns-Westertep procedure. Is the Council at all prepared to continue to listen to Parliament on such important matters as trade agreements with such politically and economically important States as Pakistan, and will it in future at least stop concluding such trade agreements without consulting Parliament?

Mr Poos. — (*FR*) As has been said during our debate today, there are more than a hundred countries in which human rights are not respected. It would become more or less impossible to conclude commercial agreements and carry on economic relations with

non-member countries if on every occasion we were to insist first upon a complete return to respect for the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights.

But having said that, I stress that it is the Council's constant concern to re-affirm respect for human rights and to insist on respect for the United Nations Charter, whatever may be the political system of any country which does not follow to the letter declarations which it has officially accepted.

As regards consultation with the Parliament, I would remind the Honourable Member that the Council suggested to Parliament that there should be a briefing session prior to signature. I do not know why that meeting did not take place and I confirm that the Council is ready to consult Parliament on the agreement with Pakistan before it is finally concluded.

President. — We now come to questions to the Foreign Ministers

Since they deal with the same subject, I call Question No 108, by Mr Raftery (H-136/85):

Subject: Ethiopia

Following the visit of Mr Natali to Ethiopia, do the Foreign Ministers, meeting in political cooperation, consider that famine is being used by the authorities in Ethiopia as a means of putting down a rebellion in part of that country? If so, what action do they intend to take?

and Question No 120, by Mr Marshall (H-260/85):

Subject: Ethiopia

Members of the Ethiopian Royal Family are still incarcerated many years after the Marxist revolution there. Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation discussed their plight?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (*FR*) The first question concerns the situation in Ethiopia. As has been stressed to the Ethiopian authorities, the Ten are following with particular attention the problems connected with the distribution of emergency aid in the famine-stricken northern regions of the country. It seems, particularly in the light of the information supplied by the Vice-President of the Commission, Mr Natali, that the distribution difficulties in certain regions of the country are due on the one hand to the fighting which is going on there and on the other to problems of logistics. In this connection the Ten confirm their wish to see peace restored in the northern regions of Ethiopia as a result of political solutions based on respect for territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — I should like to ask the President-in-Office whether he can confirm or deny

Raftery

reports that aircraft of the Communist Government in Ethiopia have been used to strafe food convoys travelling during the day to the northern part of Ethiopia, thereby forcing these convoys to travel by night, with the result that food is delayed in getting through.

Can the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers give me an assurance that these reports are untrue? If not, will he state what action the Council proposes to take in order to rectify this appalling situation?

Mr Poos. — (FR) The Council has no knowledge of the use of aircraft by the Ethiopian Government. But I can assure the Honourable Member that the Presidency will keep in contact with the group of donor countries and the United Nations representatives on this subject so as to contribute, in collaboration with the Ethiopian authorities, to efficient delivery and fair distribution of aid for the benefit of the populations affected by drought and famine in all regions of the country.

The problem of all the political detainees in Ethiopia is being followed attentively in the context of European political co-operation. On this matter the Ten have expressed their concern, in their contacts with the Addis Ababa authorities, from the humanitarian point of view about the fate of those who are still detained; they will continue to do so in future.

Mr Balfé (S). — Does the President-in-Office of the Council accept that in the circumstances the Ethiopian Government has done and is doing its best to distribute the aid as fairly as possible and that it will continue to do so?

Insofar as the Royal Princesses are concerned, whilst he would have the full support, I believe, of many in this House in pressing for their release, does he also accept that much of the propaganda surrounding them stems from people who are not friends of Ethiopia and certainly do not wish to help the people who are starving there?

Mr Poos. — (FR) I think the Honourable Member has just raised a relevant point on the present situation in Ethiopia. We have been informed that there have genuinely been difficulties in delivering Community aid because means of transport were non-existent or not available. That is a problem of which we are fully aware. We are in contact with the Ethiopian authorities in an attempt to remedy the situation.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — (NL) I should like to ask the Council what has become of the written question in which I reported that during our visits to several places in Eritrea we found a considerable quantity of European food being sold on the black market? I made my reports available to the Commission and also to the

members of the Council, and I provided irrefutable evidence of how 1m kilograms of surplus grain from the European Community had found its way on to the black market in Germaica over a period of six months. Senior members of the Ethiopian army who have defected to the other side assured us that 50% of the consignments are traded on the black market.

My first question is this: what are the findings of the investigation into this report? Secondly, are the first crops to be grown still being bombed, with napalm, for example, near the Oromos in the Tigre district and in Eritrea? Whole fields are being bombed at the moment by the very aircraft that have just been mentioned.

Mr Poos. — (FR) At the moment I am not in a position either to confirm or deny the statements which have just been made. I shall at once consult Mr Vice-President Natali, who has just been to Ethiopia, and keep the Honourable Member informed of the conclusions to be drawn from an analysis of the situation such as he has described.

Mr Marshall (ED). — As the author of a report to this House on the Horn of Africa, may I confirm to Mr Balfé my desire to see hunger ended in Ethiopia and confirm to the President-in-Office the concern of a large number of people in the Community both about human rights in Ethiopia and about allegations concerning the misuse of aid? May I ask him to keep up the pressure until he gets adequate answers on both of those issues?

Mr Poos. — (FR) I have noted what you say. I can assure you that your statements will be carefully examined and that you will have a reply as soon as possible.

Mrs Jackson (ED). — We are always hearing from representatives of the Council of Ministers that they are pressing their views upon various people around the world. Can the President-in-Office please tell us what response they have received from the Ethiopian Government to their representations on behalf of the Ethiopian princesses?

Mr Poos. — (FR) On this subject I can only say that we have not received any specific reply from the Ethiopian authorities.

President. — Question No 109, by Mr Boutos (H-140/85):

Subject: The European Community and the Balkans

In view of the geopolitical significance of the Balkans and the fact that events there necessarily have a direct and serious impact on the Member

President

States of the Community, would the Foreign Ministers state whether they have studied the situation in the Balkan Peninsula following the change in the Albanian leadership and, if so, whether they have formulated a common policy towards this region?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (FR) The situation in the Balkan Peninsula and policy affecting that region are certainly studied by the Ten with the greatest attention. However, the events referred to by the Honourable Member have not been specifically discussed in the context of European political co-operation, in so far as they do not seem to have altered the general situation in the region.

Mr Boutos (PPE). — (GR) The situation in the Balkan peninsula, Mr President of the Foreign Ministers, makes it imperative for us to examine carefully every treaty there which undergoes change. I would therefore request a more specific reply as to how you are responding to developments in this region given that the situation in Albania totally influences the situation in Yugoslavia with which the European Community has economic cooperation agreements. This examination is also made necessary by the fact that certain Member States are embarking on major initiatives in the region in conjunction with other non-Community states. In the light of these two factors perhaps you have something more to add?

Mr Poos. — (FR) It is not yet possible to determine precisely the effects on Albanian politics of the death of the Albanian leader Hoxha and the coming to power of his successor, Ramis Alia. In that sealed country any process of change has so far been concealed from foreign observers.

As a result, the time is not ripe for a further discussion of the situation in the Balkans in the context of European political co-operation in which there has been no essential change.

I would remind the Honourable Member that when normalizing its relations with all State-trading nations, the Community also approached Albania as long ago as 1974. However, the Albanian government of the day did not think it worth responding to the offer. Of course we are still ready to re-examine the situation as soon as we are convinced that there will be a positive reply from the Albanian Government.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (FR) There are two aspects to the Albanian problem: first of all there is what happens in Tirana — and on that question I can only thank you for the answer you have given — but then there is also the whole problem of Kosovo which is of very close concern to us, as Mr Boutos has already

stressed, because of our special relations with Yugoslavia.

Are the Ministers dealing with the problem which might develop in Kosovo, the consequences of which might be fatal for peace in the Balkans?

Mr Poos. — (FR) Of course the Foreign Ministers have considered the problem of Kosovo. But we have the impression that in recent months, or even in recent years, the situation has stabilized or even slightly improved by comparison with the incidents which took place in that region some years ago. There is therefore no danger in delay such as to justify the problem being put urgently on the agenda for political consultation between the Ten.

President. — Question No 110, by Mr Tzounis (H-165/85):

Subject: Development of new weapons systems by the Soviet Union in Europe

According to reliable reports, the Soviet Union recently began developing new SS 22-type missiles on the territories of East Germany and Czechoslovakia. Their range and nuclear warheads make them a particular danger to the peoples of the Community.

Do the Foreign Ministers share the view that such actions place additional difficulties in the way of efforts to secure peace and disarmament in Europe?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (FR) The specific development to which the Honourable Member refers concerns the military aspects of security, which are not the subject of discussions in the context of European political co-operation.

Mr Tzounis (PPE). — (GR) I must say that I am in no way satisfied with the Foreign Minister's reply. Because, as everyone knows, military problems have political ramifications. My question to the Foreign Minister is this: yes or no, does the appearance of these missiles in Czechoslovakia and East Germany complicate the political situation in Europe, and if it does have the Ten formed a conclusion about it and are they maintaining the requisite contact with the negotiators in Geneva in order to protect Europe's more specific interests?

Mr Poos. — (FR) For myself I can reply that the installation of these new types of missile in a number of Eastern countries is a matter for concern and that we regret it. But we cannot discuss it in the strict framework of European political co-operation. We can discuss it within the WEU, we can discuss it within

Poos

NATO, but as long as not all the members of the Community are members of the Atlantic Pact it is clear that questions of military security cannot be raised at Community level.

Mr Hughes (S). — I should like to ask the President-in-Office whether he agrees that the only way out of the insanity of mutually assured destruction is to dispose of all nuclear weapons, and in view of the barrier to progress being posed by the Strategic Defence Initiative at Geneva, does he not agree that any European backing for SDI would, in the words of the original question, 'place additional difficulties in the way of efforts to secure peace and disarmament in Europe'?

Mr Poos. — (FR) The supplementary question which has just been put is much too complicated for a yes or no answer. Further, the question raised has never been discussed in European political co-operation, so that the President-in-Office is quite unable to reply here and now.

President. — Question No 111, by Mr Evrigenis (H-166/85):

Subject: Common European stand on the Strategic Defence Initiative

The decision by the United States of America to implement the programme known as the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) has clearly placed that part of Europe which belongs to the Community in a serious dilemma going far beyond the sphere of defence. The programme is being put forward as a response to defence necessities; its inherent technological dimension, however, undoubtedly gives it significant extra economic ramifications. In the face of this challenge, the Community countries give the impression of being incapable of working out and formulating a common, or even harmonized, stand.

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation taken any steps to formulate a common, or even harmonized, stand on this matter, and what are the prospects for such a move?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (FR) The problem of harmonization and close co-operation between the ten Member countries of the European Community so as to find an appropriate answer to the challenges arising from the pace of technological progress is one of the topical themes in our Community. Mr President Delors put forward specific ideas on this subject and in March last the French Government made it the subject of a major initiative, the Eureka project, which aroused keen interest amongst the other States. The Ministers for scientific research of the Ten at their last meeting took up the problem of co-operation between the Ten in the field

of advanced technology. The European Council at Milan decided to add a fresh technological dimension to the Community by strengthening technological co-operation in Europe.

In addition it gave its support to the French Eureka project with a view to creating a Europe of Technology. The implications for technology of the Strategic Defence Initiative are certainly a significant factor in that debate. However, in view of its military nature the Strategic Defence Initiative is not the subject of co-ordination in the framework of political co-operation.

Mr Evrigenis (PPE). — (GR) The Foreign Minister's reply dealt primarily with the coordination of European actions on the technology side and not so much with the main subject of my question which concerned the formulation of a European stand towards the American Strategic Defence Initiative. The Foreign Ministers will of course be aware that there have already been European moves in connection with the Strategic Defence Initiative. These moves have been on a state basis, as in the case of the Federal Republic of Germany, or, as in France, private but by public sector undertakings — with tacit government approval that is. I would like to ask, therefore, how these actions or omissions, which reflect a kind of European disarray or confusion, can be reconciled with the preparations the Community is making to implement the Eureka programme and to move towards technological cooperation in line with the proposals of the Commission and the decisions of the European Council in Milan?

Mr Poos. — (FR) Although military questions are not amongst the subjects treated in the context of political co-operation, I can tell the Honourable Member that so far no steps have been taken at European level in the matter of the strategic initiative and that no joint European answer has been sent to the Government of the United States.

Mr Cryer (S). — Could the President-in-Office assure the House that the Common Market won't stray into military matters by being sucked into the technological developments pursued by the United States? Could I assure him that he will have every support for his repeated statements that Star Wars have nothing to do with the Common Market? Every country says that they have got nuclear weapons and nuclear systems for defence purposes only and yet they go on and on piling up stocks of nuclear weapons. Every country should set its face against the deployment of nuclear weapons and against the deployment of technology in the service of developments that threaten the future of humanity.

Can he give the House an assurance that the Common Market will set its face against any involvement

Cryer

through new technology in military projects and, in particular, the American Star Wars project?

Mr Poos. — (FR) I did not say that the strategic initiative had nothing to do with the Community. What I did say, and do repeat, is that the American strategic initiative has not been discussed and cannot be discussed within the context of political co-operation and that so far the countries of the Community have not sent a joint reply to the question put to them by the American Government.

President. — Question No 112, by Mr Wurtz, for whom Mr Vergès is deputizing (H-199/85):

Subject: Sanctions against South Africa

Could the Ministers report on the measures taken to implement the resolution (Doc. B 2-153/85) on the situation in southern Africa adopted by the European Parliament at the April 1985 session, paragraph 4 of which expressly called for the Member States to break off all economic, financial, cultural and military links with South Africa?

Mr Poos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (FR) The situation in South Africa and the policy to be pursued towards South Africa are, as is well known, regularly discussed within the framework of European political co-operation. The firm position of the Ten in this connection was recalled in the declarations of the Foreign Ministers of 25 March and 29 April 1985.

As regards measures of an economic, financial, cultural and military nature regarding South Africa, the Ten apply strictly the mandatory measures decided upon by the United Nations. The Ten will continue to use their collective weight to induce the South African Government to bring the inhuman system of apartheid to an end.

Mr Hindley (S). — In the light of the Canadian Conservative Government's decision to impose an embargo on certain kinds of trade with South Africa, does the Minister find this action by the Conservative Government in Canada commendable? Secondly, does he see this decision taken by a Conservative government as a sign of growing revulsion for the *apartheid* régime in South Africa?

Mr Poos. — (FR) At present the Ten have not worked out a joint position as regards any economic sanctions against South Africa.

Of course the European partners will follow the situation in the south of the African continent very closely

and will use means at their disposal to exert pressure in favour of the abolition of the system of apartheid.

My view is that the Ten should devote great attention to the attitudes adopted by spokesmen of the black community. The adaptation and implementation of the code of conduct for South African subsidiaries of European companies would certainly represent an important step forward in this matter.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Would the Minister accept that all the governments of the Community deplore *apartheid* as practised in South Africa, but would he not also agree that the measures proposed in this question would be counter-productive and that the very people who would suffer most are those that we have been trying to help, in other words, the black people? Would these measures not be very much against their best interests?

Mr Poos. — (FR) Successive Presidents of the Council have stated that they condemned the system of apartheid in force in South Africa. As to the problem of economic sanctions, there is no agreement between the Ten on the expediency or value of such steps.

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

Mr Cryer (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, I understood that I was not called because I came from the same political group as the original questioner. However, the original questioner took over the question and was not called as a member of the British Labour group. Surely the convention that no two people from the same political group are called for supplementary questions does not apply where the original questioner takes over a question!

Lady Elles (ED). — In fact the question was put by Mr Vergès in place of Mr Wurtz, and Mr Hindley had a supplementary question. I hope Mr Cryer will accept that explanation and agree that the correct procedure was followed.

Votes

¹ See Annex containing answers to questions not answered during Question Time.

Lady Elles

Report by Mr Gerontopoulos, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on International Youth Year 1985 (Doc. A 2-71/85)

Motion for a resolution

Preamble: Amendment No 17

Mr Gerontopoulos (PPE), rapporteur. — (GR) Mr President, first of all I should like to say that by being here in this Chamber you are showing your concern about the problems of youth. And for the young people of Europe that is something very significant. I should like to stress that the amendments have not been discussed by the Committee on Youth, so I will give my personal opinion. I agree that Amendment No 17 should be adopted, but not Amendment No 25 which is included in No 17. That is to say, I am for Amendment No 17 and against Amendment No 25.

Explanations of vote

Mr Fajardie (S). — (FR) By making 1985 the international youth year we have shown that we have faith in the future of Europe and that we have the will to provide for that future.

I should like to point out three factors which we regard as essential for a youth policy.

The first concerns the crucial problem of youth unemployment. Nothing is possible in an atmosphere of distress, nothing is possible without hope and the Commission of the European Communities must draw up as a matter of urgency practical proposals dealing in particular with maintaining creativity and innovation, the promotion of occupational training and with an in-depth consideration of the question of working hours.

The second concerns solidarity with all the outcasts of poverty and liberty. Young people should be helped in the efforts they make to achieve something positive as for example with the fight against such abominations as racism, to show the bond which links us to the people of the third world and, closer to home, to those who are denied their birthright; to proclaim in a word that no dictatorship is compatible with the spirit of liberty which we are trying to promote.

The third factor concerns non-government youth organizations. It is through these free organizations with free young people as members that we must get a significant part of our message and our resources across if we believe, as much as we claim, in European culture and if we are determined to give that culture a future.

It is with this in mind that we approve the report before us on the International Youth Year.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — I shall vote for the report of Mr Gerontopoulos, but in doing so I make a strong plea concerning young people and hard drugs. Those who have become addicts are often the victims of our society and of an increasingly formidable network of big crime, and must be treated as such. The law must be ruthless, as Mr Gerontopoulos states, but against the cold and equally ruthless criminals who run their murderous trade. We have to distinguish between the pawn, the small-time drug pedlar and the big operator. We must embark on a full programme of education for young people, parents and teachers into the dangers of hard drugs and allocate sufficient funds for rehabilitation.

I have no doubt this Parliament can play a full and valuable rôle in achieving these objectives.

Mr Anastassopoulos (PPE). — (GR) I asked to speak about the application of the Rules of Procedure, and with all the respect which you know I have for you I should like you to tell me why the rapporteur was not asked for his opinion on the amendments. There was, certainly, some confusion with the microphones when you had to move places, but I could not understand why, after that, the opinion of the rapporteur, Mr Gerontopoulos, ceased to be sought. Of course, he himself, with his characteristic modesty, did not insist on being asked for his opinion. The procedure followed runs counter to the Rules of Procedure and the traditions of Parliament.

President. — Mr Anastassopoulos, the rapporteur was expressing his personal view since no opinion had been formulated by the committee.

If there was any confusion during the voting, I offer my apologies.

Mr Adamou (COM), in writing. — (GR) Mr President, the slogan of International Youth Year, 'participation, development, peace', underlines the need for governments to take concrete steps to guarantee young people's rights and to create all those economic, political and other conditions which will enable the various sectors of youth genuinely to become organized and claim their rights and so participate in the wider struggles of working people. These objectives are reflected in the struggles of the democratic youth movement which embraces the bulk of young people worldwide with regard to their real problems.

The report seeks to distort the content of these objectives by seeing them as part of the shaping of a 'European consciousness' and of the development of the 'European ideal'.

Adamou

Youth is fighting for peace against the Europe of nuclear missiles. Fighting for the right to work which the Europe of exploitation and monopolies has taken from it. It is organizing and fighting for wider and more far-reaching democracy against the Europe of anti-strike and repressive police measures.

Youth is demanding its rights and is organized in the fight for them against the tendencies towards alienation and 'individual escape' and against the hypocrisy of the supposed solutions offered to it by 'European Union'.

The Communist Party of Greece will not vote for the report because it believes in and is fighting for the objectives of International Youth Year which it sees being promoted in a direction utterly different from that of the development of the so-called 'European identity and consciousness'.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Report by Mrs Pantazi, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on instituting a Solidarity with Third-World Children Week (Doc. A 2-73/85)

Explanations of vote

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) The tragic situation of children in the developing countries makes it essential for us to grasp the vital significance of the initiative to organize a week of solidarity with the children of the Third World. In particular, after the flare-up of racist tendencies in recent years and the emergence of signs of xenophobia, it becomes especially important for the European Community to promote programmes to develop the friendship of the peoples of North and South resolutely and with the utmost speed.

Agreeing with the sum of measures proposed by the rapporteur and sharing her anxieties about the limited funding available from the budget we would like to draw attention to, in our opinion, two very important points. Firstly, to the fact that this initiative to make European public opinion sensitive to the reality of the Third World with regard to education, health and food supplies, etc., must constitute part of an unselfish policy which has as its prime objective real participation by the EEC in the development of Third World countries and not be a paternalistic approach to the development issue. We ask, therefore, that Third World organizations, such as the Organization of African States, should participate fully and supervise

this Community information campaign and have the right to intervene where they see tendencies towards misleading information. Secondly, we want to stress the responsibility of the mass media and of those charged with carrying through this initiative to ensure that correct information is given and that mistaken impressions are not created in the public mind.

The rapporteur's motion for a resolution has our full agreement and we hope that the commencement of this campaign to improve and close relations between North and South will have a positive effect on the treatment accorded to the children of foreign workers in the Member States of the Community. We hope that the slogan 'touche pas à mon pote', with which young people are making their opposition to racism more and more clear, will develop into a movement to awaken public opinion as a whole and promote solidarity between peoples.

Mrs Pery (S) in writing. — (FR) I am in favour of a week of solidarity in favour of children from the third world. I vigorously support efforts to make young Europeans aware of the problems of health, food, education and occupational training for young people in developing countries. Young people readily appreciate the plight of others.

But beyond the purely emotional level and that of the impact of pictures, we must make them aware of the basic problems facing developing countries. To this end we must channel our efforts not only through the traditional written word and audio-visual means but also through such media as schools and colleges, universities, youth organizations, feminist organizations, the unions, socio-professional organizations and the churches.

The cost of such an information campaign should be shared by the European Community, the Member States and non-government organizations, which received more than two thousand million centimes from the EEC last year for their publicity campaign.

Such an information week could be held at Christmas time and I hope that the European Parliament will give the campaign priority in its information policy.

Just when racism and xenophobia are raising their ugly heads once more it is essential to inform and instruct our young people. They will make the world of tomorrow and the success which the 'Touche pas à mon pote!' [Hands off my pal] campaign has enjoyed in France might give us the impression that young people are our hope for better times ahead with greater solidarity.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

¹ The rapporteur spoke *in favour* of Amendment No 5 and *against* Amendments Nos 1 and 3.

Motions for resolutions on the European Council meeting in Milan

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr President, under Rule 85 I should like to move that all these resolutions be referred to the Political Affairs Committee, and I do so for two reasons, one procedural and the other practical. The procedural reason was raised by my colleague Sir James Scott-Hopkins on Monday, when he pointed out that none of these resolutions is based on any rule in our procedure. They are not based on Rule 42, Rule 47, Rule 48 or Rule 49, which are the only Rules on which a motion can be based.

The second reason is much more important. It was made clear to us by the occupant of the Chair, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, that we should be able to pronounce on the statement made by the President, and I agree. But if you look at our draft agenda, you will see it says that these resolutions are tabled on the basis of these statements, and, Mr President, the deadline for tabling these resolutions occurred long before that statement was made. Not only did the deadline for the resolutions occur long before the statement was made but so did the deadline for tabling amendments. It is, therefore, absolutely impossible that any of these resolutions, even if amended, could reflect the statement made to us by the President-in-Office. Now you may ask if this matters very much. I think it does, because if we now proceed to vote on all these resolutions and all these amendments and they are all adopted, what effect will they have on the President or anybody else? They will be based on a suspect procedure and none of them will have taken into account what the President-in-Office actually said to us on the day. It would be much better — and this is why I am moving that they be referred to committee — if the Political Affairs Committee were to take all these resolutions and produce a considered report on the Milan Summit for our next part-session. Otherwise I do not believe any of these resolutions will have any effect at all.

President. — Following Mr Patterson's request, I give the floor to one speaker for and one speaker against.

Mr Nord (L). — (NL) Mr President, a few days ago I voted for Sir James Scott-Hopkins's proposal that these resolutions should be declared out of order, because that is what they are. Parliament did not agree with us. But it is now quite a different matter to refer them to the Political Affairs Committee. If you want to refer them anywhere, then it should be to the Committee on Institutional Affairs because that is where the resolution on the Milan Summit came from. If you refer it to another committee, you will be causing a conflict of competence between two committees, which I would like to see Parliament spared on the eve of the recess. Either the whole matter should be declared out of order, although you have already

rejected that once, or we should vote on it, and that is probably the best solution. But it should certainly not be referred to a committee other than that from which all this ought to have originated and did originate. Unfortunately, a number of duplicate resolutions have also been tabled. I am therefore opposed to Mr Patterson's proposal.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — I won't hold the House up. We have heard all the arguments, but if the motion put before the House is to refer these texts to committee, then I shall vote in favour of it, as long as the committee is not specified. It would be your decision or that of the Bureau as to which committee it goes to. Therefore, if the proposition is to refer these texts to committee, I am in favour of it and I hope the House will support it. I hope that is what you will put to the House.

(Parliament rejected Mr Patterson's request)

Motion for a resolution by Mr Van der Lek and others on behalf of the Rainbow Group, on the statements by the Council and the Commission after the European Council meeting of 28-29 June 1985 in Milan (Doc. B 2-633/85): rejected

*
* *

Motion for a resolution by Mr Balfe and others, on the outcome of the European Council meeting in Milan (Doc. B 2-634/85)

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, on a point of order. I am delighted to see this resolution tabled in my name, but feel I should point out that it was actually tabled with the first signatory as Mr Lomas, as leader of the British Labour group.

President. — I am sorry, Mr Balfe, but in the copy I have in front of me you figure as the first signatory.

Explanation of vote

Mr Lomas (S). — I shall of course vote for the resolution tabled by the Labour Members, because it is one of the few realistic resolutions on the Milan Summit. It notes the complete failure of the summit, it notes the failure to do anything about the 15 million unemployed in the Community or the 35 million who, on the Commission's own admission, are now living in poverty in the Community.

The sum total of the Milan Summit was to call for yet another summit, because that is what the intergovern-

Lomas

mental conference is. It is simply another summit to discuss the abolition of the veto, which is the only weapon that national governments have to protect themselves against the worst excesses of the Common Market.

(Applause)

It will also be for steps towards European Union, and we all know what European Union means for the Members opposite: a union of paradise for the multinationals, for the financial speculators, and of course they support that, of course they do! The benches over there are full of them.

(Protests from the centre and the right)

Of course they are in favour of it! Well, we speak for the workers of Europe and we shall vote against these motions.

(Mixed reactions)

Parliament rejected the motion)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution by Mr Cervetti and others, on the statements by the President-in-Office of the Council on the outcome of the European Council meeting in Milan (Doc. B 2-636/85): adopted

*
* *

Motion for a resolution by Mr Arndt and Mr Didò, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the outcome of the European Council meeting in Milan (Doc. B 2-637/85/rev.)

Explanations of vote

Mr Bøgh (ARC). — *(DA)* Mr President, for those of us who have grown up in a Scandinavian democratic tradition, it was ominous to see the Spinelli report on the Union issue adopted after the Milan Summit by a large majority of the parliamentarians present. We noted, however, that this momentous event for the pro-Europeans could only attract a very small number of parliamentarians to this part-session. That provided food for thought.

But there was also an important bright spot: for the first time it seems that no Danish parliamentarian voted in favour of a Union report. That is worth drawing attention to, and it is gratifying. As an old social

democrat, I am particularly glad to see that the Danish social democrats have found their feet again as Danes and as socialists. I am thinking of the clear dissociation from the Milan jubilation of their pro-Union sister parties, which emerges from their motions for amendments to this report. My fellow group members and myself were happy to vote for these amendments. Let us hope that a start has been made on healing the rift created in the Danish social democratic movement by the EEC issue. All this Union mania seems to have done some good after all!

Mr Croux (PPE). — *(NL)* In connection with my explanation of vote, I should just like to point out that the aim of our amendments was to bring about some concordance between yesterday's and today's resolutions. That is why we called for the insertion of a third indent emphasizing this and why we then wanted all the references to institutional matters in paragraphs 1 to 9 deleted. The only practical way of achieving this was to adopt Mr Fich's amendments, which called for precisely that. Everyone now knows why we tabled these amendments and why we voted the way we did: we wanted a perfect match of what we did yesterday and what we have decided today.

Mr Christiansen (S). — *(DA)* Mr President, I will be brief, but I should like to take this opportunity to express satisfaction over the fact that a majority in this Chamber voted for the amendments tabled by Mr Fich and myself. We tabled them because we thought that Union, the intergovernmental conference and all the institutional questions were adequately dealt with yesterday. After the parade of speeches, in which some got tired of waiting for the slowest ship in the convoy, and others spoke of the tyranny of the slow-movers, we wanted to show by our amendment that, when it comes to matters of substance in cooperation, you can count on the Danish social democrats. We have therefore decided to vote for the motion for a resolution now before us.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution by Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the conclusions of the Milan Summit (Doc. B 2-638/85): rejected

*
* *

Motion for a resolution by Mr Ducarme and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the meeting of the European Council in Milan (Doc. B 2-639/85): adopted

*
* *

Motion for a resolution by Mr Pannella and others, on the Milan Summit (Doc. B 2-684/85)

Explanation of vote

Mr Panella (NI). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to point out that in fact it was rather by chance that my signature appeared first, as in the case of Mr Balfe just now, and this is the first time for six years — since 1979 in fact, since there are signatories from other groups. One quarter of the signatories are socialists, from Mr Didò's signature onwards. Mr Ligios and others also signed, not to mention Altiero Spinelli and Felice Ippolito — you have the document before you.

I regret that at Milan the Parliament's resolution of 12 June last which we adopted unanimously, did not even get a mention. We should make our disappointment known and repeat our request to the Council and the Commission to take account of the arguments

which the Parliament unanimously proposed for consideration at Milan.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution by Mr Prag and others, on the Milan Summit and European Union (Doc. B 2-711/85): rejected

*
* *

President. — In view of the hour, we shall now interrupt voting-time. Those votes that are still outstanding will be taken tomorrow at the next voting-time.¹

(The sitting closed at 7.45 p.m.)

¹ For the next sitting's agenda, see Minutes.

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 11 JULY 1985

Contents

1. Agenda		3. Topical and urgent debate	
Mr Hutton	158	Air traffic safety and international terrorism	
2. Question Time (Doc. B 2-627/85) (contd)		— Motions for resolutions (Doc. B 2-673/85)	
Questions to the Commission		by Mrs Veil and others, (Doc. B 2-678/85)	
Question No 1, by Mr von Wogau: Euro-		by Mr de Camaret and others, (Doc. B 2-	
pean Patent Office:		690/85) by Mr Visser and others, (Doc. B 2-	
Mr Sutherland (Commission); Mr Christo-	159	692/85) by Mr Newton Dunn and others,	
doulou; Mr Sutherland		(Doc. B 2-701/85) by Mr Cornelissen and	
Question No 5, by Mr Fitzgerald: The		others, and (Doc. B 2-705/85) by Mr Bar-	
homeless:		zanti and others	
Mr Sutherland; Mr Fitzgerald; Mr Suther-	159	Mr Nordmann; Mr Collinot; Mr Visser; Mr	
land; Mr Ford; Mr Sutherland		Newton Dunn; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Nov-	
Question No 8, by Mr Ford: Replies to ques-		elli; Mr Lagakos; Mr Alavanos; Mr Coste-	
tions for written answer:		Floret; Mr Van der Lek; Mr Natali (Com-	
Mr Varfis (Commission); Mr Ford; Mr Var-	160	mission)	167
fis; Mr Rogalla; Mr Varfis		Famine — Motion for a resolution (Doc.	
Question No 9, by Mr Christodoulou: Com-		B 2-682/85 rev.) by Mrs Focke and others	
munity measures to combat phylloxera on the		Mrs Focke; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Bersani; Mr	
island of Crete:		Christopher Jackson; Mr Trivelli; Mr Beyer	
Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Christo-	161	de Ryke; Mr Guerneur; Mr CiccioMessere;	
doulou; Mr Andriessen		Mr Wedekind; Mr Natali (Commission) . .	172
Question No 10, by Mrs Boot: Inclusion of		EEC-USA agriculture trade — Motions for	
the ECU value on stamps issued by the		resolutions (Doc. B 2-670/85) by Mr Parodi	
Member States of the Community:		and others, (Doc. B 2-674/85) by Mrs S.	
Mr Sutherland; Mrs Boot; Mr Sutherland;		Martin and others, (Doc. B 2-694/85) by Mr	
Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Sutherland;		de la Malène and others, (Doc. B 2-702/85)	
Mrs Hammerich; Mr Sutherland; Mr		by Mr Raftery and others, and (Doc. B 2-	
Rogalla; Mr Sutherland; Mr Aigner; Mr	162	704/85) by Mr Cervetti and others	
Sutherland		Mr Costanzo; Mrs S. Martin; Mr Musso; Mr	
Question No 14, by Mrs Van den Heuvel:		Raftery; Mr Gatti; Mr Eyraud; Mr Dalsass;	
Discrimination against homosexuals:		Mr Provan; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Verbeek;	
Mr Sutherland; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr		Mr Pordea; Mr Ulburgbs; Mr Blumenfeld;	
Sutherland; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Suther-	164	Mr Andriessen (Commission); Sir James	
land		Scott-Hopkins; Mr Andriessen; Sir James	
Question No 15, by Mr MacSharry: Cereal		Scott-Hopkins; Mr Andriessen	177
cut-backs:		Human rights — Motions for resolutions	
Mr Andriessen; Mr MacSharry; Mr Andries-		(Doc. B 2-698/85) by Mrs Pery and others,	
sen; Mrs Caroline Jackson; Mr Andriessen;		(Doc. B 2-699/85) by Mr Saby, (Doc. B 2-	
Mr Sutra; Mr Andriessen; Mr Cryer; Mr		700/85) by Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul and Mr	
Andriessen; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr		Arndt, (Doc. B 2-707/85) by Mr Mallet and	
Andriessen; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf; Mr	165	others, and (Doc. B 2-710/85) by Mr Wurtz	
Andriessen		Mrs Pery; Mr Mallet; Mr Wurtz; Mr Saby;	
		Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mr Habsburg; Mr	
		Prag; Mr De Vries; Mr Ripa di Meana	
		(Commission); Lord Bethell; Mrs Wiczorek-	

	<i>rek-Zeul; Mr Arndt; Mrs Castle; Mrs Veil; Mr West</i>	185			
4.	<i>Income and equal treatment for men and women — Report (Doc. A 2-55/85) by Dame Shelagh Roberts</i> <i>Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Miss Tongue; Mrs Braun-Moser; Mrs Daly; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mrs Lemass; Mrs Piermont; Mrs Lehideux; Mr Van der Waal; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Lenz; Mr Filinis; Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission)</i>	190	7.	<i>Specific regional development measures (contd)</i> <i>Mr Rossetti; Mr Hutton; Mr Varfis (Commission)</i>	219
5.	<i>Specific regional development measures — Report (Doc. A 2-72/85) by Mr Hutton</i> <i>Mr Hutten; Mr Mattina; Mr Newman; Mr Poetschki; Mr C. Beazley; Mr De Pasquale; Mr MacSharry; Mr Gautier; Mr McCartin; Mrs Faith</i>	201	8.	<i>Regional development programmes — Report (Doc. A 2-63/85) by Mr Poetschki</i> <i>Mr Poetschki; Mr Sakellariou; Mr O'Donnell; Mr Hutton; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Barrett; Mr Dimitriadis; Mrs Boot; Mr Varfis (Commission)</i>	221
6.	<i>Votes</i> <i>Mr Rothley; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Falconer; Mr Curry; Mrs Veil; Mr Rothley; Mr Curry; Mr von der Vring; Mr Rothley; Mrs Veil; Mr Falconer; Mr Cryer; Mr Schwalba-Hoth; Mr Ford and Mr Hughes; Mr Stewart; Mr Gerontopoulos; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Papapietro; Mr McMillan-Scott; Mr McMahon; Mrs Dury; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Brok; Mr Ford; Mrs Veil; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Filinis; Mr Kolokotronis; Mrs Lizin; Mr Marshall; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Battersby; Mr Filinis; Mr Bombard; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Rossetti; Mr Battersby; Mr Nordmann; Mr Hindley; Mr Bombard; Mr Wedekind; Mrs Hammrich; Mrs Piermont; Sir Peter Vanneck</i>	207	9.	<i>Water resources — Report (Doc. A 2-69/85) by Mr Vandemeulebroucke</i> <i>Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Lambrias; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Chanterie; Mr Varfis (Commission); Mr Chanterie; Mr Varfis</i>	227
			10.	<i>Appointing members of the Board of the European Foundation — Report (Doc. A 2-47/85) by Mr Fajardie</i> <i>Mr Fajardie; Mr Hahn; Mr C. Beazley; Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission)</i>	230
			11.	<i>Beef sector — Report (Doc. A 2-48/85) by Mrs S. Martin</i> <i>Mrs S. Martin; Mr Eyraud; Mr Clinton; Mr Barrett; Mr Andriessen (Commission)</i>	233
			12.	<i>Animal welfare policy — Interim report (Doc. A 2-62/85) by Mr Simmonds</i> <i>Mr Simmonds; Mrs Crawley; Mr Mertens; Mr Schinzel; Mr Mertens; Mr Andriessen (Commission)</i>	237
			13.	<i>Dried grapes and dried figs — Report (Doc. A 2-66/85) by Mr Stavrou</i> <i>Mr Stavrou; Mr Battersby; Mr Gautier; Mr Andriessen (Commission)</i>	240
			Annex		242

IN THE CHAIR : MRS PERY

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)¹

1. Agenda

President. — The Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning has asked that the report by Mr Hutten, entered under No 139 and due to be voted

on, should be taken before the two other reports by the same committee, namely those by Mr Poetschki and Mr Vandemeulebroucke respectively, which are own-initiative reports at present down as Nos 137 and 156 on the agenda.

In accordance with Rule 56 of our Rules of Procedure, I put this proposal to Parliament.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Madam President, I thought that perhaps Members were not quite clear what the committee's request was. It is simply to change the order of the debates and give priority to the Commission consultation on the new regulation for the non-quota section over the own initiative reports. I think Parliament would be seen to be giving its essential work priority by simply changing the order of debates

¹ *Approval of the Minutes — Documents received — Membership of committees: see Minutes.*

Hutton

in this way. It is possible, too, that we may even get to the vote on the consultation this evening when the House may be better represented, which would be to the Commission's benefit.

(Parliament agreed to the proposal)

2. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. B 2-627/85)

We shall deal with the Questions addressed to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr von Wogau, for whom Mr Christodoulou is deputizing (H-578/84):

Subject: European Patent Office

Is it correct that, owing to a protest against salary differentials between the European Patent Office's places of work in Munich and the Hague, no European or Dutch applications for patents are currently being processed, and what possibilities are open to the Commission to ensure that the European Patent Office complies with its responsibilities in full?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — As the question indicates, during the period of the industrial action from 15 December 1984 to 11 February 1985, the administrative handling of both European patent applications and the national patent applications transmitted to the European Patent Office for search on the state-of-the-art were seriously affected.

Measures were taken, however, to avoid the risk of loss of rights by applicants and to minimize the effects of the action on the overall activity of the Hague Office when the industrial action ended in February. Staff then worked overtime to clear the backlog of dossiers waiting for processing. This was achieved at the end of April, and the Hague Office has been functioning normally since then. There have been no adverse effects for applicants.

The European Patent Office has earned a good reputation since it began granting European patents in 1978. The number of European patent applications filed has increased from 3 599 in 1978 to 33 092 in 1984. While we all regret the disruptions caused by industrial action, there are no grounds for criticizing the European Patent Office for the way it handled the resulting difficulties and the Commission does not propose, therefore, making any representations on the matter.

Mr Christodoulou (PPE). — *(GR)* I should like to thank the Commissioner for the information he has

just given us and ask him what are the prospects for the European Patent and, if there are any obstacles, what measures have been taken to eliminate them?

Mr Sutherland. — First of all, I should say that the European Patent Office is neither an institution of the European Communities nor does a formal link exist with it, except that the Commission has observer status in the office's administrative council. The European Patent Office itself is composed of the representatives of the eleven contracting States. However, the Commission maintains contact with the Office on matters of mutual interest and is indeed proceeding and we believe that we should proceed with a more uniform European patent code. There are discussions taking place at present in that area.

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 2, 3 and 4 will receive written replies¹.

Question No 5 by Mr Fitzgerald (H-764/84):

Subject: The homeless

On 25 October last the European Parliament adopted a report on 'Specific Community Action to combat poverty', which included two amendments on the homeless.

In view of the fact that over 300 lives in Europe have so far been lost as a result of the severe cold, including the old and homeless, will the Commission now indicate as a matter of extreme urgency whether or not it intends to examine the extent of the problem with a view to tackling this tragic situation?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — In its document of 26 November 1984 the Commission, after identifying the homeless as one of the constituents of the marginal population groups most at risk, stated that it intended to ask Member States to make an inventory of all projects at present being carried out in favour of this underprivileged group before considering Community funding of projects under the new anti-poverty programme — which will run from 1985 to 1988 — to initiate research into the causes of their plight and to investigate likely solutions.

The Commission has already started this programme and with regard to the second matter, the initiation of research into the causes of plight, it is at present making arrangements for the organizations working with and for the homeless to get together to examine the problem at a seminar to be held in Ireland in the summer and to make concrete proposals for concerted international action.

¹ cf. Annex.

Sutherland

In the matter of the homeless, I myself informed the Social Affairs Committee that a seminar was being organized on behalf of the Commission by the national campaign for the homeless on the 13 to 15 September 1985 in Cork.

Mr Fitzgerald (RDE). — May I thank the Commissioner for the comprehensive nature of his reply. No doubt he will appreciate that the tragic loss of life of so many homeless during the winter months is a situation which must deeply concern the Member States of the Community. Not only that but the alarming growth of homelessness among the young must be extremely disturbing for all of us. I therefore welcome the Commission's participation in the conference in my own city of Cork.

Will the Commissioner now indicate whether the Commission has considered opening a new and separate budgetary line to accommodate this growing problem within our Community? Could I further ask him if there is a Commission input into the conference being organized by the International Federation for Housing and Planning in Hungary taking place also, I understand, this autumn?

Mr Sutherland. — With regard to the first part of the supplementary question, the position as far as the Commission is concerned is that in the light of the research which has been initiated following the conference which will be held from 13 to 15 September 1985, the Commission will reconsider the position in the context of the new anti-poverty programme and any possible other recourse that might be had by the homeless to the funds of the Community. The difficulties of additional funding are of course well known to the Members of this Parliament and we will have considerable difficulties in supplementing the budgetary resources, which are so limited, in order to assist in this particular, though worthy, area.

With regard to the latter part of the question relating specifically to the question of a conference in Hungary, I am afraid that I am unable to answer Mr Fitzgerald but I will inquire into the matter and inform him orally as to whether the Commission will be participating in the conference in question.

Mr Ford (S). — I would like to raise with the Commissioner the issue of homelessness amongst the young, particularly State-created homelessness in the sense that recent changes in UK social security regulations have imposed a restrictive time limit for young people under 25 claiming benefits to stay in any one place when they have been living away from home. These young homeless people must now move on to another part of the UK after claiming benefits for periods of between 2 and 8 weeks in any one place. They are not permitted to return to that area for another six months. Most of the young people who are

hardest hit by these board and lodging rules are without stable family homes and have nowhere else to go. Does the Commission consider that such laws which are bringing on a return to the nomadic bands of poor people wandering the country are in accordance with the Treaty of Rome provisions allowing the free movement of people and does it consider that such a limited period of eight weeks maximum is sufficient time in current economic conditions in which to look for and secure work?

Mr Sutherland. — I would not like to answer the question directly without a very specific question being raised in regard to the legislation in question and without detailed consideration of it. Therefore, I cannot reply specifically to the query which has been raised. Suffice it to say that the problem of the homeless generally is one which is of great concern to the Commission, and the Commission will continue to investigate and research it.

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 6 and 7 will receive written replies¹.

Question No 8, by Mr Ford (H-107/85):

Subject: Replies to questions for written answer

Can the Commission detail the average time in days to reply to questions put down for written answer on a year basis for the first five years? Can they indicate the number of questions each year that have not been answered over the same period?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) I would start by pointing out that the question is clearly aimed at obtaining statistical information. On the other hand, it does reflect the genuine interest of many Members of Parliament in a matter which is also of particular interest to the Commission itself.

The average time needed to reply remained more or less the same over the last five years, at about 60 days, with slight variations from year to year. The number of questions involved was about 160 per month. However, what is particularly important is the considerable increase in the number of questions since November 1984, to between 250 and 300 a month. Every single one of these questions has to go through the same procedure, which is fairly complicated and includes: translation into all the official languages, drafting of a reply, coordination between the departments, approval of the Commission and then translation of the reply into all the languages of the Community.

The result of the large increase in the number of questions over the last few months is that the system is

¹ See Annex.

Varfis

overloaded and the average time taken to reply to Members' questions has now risen from 60 to 70 days. We shall certainly have to look for and find ways of ensuring that there is no further increase in the delay despite the increase in the number of questions — which it must be said reflects the ever-increasing interest of Members in the Commission's activities. It was in this spirit that I recently wrote to the President of Parliament calling for talks between the responsible departments of the two institutions with a view to finding practical solutions.

I am aware, moreover, that Parliament's Committee on the Rules of Procedure will shortly be studying the procedures for questions, and, if I am asked, I will naturally be willing to participate in the discussions on the matter.

Mr Ford (S). — May I ask Mr Sutherland as an aside if, after he has been able to consider my previous supplementary question, he would answer my question in writing on the points contained in the current question.

Perhaps I have been unfortunate but it certainly seems to me that many of my questions have taken rather longer than 60 days to answer. However, I do thank the Commissioner for a much fuller reply than I got to a similar question last month to the Council. That said, does the Commissioner realize that, in order to reduce the amount of time they have to wait for answers, Members are now putting down questions for Question Time with no intention of actually asking them in the House, as has been demonstrated this morning when I think more than half the people with questions down were not in fact present in the Chamber to have them answered? Question Time is now being bogged down because people are having to wait far too long for written answers to written questions. I hope therefore that Parliament and the Commission will find some way, along with the other Community institutions, of speeding up the process as much as possible so that we can get back to a sensible organization of Question Time instead of using this as a way of cleverly getting quicker answers to written questions.

Mr Varfis. — (GR) I was glad to hear what Mr Ford said, because this really is a much more general matter which concerns both the written and the oral questions and which can only be solved by the means I mentioned before, i.e. through close cooperation between Parliament and the Commission. I can see that we are moving in that direction.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) In addition to the time aspect there is obviously also the question of relevance in the replies to written questions — i.e. the attempts to avoid answering a question by dodging the issue. I should therefore like to ask the Commissioner

whether or not he will, in future, also take account of this aspect. Is the Commission prepared to see to it that its answers are more precise in future and actually in line with what the questioner had in mind, so that we can establish a genuine dialogue? This would save us a lot of work, since all that happens when a question is not answered precisely is that a new one is put.

Mr Varfis. — (GR) Madam President, it is difficult for me to answer this question, since I believe the Commission does everything to ensure that its answers — like the questions, of course — are as specific as possible.

I would point out, however, that although the written questions differ enormously, many of them — like this one — ask for specific data which could be obtained without the need for someone to table a question to the Commission. This is perhaps something which might be borne in mind when looking at ways of speeding up Question Time. At any rate, I have noted what Mr Rogalla has said and will pass it on to my colleagues so that we can look into whether there are any Commission replies which were not completely accurate.

President. — Question No 9 by Mr Christodoulou (H-105/85):

Subject: Community measures to combat phylloxera on the island of Crete

Recent findings show that phylloxera is now well established in several areas on the island of Crete — the most southerly region in Greece — and it is thought that the vineyards will succumb completely in the very near future. Vine growing for the production of wine grapes, table grapes and raisins plays a major role in the Cretan economy and its future can only be secured by a comprehensive restructuring of the Cretan vineyards in order to rid them of this pest once and for all. This is a matter of urgency because of the irreversible destruction that this insect is causing to vines. Replacing the present vines with resistance varieties in conjunction with modernizing production and marketing techniques and maintaining producers' incomes during the period needed to carry out restructuring requires technical and financial facilities beyond regional scope.

Could the Commission state what measures have been considered or determined at Community level to meet the situation on the island of Crete, in particular under the structural provisions of the recently amended legislation governing the wine sector, the Community's new structural policy or in the context of implementing IMPs?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) No specific measure has been introduced at

Andriessen

Community level with a view to combating phylloxera in Greece.

However, Council Regulation No 895/95 of 1 April 1985 provides for a common measure to improve the structures of the winemaking sector in Greece. This restructuring concerns a total of 20 000 hectares of vineyards and may involve, among other things, the replacement of existing vines by grafted vines which are resistant to phylloxera. The aim of the regulation is to improve the quality of viticultural products and may involve aid to restructuring or compensation for loss of income resulting from the grubbing-up of existing vines and their replacement by vines consisting of phylloxera-resistant roots onto which wine-producing varieties have been grafted.

The Council Regulation also provides for additional measures designed to facilitate restructuring such as the production of replanting material and technical assistance etc. All these measures come under the structural section of the adapted legislation in the vine-growing sector and the Commission is convinced that these measures fully correspond to the needs of the Greek wine growers. Thus, it would not be logical to provide Community aid for similar measures in the context of the new agricultural structural policy. This regulation anticipates the IMPs and concerns a sector which is of the utmost significance for both Greek agriculture and agriculture throughout the Mediterranean region.

The Commission does not therefore feel that there is any call for special measures in this case.

Mr Christodoulou (PPE). — (GR) I should like to thank Mr Andriessen for his reply, although I was somewhat surprised at it. He is presumably aware that the varieties of grape grown on Crete, and in particular the table grapes, are the earliest in the Community. This is therefore a special crop and a pressing reason for maintaining winegrowing on Crete. Mr Andriessen will also be aware that phylloxera, once it attacks the vines in an isolated region such as Crete, spreads extremely fast and finally leads to the destruction of all the vines within a very short period of time.

I should therefore like to ask Mr Andriessen to reconsider the decision he has just referred to, to take account of the special features of winegrowing on Crete which, precisely because of the island's climate, make the grapes a product of special interest of the Community. Could he change his mind look into whether, in the framework of the various measures I referred to in my question, it would be possible to provide some form of extraordinary support with a view to saving this special crop, which I think is of particular commercial interest to the Community, bearing also in mind that the social structure of the island will be completely changed if this crop is destroyed.

Mr Andriessen (NL). — The Commission is obviously aware that phylloxera can spread very rapidly, wreaking havoc with the vineyards it infests. The regulation which has been introduced provides, I think, all the necessary possibilities for dealing with the specific needs of Crete, but I would assure you that, in view of what the Honourable Member has just said, I will have the appropriate Commission departments look carefully into the question of whether or not this is so and whether special measures might nevertheless be necessary. I do not think they will be, but I will certainly look into the matter once more.

President. — Question No 10, by Mrs Boot (H-173/85):

Subject: Inclusion of the ECU value on stamps issued by the Member States of the Community

Inclusion of the ECU value on stamps issued by the Member States would do much to make people more aware of Europe.

Is the Commission prepared to take this matter up with the postal authorities in the Member States in the near future?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — The suggestion contained in the question is an interesting one. It has not, in fact, been discussed by the Commission, but there are, I think, considerable practical problems. The ECU does not have a fixed value in relation to national currencies and fluctuates within fixed limits which themselves may be revised. To attempt to price postage stamps both in national currencies and in the ECU equivalent would mean constant revision, and this would simply not be practicable. This being so, the Commission would not propose approaching the postal authorities of the Member States along the lines suggested. It seems to be impractical, however desirable it may be from the point of view of the European identity referred to in the question.

Mrs Boot (PPE). — (NL) I would agree with the Commissioner that certain problems arise from the fact that the ECU does not have a fixed value in relation to national currencies but I could suggest to the European Institutions that they perhaps adjust their own franking machines to the ECU value applying on the day in question.

However, expressing the value of national postage stamps in ECU as a general rule would not pose insurmountable problems either, since the prices applied in the various countries, are, I think, fairly equivalent — i.e. 70 cents in the Netherlands, 80 Pfennig in the Federal Republic, 12 Francs in Belgium, 2.10 Francs in France and 17 p in the United Kingdom. There is an agreement between the postal authorities on the approximate equivalence of these

Boot

amounts. This means that there should also be an agreement between the postal authorities to replace, for example, the figure of 70 cents by an amount in ECU, so that the stamp will be marked 0.3 ECU or 0.2 ECU, for example. This would be particularly useful from the point of view of recognizing the value of postage stamps throughout Europe. Will you, therefore, ask the postal authorities to print the value in ECU instead of the national currenties.

Mr Sutherland. — With regard to postal matters generally and the question of stamps, the Commission has been active in trying to harmonize postal tariffs in a way which promotes the extension of domestic postal rates to all letters and postcards with destinations in the Community. Indeed, the Commission has made a recommendation to the Member States to this effect. To date, however, our efforts have proved only partially successful.

In December 1982 the Commission held a consultative meeting with the representatives of the postal authorities of the Member States to examine the difficulties which prevent the introduction of the domestic tariff for all inter-Community letters and postcards. There have been some difficulties in bringing about harmonization in approach between the Member States.

It is, however, an issue with which the Commission is concerned and there have been discussions, as the Honourable Member will be aware, in regard to the whole issue of the European postage stamp. The creation of a European postage stamp could be envisaged if uniform postal tariffs could be introduced.

Equally, the use of the ECU as a denominating currency for the price of postal stamps across the Community could, of course, be considered. I feel, however, that the difficulty which has been adverted to by the questioner and which I have also mentioned in my reply, namely the fluctuating rate of the ECU, renders the problem one to which it is very difficult to find a solution.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Would the Commission not agree that by far the best place to start would be by introducing a standard rate between European countries, e.g. for letters from the UK to France or from France to Germany? Would it not be a good idea to start at that level and get a harmonized postal rate, not necessarily using ECUs but getting an approximation of value? At the moment postal rates vary widely in all the Member States. Would that not be the place to start?

Mr Sutherland. — I think that the supplementary question reflects the view of the Commission, which, as I said, has been anxious to bring about a harmonization of rates. Of course, the difficulty in any harmonization means that for some there will be financial

losses. It is the Member States with the higher rates for postage stamps which have resisted harmonization which would mean, in effect, a reduction in the price of their stamps. It is that difficulty, which we have experienced with a number of Member States, that has inhibited the development of dialogue, although it is still continuing.

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — (DA) Will the Commission explain what would be the point of introducing stamps with the values marked in ECU?

I am afraid that this could give rise to irritation and amusement in equal proportions in my country, which can surely not be the aim. Since we do not yet have a common currency known as the ECU, what can be the deeper significance of printing values in ECU on postage stamps? The Commissioner said he was not entirely opposed to the idea. What, then, is the point?

Mr Sutherland. — The wording of the question makes it clear that the purpose of using the ECU on stamps, if it were possible, would be to heighten an awareness of the European dimension in terms of everyday living. That is something of which I would generally approve. However, the practical reality is that it is not possible to introduce ECU stamps. If there was a fixed stable ECU which was applicable across the Community, then the position might be different. However, the practical reality is that it would not be feasible to implement this proposal.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) My question goes beyond the ECU issue. Can the Commissioner imagine — whatever the views of his advisors and whatever the postal authorities have to say — that it would be possible to print a common European emblem on all postage stamps throughout the Community without first of all standardizing postal rates. Secondly, is he prepared, therefore, to interpret the conclusion of the European Council — Item 4, Citizens' Europe — as a call on the Commission to take this simple action with the minimum possible delay?

Mr Sutherland. — In principle and personally — but I am sure that I also speak for all of my colleagues in the Commission — I am in favour of anything that heightens the perception of the importance and the development of Europe. The practical reality of imposing such a regime on the Member States, however, stands in the way of developing a common European stamp.

Mr Aigner (PPE). — (DE) In many forums, the people of Europe repeatedly call for a stamp of their own as a symbol. If the people want this, they will also make sacrifices. It will not replace the national stamps, and the citizens will have the choice between the European stamp and the national one. The financial

Aigner

and ECU-related problems which I have mentioned must take a backseat, since the citizen will be free to choose. If this costs a little more, then it costs a little more. The citizen will make the sacrifice.

Is the Commissioner prepared to tell us where the difficulties really lie, so that we can bring some pressure to bear at national level?

Mr Sutherland. — Following Parliament's resolution of 14 October 1982, the Commission examined two questions. One of these was indeed the European postage stamp, which was to have been a stamp which would be valid throughout the territory of the Community and would be used in all Member States of the Community.

The creation of the European postage stamp, which is something which the Commission would agree with, could, however, only be envisaged, in the view of the national authorities, if there were a unification of postal tariffs as well as a single postal authority in the Community. This requirement, which was advanced by the national authorities, would, of course, prohibit the present introduction of the European postage stamp, because, naturally, there is no such single postal authority in the Community. Failing this, the argument advanced was that the difficulties of creating such a stamp would involve such complications that there could be some doubts about the possibility of overcoming them. The matter is not dormant, it is being pursued; but there are difficulties in different perceptions amongst the Member States and the postal authorities in each Member State as to the proper way to proceed.

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 11, 12 and 13 will receive written replies¹.

Question No 14, by Mrs van den Heuvel (H-245/85):

Subject: Discrimination against homosexuals

The Commission has already declared that it is unacceptable that sexual orientation should constitute a reason for dismissal from a job and that policies relating to recruitment and working conditions should discriminate against homosexuals since both are incompatible with the Treaty. Why does the Commission therefore consider that it cannot take steps to combat discrimination against homosexuals?

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — I would refer the honourable Member to the position taken by the Commission during the parliamentary debate on 13 March 1984.

The Commission maintains the position that there is no specific provision of the Treaty which covers the problem of discrimination in employment on the grounds of sexual preference and that, in consequence, the most appropriate fora in which to pursue this question would be the Council of Europe and the European Convention on Human Rights. The Commission would also refer to the replies of the Commission to Questions Nos 206/85, 2025/84, H-686/84, H-413/84 and 2133/83.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — (NL) I am a little surprised at the answer given by this Commissioner since his predecessor adopted a very positive attitude following the report by Mrs Squarcialupi. I have here the report of proceedings for 13 March 1984, in which he explicitly stated that he fully intended to introduce a proposal on individual dismissals as soon as possible, and I would be pleased if work went ahead on this question. Mr Sutherland, however, suddenly refers the whole matter to the Council of Europe, whereas I thought I could count on a certain amount of continuity in Commission policy. I repeat that I am surprised at the way the present Commissioner has taken this important issue out of our hands and referred it to another body on which we have no influence whatsoever. I should like to know how this sudden about-face can be explained.

Mr Sutherland. — I think that in referring to the answers to the other questions I made clear that there is absolute continuity in the position of the Commission in regard to this question. If the impression I have given by referring to those answers is a different one, I would like to correct it.

I would like to take the opportunity of making clear that on the issue of dismissal the Commission takes the view that dismissal of any employee on the grounds of any aspect of his or her private life is unacceptable in principle. I think that was the position taken by my predecessor, and I repeat it here. I have indicated clearly that the position of the Commission is unchanged. I have however, indicated also that the European Convention on Human Rights, which specifically relates to issues of privacy, is a forum in which action can be taken.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) Does this mean that the Commission rejects the kind of practices indulged in by certain educational establishments, which, for certain reasons, hold certain opinions concerning homosexuals and dismiss staff if they find out that they are homosexuals? I hope you will assure me that it does reject such practices, since they form part of official policy in some educational establishments. No homosexuals are taken on and if it comes to light that existing members of staff are homosexual, they are threatened with dismissal. Does the Commission think this practice is acceptable?

¹ See Annex.

Mr Sutherland. — I thought that I indicated quite clearly that the Commission takes the view that dismissal on the grounds of any aspect of an employee's private life is unacceptable in principle. I repeat that.

President. — Question No 15, by Mr MacSharry (H-552/84):

Subject: Cereal cut-backs

In view of the reports that have appeared in the past concerning the possible introduction of quotas or coresponsibility measures for cereal producers and the suggestion that steps could be taken which could reduce prices or output, will the Commission state whether or not any recognition of areas such as Ireland, which are disadvantaged by climate and which have not fully reached their potential agricultural output, will be taken into consideration?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) In the discussion document on prospects for agricultural policy which I submitted first to the Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture and then to the press yesterday, the question of cereals and possible measures designed to reduce surpluses or find other market outlets are discussed at length. One of the possibilities mentioned in this document — not in terms of a Commission policy or decision, but as an option which should be discussed — is the idea of coresponsibility which, for the rest, is a perfectly familiar concept in our agricultural policy. There are other agricultural sectors in which coresponsibility levies paid by the producers have been a reality for some time now.

I do not think this is the time to go into these problems in depth, but I would nevertheless like to say that, in my view, it is wrong to think that responsibility would provide an easy answer to the problems in the cereals sector and, in particular, the surpluses. It has emerged from our experience so far with intervention of this kind that it is exceptionally difficult to find ways of applying the principle which are both economically and socially acceptable. However, I do think that these options, which are being discussed both within the Commission and elsewhere, should be brought into the public debate on this problem.

I should like to add that the Commission intends, in view of the fundamental problem in the cereals sector, to make concrete proposals by early autumn for adjustments in the cereals sector, since we feel this is a matter of urgency, given the current situation, and that we cannot wait until the debate on the document has been concluded.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — I am sorry that the Commissioner did not reply to the specific part of my question relating to special recognition for the case in Ire-

land. Would he please do so? I appreciate all he has said in relation to the cereal question, but I would ask him to give us some time-scale as to when some of the options he has talked about — some of which are very good — will become policy.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) I apologise for not going into the specifically Irish aspect of the question. I think it is quite right that account should be taken of specific production conditions in particular regions of the Community when we are examining the idea of coresponsibility. I cannot say any more at this stage, but I do think it is right that this aspect should be taken into consideration.

As regards the time scale, I intend to submit proposals on cereals to the Commission by the end of September or the beginning of October. I hope that the Commission will be able to come to some decision on these proposals in the course of October so that they can be submitted to the Council before the end of this autumn and play their part in the policy to be drawn up for the coming years. As regards the time scale for the discussion document as such, i.e. the prospects for the cereals sector and perhaps other sectors which need separate treatment, I intend to draw conclusions from the public debate at the end of this year and submit specific proposals with an eye to 1986 and the years thereafter.

Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED). — I would ask the Commissioner specifically about cereal quotas. Does the Commission not recall that having proposed price-cuts in the milk sector, it had to fall back on quotas because of disagreement in the Council? Would the Commissioner not agree that the logic of the present situation in the cereals sector is that it is highly likely that it will have to resort to cereal quotas as a means of controlling cereal surpluses, and would he not agree with me that the Commission should come clean on this soon in order that cereal quotas are not introduced in the same hurried and muddled way, to the disadvantage of cereal farmers in the Community, as happened with dairy quotas?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) In an attempt to give an objective picture of all the possible options for dealing with the problem of surpluses in the cereals sector, the document includes a paragraph on quotas. I would add, however, that for the time being the Commission does not regard quotas as the most appropriate solution to the problem but thinks they might prove unavoidable — as was the case in the dairy sector — unless other measures are taken in good time. At any rate, if the Commission in fact reaches some decisions on adapting the arrangements in the cereals sector in the course of October — as I hope — it will have to give a definite answer to the question of whether or not quotas should be introduced. I hope the answer can be

Andriessen

'no', since I am not convinced that the introduction of quotas is the best solution to the problem.

Mr Sutra (S). — (*FR*) I should like to ask the Commissioner whether or not he feels that it is somewhat out of place to talk about 'surpluses' in the case of cereals? I say this for two reasons. Firstly, this planet is undoubtedly capable of feeding the thousands of millions of people living on it, provided we coordinate our use of its resources. While there are products which do not lend themselves to world-scale marketing, such as dairy produce, in the case of cereals, the problem of famine, which is horrifyingly in evidence at this time, provides a clear demonstration that the word 'surpluses' is out of place.

But this humanitarian reason is not the only one: there is also a commercial reason. It is a fact that there is trade in cereals in the world and certain individual countries of the Community and the Community as a whole must be active on these markets. Does this talk of surpluses mean that the Community would give up the entire world market in cereals to the United States? I do not think so, and I hope that the word 'surplus' will be banned from our discussion on the problem of cereals. This is not the case for all agricultural products, but as far as cereals are concerned, I think the word 'surpluses' should disappear once and for all from our debates.

Mr Andriessen. — (*NL*) It is all very well trying to eliminate a particular word from our debate, but until we manage to eliminate the still increasing mountains of cereals, there is not very much point in discussing questions of semantics. What is involved here? The fact is that by the end of this season cereals stocks in the Community will have increased approximately three-fold over the beginning of the season and a similar trend can be observed in many other countries. We are discussing the fact that it seems likely that the next harvest will also be huge at world level and that we cannot help talking in terms of a 'surplus' in view of the lack of purchasing power in the world. Banning a particular word from the debate does not change the problem. That was the first point I wanted to make.

My second point is that, there is obviously a hunger problem in the world. This is something which this Parliament has repeatedly debated and Parliament is aware of the Commission's views on the subject. However, this question goes far beyond the scope of the agricultural policy. The question of hunger in the world clearly has its ramifications and links with the agricultural policy of the Community, but goes far beyond this policy as such and is primarily a question of the willingness of the richer western countries to provide sufficient means to support purchasing power in the developing countries or even provide food aid even where this purchasing power is lacking. Parliament knows what the Commission thinks on this

point. However, this does not alter the fact that, in terms of practical policy, we currently have enormous surpluses to contend with.

My third remark concerns our position in the world market. I have made no suggestion whatsoever that the Commission thinks the Community should give up its position as an exporter on the world market. Indeed the reverse is true. I can therefore assure the honourable Member that, as far as cereals exports are concerned, the Community as a whole was more active last year than in previous years. I will have to wait and see where this leads. However, this should make it clear that we are continuing to pursue our export policy even though we feel that, in view of the situation in the world market, the existing instruments and their application should be carefully examined.

Mr Cryer (S). — Is the Commissioner trying to put across to the Assembly that the free-market economics which he and his cronies in the Commission and the Tories and the right wing in this Assembly continually support are not actually a solution to the absurd and lunatic policies of the CAP? Can he tell us how the grain mountains — not surpluses, mountains — are going to be disposed of when the West Germans have used their veto after years of talk about unification? They are using the veto to stop the CAP being changed. In view of the vested interests in this Community, in which 72% of the budget goes to lining the pockets of farmers, spending £ 2 000 m on storing these massive surpluses, and the failure of the Commission to shift significant quantities of these massive mountains to the starving of the world, could he tell us whether the only solution for countries to escape this burden is, in fact, to get out of the Common Market?

Mr Andriessen. — (*NL*) As is so often the case, a simple question on a particular aspect of the agricultural policy virtually leads to a broad debate on the whole question of agriculture. I would obviously be only too glad to join in that debate, but I do not know if this will be possible in the few minutes I have left. Let me simply point out that the Commission indeed believes that free-market economics have an important role to play in the common agricultural policy — not an exclusive role, but an important one nevertheless. May I also point out that the Commission regrets at least as much as this Parliament that a decision to do something about cereals prices has been blocked by means of an instrument which does not really exist. Might I remind the honourable Member and the entire Parliament that the Commission subsequently took conservative measures with a view to achieving what the Council's decision had rendered impossible. Criticism of the one could have involved a certain appreciation of the other. Thirdly, I have gone into the problem of our surpluses and the problem of hunger in the world in great depth and have nothing to add. Finally, I would point out that the document tabled by the

Andriessen

Commission does not set out any definitive attitudes concerning certain reforms to the agricultural policy but merely contains a number of options. The Commission would be glad if the criticism made by the honourable Member could be translated into specific proposals.

Mr de Courcy Ling (ED). — Of course it is well known, is it not, that the British Labour Members are the enemies of the British farmer, but I do not want to pursue that question. I simply want to press Mr Andriessen a little bit further on the question of cereal quotas. Is he aware that there is considerable alarm already among the farming communities throughout the European Community and that there is a considerable danger that anything he says today about the possibility of cereal quotas being introduced will be taken out of context and will be headline news in the farming press next week and will serve further to undermine confidence in farming in a number of parts of the Community? Would he therefore give an assurance that his intention is simply to contain cereal production within the 1984-85 ceiling and that it would in fact be quite out of the question to introduce quotas of the type that were introduced in the milk sector? The most that could be achieved would be to have a national kind of quota where individual Member States would be permitted to continue in 1986 and 1987 to produce approximately the same quantities of cereals as they produced in 1984 and 1985. Will he also be a little bit more precise about the percentage which the 1984 surplus represented of total 1984 production? If it is, as I understand it to be, approximately 16 million tonnes that, in fact, is a percentage well under 20% of total European production, probably nearer 12% than 20%.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) I thought I made my personal opinions concerning quotas clear in an answer to a previous question. I am not in favour of quotas. I have frequently made this point in this Parliament and I repeat it here today. However, the idea inevitably comes up in our debate on this matter and we can only hope that it is rejected. Thus, there is little point at this stage of discussing the possible ways in which quotas could be applied, but I think I am right in saying that quotas must be avoided, if at all possible. This is my view and I do not think, therefore, that there is much point in discussing what will happen in 1985/1986 and 1986/1987 at this stage. Obviously, we shall not make any further changes whatsoever for the current year.

Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC). — (DE) Mr Andriessen, the cereals surpluses have increased very rapidly as a result of chemical products and artificial fertilizers. Should we not, therefore, consider whether or not we could eliminate these surpluses by not using chemicals and fertilizers which increase yield? Should we not help the farmers by means of compensation to farm less intensively? This would contribute towards

healthier production and a reduced strain on the environment.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) Technological developments undoubtedly form one of the reasons — but certainly not the only one — for the relatively rapid increase in cereals production. However, unlike the honourable Member, I do not think it would be a good idea to call a halt to technological developments or to try to oppose them since, as I see it, that would not be feasible — certainly not in isolation in a world in which, whether we like it or not, technology is applied. Thus, I think we should look for solutions which ensure that no surpluses arise, while taking account of the use of high technology, and, if there is a threat of surpluses, enable us to find reasonable outlets for them.

Obviously, this is a point which we will have to discuss in greater depth when we come to deal with the document I tabled yesterday.

President. — Question Time is closed.¹

3. Topical and urgent debate

Air traffic safety and international terrorism

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-673/85), tabled by Mrs Veil and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on international terrorism;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-678/85), tabled by Mr de Camaret and others on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the midair explosion of an Indian airliner;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-690/85), tabled by Mr Visser and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on air traffic safety;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-692/85), tabled by Mr Newton Dunn and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on action by the European Community to combat terrorism;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-701/85), tabled by Mr Cornelissen and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on security at airports and in air transport;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-705/85), tabled by Mr Barzanti and others, on the recent terrorist attacks and hijackings.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Nordmann (L). — (FR) I should like to table the motion for a resolution on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group while at the same time expressing support for the amendment replacing the various motions relating to the taking of hostages on board aircraft, which have been widely reported over the past few weeks, and I should like to draw particular attention to the specific nature of the events which took place and which are jeopardizing a number of principles.

My first point is that aircraft hijacking has a political dimension. It is an act designed to destabilize democracy and represents a challenge in the face of which our democracies should show solidarity. What is needed outside the Community, and even within it, is a clear knowledge of who is who and who is on what side in this conflict. This call for solidarity applies no less to the victims of hijackings and, specifically on this point, our text makes express reference to the scandalous discrimination to which a number of hijacking victims have been subjected and, on certain occasions, unfortunately, with the support of certain governments or the staff of certain airlines. This point must be stressed.

Lastly, our motion is an invitation to consider the problems of information. As we have seen, international terrorism knows how to use modern information channels. This is also a challenge for us.

How can we reconcile the indispensable need for freedom of information with the critical distance required to prevent these acts of lawlessness which we have witnessed? I will quote merely one example, that of the complacency with which the farewell dinner offered by the captors to these victims was recounted. Information on a day-by-day basis devoid of critical comment seemed almost an apology to the terrorists and one could easily forget that they had taken hostages and were not simply acting as 'hosts'. But, ladies and gentlemen, the person who takes hostages even if he offers couscous to his victims is no less guilty of a barbaric crime for so doing. This critical appraisal, this need to describe the true facts where mere outward appearances may be deceptive was forgotten by too many of the media and I feel that it is the duty of this Parliament without wishing to take over the role of the press and journalists and without pointing fingers, to recall the need for the critical elements to be maintained in today's news coverage.

Mr Collinot (DR). — (FR) Madam President, terrorism is striking throughout Europe and the phenomenon of state terrorism is gradually replacing that of group action. This is known to be the case with Libya. It has recently been clearly shown that Syria was pulling all the strings in the recent American hostage affair.

In Europe, as I stated earlier in Strasbourg, this terrorism enjoys almost total impunity and this is particu-

larly true in France where the problems of the government's relations and those of the Socialist Party, not only with the terrorists of Southern Africa but also those active in Guadeloupe, as well as the relations of that party's Secretary General, Lionel Jospin, who, according to statements by the key figure in 'Action directe', Jean-Marc Roulolan, intervened on the latter's behalf. Mr Jospin, who is today citing two opposition newspapers before the courts, *Minute* and *National-Hebdo* and who, in the terms used by Mr Jean-Claude Goudot, publisher of *Minute*, is behaving like a 'vulture' given that his action against this free newspaper was not brought until some two weeks after the premises of the newspaper were wrecked by the explosion of a bomb placed by the former protégés of the MEP in question.

(Protests from the Socialist Group)

This is the last straw! In attempting to condemn the victims of terrorism Mr Jospin is revealing his true face. In the wake of this scandalous action by a number of socialist members this Parliament should adopt a clear position and invite the French Government — the Minister of the Interior, Mr Pierre Joxe, of which spent some of his youth in the Soviet Union — to join the other Member States of the Community in combating terrorism.

(Protests from the Socialist Group)

99% of terrorist action in the world is directed against the countries of the Western World! This is hardly surprising since the hand which supplies the weapons for the terrorist states is none other than the Soviet Union. Combating terrorism calls for European and Western solidarity and not complicity, least of all intellectual complicity, such as the most recent example given by Mr Arndt, Chairman of the Socialist Group of the European Parliament who unexpectedly two days ago before the enlarged Bureau made a request for an urgent debate on Vietnam, or the grotesque stance adopted by the Left in this Parliament, who yesterday opposed an urgent debate on the Lebanon.

'Grotesque', said Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, 'is a word which conceals the criminal'.

No more lip service! But everyone choose his side.

Terrorism has never . . .

President. — I am sorry, Mr Collinot, but you have no time left.

Mr Collinot (DR). — (FR) Madam President, I am going to use the time allocated to Mr d'Ormesson.

President. — I regret, Mr Collinot, that your request is inadmissible.

(Applause from the Left)

Mr Visser (S). — *(NL)* Madam Chairman, the disgraceful comments from the right are best ignored completely because such complete rubbish would need far too long to refute. It is a disgraceful and partisan contribution to the discussion.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

To come to my own speech, Madam Chairman, I want to discuss safety in the air and at airports. In fact, not much has, or should have, to be said to this topic since Parliament is relatively united on the issue. I am convinced that the whole Parliament completely condemns the criminal acts committed at airports and against aircraft. These are quite unjustified acts deliberately committed against innocent citizens, including women and children, incapable of defending themselves.

Condemnation has, however, no effect unless it is followed by specific measures. Unfortunately, it must be said that security in a number of countries, including some within the Community, is inadequate. While on paper it appears satisfactory vigilance relaxes as time goes on and then the stable door has to be shut once the horse has bolted.

It must also be obvious, Madam Chairman, that there is no such thing as complete safety. There is no absolute certainty especially where criminal acts are deliberately committed but what is necessary is that security measures be enhanced and that international cooperation be improved. Regrettably, disasters such as the recent ones often have to occur before these ideas can become reality. Some measures are obvious: thorough security coverage of airports, sound monitoring of people and better checks on baggage — difficult though that may be. It is therefore essential that the airports be equipped with the most modern technology and that security regulations be imposed on airports. The security measures listed in an appendix to the international civil aviation organizations treaty are no more than recommendations and must be made compulsory.

Moreover, regular inspections can be greatly improved. It would be very valuable to have teams of inspectors, both at a national and ECAC level, visiting airports relatively frequently.

Madam Chairman, the resolution on which we are soon to vote contains a number of specific recommendations. While it is of course important that the resolution be approved, it is even more important that the recommendations be adopted by all concerned. Unfortunately, it must be said that the compromise resolu-

tion put forward by the political affairs committee contains a couple of quite careless errors. I refer to considerations B and C. Consideration B states that the hijacking occurred at Athens airport. That is incorrect. The hijacking took place not at the airport but in the air. Consideration C states that the weapons were smuggled on board while the plane was at Athens airport. There is no proof whatever of this. Recent information indicates that this took place earlier at another airport. It is therefore necessary that considerations B and C be removed from the resolution. At this stage, this can only be done by voting separately on each individual part of the resolution. We believe that Parliament would be well advised to drop considerations B and C at this stage and we request that a division be called.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — Madam President, I sincerely hope that everyone in this House today deplores and condemns violence, whatever form it takes, because this House stands above all for peaceful reconciliation of differences. We should remind the world today that grievances, even legitimate and strongly felt ones, must not and never will be solved by premeditated and unprovoked violence and by cold-blooded murder.

We send our deepest sympathy to the family of the American who was murdered at Beirut, to the families of the passengers on the Air India flight which may have been destroyed in midair by a time-bomb, and to the families of the baggage handlers at Tokyo. We also share, of course, the continuing sorrow of those who lost friends and relatives when the unarmed South Korean airliner was shot down by the Soviet Union.

Madam President, we should support the firm statement by President Reagan that international terrorism in whatever form must not go unpunished. We should support the call for a boycott of Beirut Airport, where assistance was undeniably given to hijackers recently. A unanimous call must go out from this House today that international violence and terrorism, most particularly against individuals going peacefully about their own private lives, will never be tolerated, never condoned, never assisted on our continent. We look for immediate and effective action by the authorities in our Community to ensure that this behaviour is stamped out for ever.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — *(NL)* History is repeating itself, Madam President. In the Middle Ages, shipping was threatened and crews terrorized by pirates with skull-and-crossbones flags and eyepatches. In 1985, airborne criminals are hijacking aircraft with explosives, setting off bombs at airports and terrorizing passengers and aircrew both in the air and on the ground. There is nothing that the terrorists are not prepared to do to achieve their goals. So it was that, during the

Cornelissen

recent hijacking of the TWA aircraft, an innocent passenger was shot down in cold blood while those on the American aircraft later declared that they had been subjected to a war of nerves that included the playing of Russian roulette.

Madam Chairman, what is our response to hijackers, to the pirates of the 20th century? It is quite understandable that the release of the hostages is given the highest priority by everyone every time that hijacking is actually going on but if the civilized world wants to curtail terrorism it will have to use the breathing space between terrorist acts to take active measures to help security. It will have to be a permanent process because terrorists learn more quickly than governments do. Unfortunately, there is no miracle solution and a 'package' of measures will always be needed.

I am in complete agreement, Madam Chairman, with the call for effective and better monitoring of passengers and baggage of airports. Of particular importance here is to ensure that access to security areas is restricted to reliable personnel. Regrettably, that comment also applies to a number of airports within the Member States. I have been informed that Athens airport, where security has since been considerably tightened, is unfortunately not the only airport in the Community with inadequate security. Incidentally, the Israeli airline EL AL has shown that sound checks are possible. A joint, worldwide approach is vital if anti-terrorist action is to be successful and I call on the Council of Ministers and the Commission to undertake action in this regard. It is obvious that this will require close cooperation with international air transport organizations.

In my opinion, what is lacking in the compromise document put forward to replace the different earlier resolutions are the measures to be taken against hijackers and other terrorists and also measures to be taken against government and authorities that aid and abet hijackers. Once pirates were condemned to severe corporal punishment including the amputation of a hand but now some countries greet hijackers as national heroes.

On behalf of the EVP Group, I would request that the Council of Ministers and the European Commission be urged to investigate the possibilities of instituting an international boycott of unsafe airports and of those countries taking insufficiently severe action against hijackers. After all, fellow members, the American passenger thrown out of the TWA plane like shot game could have been one of us.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Novelli (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, it is a regrettable fact that this Parliament never meets without motions for resolutions being placed on the agenda requesting topical and urgent debates on

events which have deeply affected public opinion throughout the world, which have caused grief and despair to dozens of families and which have cast a shadow over the lives of a large number of individuals, in many cases for ever.

I have lost count of the number of times we have expressed our strongest and utter condemnation of the acts of terrorism committed in recent weeks, whatever the political colour or banner of the perpetrators. There can be no distinction between acts of terrorism, and even less justification for them.

Let us express yet again our solidarity with the families of the victims, the injured, with all who have suffered and who will continue to suffer. Let us yet again call on the governments and the authorities responsible for security to introduce at the earliest possible date all the security measures which are necessary at airports and to coordinate their efforts to combat terrorism and organized crime.

But I think, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, that each of us feels a deep sense of sorrow and anger each time we learn, from the radio, television or the press, of yet another terrorist attack; at the same time we experience a feeling of indignation and above all powerlessness at having to accept this misguided spread of terror and therefore having to repeat this familiar ritual in this House.

At least within our individual consciences we must ask ourselves why such events occur, what is behind them and what are the causes of such horrors. At the root of it all we find violence, intolerance and tyranny, which have ousted the reason that should dominate the spirit of all individuals and all communities. Egoism, mental unbalance and worldly injustice can no doubt all nurture tensions, but it is not just a matter of structural and economic causes; superstructural cultural elements also play a role, giving rise to the phenomena of fanaticism and exasperation. The only absolute value which exists in this world is human life. A more widespread and consistent cultivation of life could, to a certain extent, counteract the cultivation of terror and death.

Mr Lagakos (S). — *(GR)* Madam President, following the hijacking of the TWA aircraft a campaign of slander has been conducted against Greece throughout the world. For this reason I should like to remind you that Greece has firm views on the subject of terrorism, which it considers to be a scourge and a dangerous phenomenon of our times. The preventive measures taken by the Greek authorities at airports for the safety of flights are the same as those applied in other European countries, and the latest German devices are used, like those made by Siemens and other firms. Of course it is impossible to make 100 per cent sure that unfortunate events such as this do not happen. We must stress at this point that the high level and effec-

Lagakos

tiveness of the checks carried out at Athens Airport were also noted by the representatives of IATA and of the German and American Civil Aviation Authorities, who recently visited Athens Airport for this purpose and expressed their complete satisfaction.

It is a fact that it has not been proved whether the arms were brought on board in Athens or in Cairo. And this is stated by the crew of the TWA aircraft. Hijackers have turned up not only in Athens Airport but in many other countries, but this has never given rise to unfavourable references to the governments of those countries. And what is more, of the 50 incidents recorded in the last two years, only two started from Athens Airport, where additional security measures are applied, since there is an American air base in the same place.

I am not in a position to know whether at the moment any urgent steps have been taken to lift the American Government's ban on Athens Airport. We therefore request the deletion of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the compromise amendment, since accuracy and unanimity lend special weight to the joint attempt to combat terrorism.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Madam President, we also share the concern for the safety of airports and agree that measures must be taken to guarantee it. Despite this, we have some reservations concerning the compromise amendment which has been tabled. First of all, we have reservations on paragraphs 2 and 3, since they constitute an attempt to get the European Parliament to participate in the efforts of the President of the USA to find a scapegoat for the TWA affair, which in this case was Athens Airport.

A second point on which we have reservations is that regulations on airport safety should not be laid down by the EEC but should be internationally agreed, and it is really unacceptable for the USA on the one hand to condemn the hijackers while of the other hand granting hospitality to the hijackers of a Soviet aircraft.

A third point which the compromise amendment deliberately ignores is the vicious circle of terrorism, namely that individual terrorism is often the result of the development of state terrorism, and in the case of the Middle East of the state terrorism practice by Israel. The compromise amendment also fails to mention the efforts by the USA to exploit hijacking incidents in order to inflict state terrorism on countries such as Cuba, Nicaragua and North Korea, efforts which ought to be condemned by the European Parliament.

That is why we have serious reservations about the compromise amendment.

Mr Coste-Floret (RDE). — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, terrorism is a very serious busi-

ness. I find it regrettable that leaving aside all political differences it proved impossible to table a single motion on this problem urging the various ministers responsible to meet and consider the problem. To play down terrorism, as some have done, to the level of domestic policy does a disservice to the seriousness of this debate. My Group will vote in favour of the motion tabled by Mrs Veil and the Liberal Group and that tabled by the PPE and the various other motions. We feel that faced with terrorism, which day by day is killing and committing acts of outrage against the dignity and freedom of people, we must — and most urgently — take appropriate steps. We wholeheartedly support the call for a conference to be attended by the ministers responsible in the countries of the democratic world but should we not be going further? Terrorism is internationally organized whereas prevention is not and would it not possibly be better to support my proposal for a European Community of security for persons and property? Faced with the international dimension of terrorism, prevention must also be on an international scale. I would add that the compromise amendment in paragraph 3 demands the immediate release of all the hostages held in Lebanon. It is right to be concerned not only with the prevention of terrorism but also with the release of its victims. They must not be forgotten. It is for this reason that we support wholeheartedly the paragraph of Mrs Veil's motion for a resolution which calls for the release of all the hostages without discrimination.

My Group will also now vote in favour of your motion, Madam President, which demands the immediate release of the four French hostages. The situation is different from the others since Mr Nabih Beri, who is both a minister in Lebanon and the spokesman for those who captured the hostages, undertook to free them unconditionally. At this moment they are still being held. This is an example not only of an attack on the freedom of persons but also of breaking one's promises.

Before I finish I should like to add that in Lebanon there are other hostages who should be mentioned and these are the Christian population of Lebanon who have been driven from their towns and villages . . .

President. — Mr Coste-Floret, excuse me interrupting but you have no time left.

Mr Van der Lek (ARC). — (NL) We are beginning to get rather fed up with this monthly ritual of debates on terrorism. I will explain once more why this is so.

Of course we condemn acts of political violence and holding human lives to ransom. We find it abominable. Nevertheless, an incomprehensibly selective indignation is apparent here. If we are going to talk about violence to achieve political ends, we can't escape the fact that we live in countries which are armed to the

Van der Lek

teeth, that weapons are manufactured and supplied to anyone that wants them, that young people are trained in the arts of war and that tanks and warships are used to maintain the balance of power. We cannot then avoid the subject of institutionalized violence. A hard capitalist economy that yields wealth for some people and repression and poverty for others.

To some extent in our name, injustice is perpetuated by violence — yes by violence. I consider that selective indignation. Countries which support contras, which possess a CIA that recommends political murder and countries that wage wars in the Falklands have no right to react so hysterically to a hijacking.

Of course we want to see preventive measures being taken. And of course we want air transport to be safe. We believe, however, that these measures have already been taken. The additional ones now being demanded are a form of clutching at straws, 100% security is regrettably impossible to achieve. We consider this form of debate on terrorism quite useless. We are not prepared to participate in the resolutions and will abstain.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (IT) Madam President, the Commission has always unreservedly condemned all acts of terrorism. It thus supports any initiative taken to curb such acts. In the White Paper on the creation of a large internal market by 1992 we have already stated that the abolition of physical checks on the Community's internal borders should be followed by greater cooperation between the various authorities in the Member States, in particular the activities of the police.

The Commission supports steps taken in this field by the Ministers of the Interior and Justice and also supports the widening of European cooperation on the combating of international violence as decided at the last summit meeting held in Rome on 20 and 21 June 1985.

President. — The debate is closed.

(In successive votes Parliament:

— *adopted Amendment No 1 by Mrs Veil and others¹ seeking to replace the motions for resolution Docs B 2-673/85 and B 2-701/85;*

— *rejected the motion for a resolution Doc. B 2-678/85;*

¹ Amendment No 1 tabled by:
Mrs Veil, Mr Nordmann and Mr Ducarme on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group
Mr Hänsch on behalf of the Socialist Group
Mr Cornelissen and Mr Habsburg on behalf of the EPP Group
Mr Prag on behalf of the ED Group
Mr Segre and Mr Barzanti.

— *adopted Amendment No 1 by Mr Visser and others¹ seeking to replace the motions for resolution Docs. B 2-690/85, B 2-692/85 and B 2-705/85).*

Famine

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-682/85/rev.), tabled by Mrs Focke and others, on emergency measures to be taken to assist African countries threatened by famine.

Mrs Focke (S). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen. After a period in which the European Parliament has all too long relied on information provided by others on the subject of the famine in Africa it has now investigated the situation itself by sending two small delegations which between 29 June and 7 July visited Ethiopia, the Sudan and Chad. Both delegations will submit detailed reports to Parliament. These reports will centre primarily on the resources and long-term responsibility of the European Community for development, self-sufficiency in food and regional cooperation.

What is needed at the moment are immediate and urgent follow-up measures so that in two main areas the problems which struck us as common to all three countries can be solved. First, the transport of emergency supplies within the various countries in question, and second, the stimulation of agriculture in the areas affected by famine and drought now that the rainy period is starting.

Large-scale food supplies are no help to the starving if they are stocked in ports or inland depots for a lack of lorries, spare parts, tyres, fuel, railway wagons or aircraft to distribute them. The stage is set for famine in the following year if the peasants are given no seed and no hoes for them to sow their fields.

The emergency aid must be distributed to all who need it, even in the remote areas. It must be linked as soon as possible with help for self-help. Both have been sadly neglected. The disaster has by no means been overcome, indeed it is threatening to become even more acute over the next few weeks. We call urgently upon the Commission and above all to the Council and the Member States to make additional resources available. Life-saving action must now follow the fine words spoken in Milan!

(Applause)

¹ Amendment No 1 tabled by:
Mr Visser and Mr Hänsch on behalf of the Socialist Group
Mr Cornelissen and Mr Habsburg on behalf of the EPP Group
Mr Prag on behalf of the ED Group
Mr Nordmann on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group
Mr Segre and Mr Barzanti.

IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

Vice-President

Mr Fellermaier (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, my Group supports the urgent motion for a resolution because this motion perceptively and realistically puts into practice the results of the two delegations which last week visited the areas affected by famine. The report clearly states that if the European Community and the governments of the Member States do not launch a concerted action for aid over the next few months to improve the regional infrastructure in the famine areas, a disaster of an unprecedented scale will be upon us because over the past few days the rains have been making parts of these regions completely unpassable.

As a Member of a delegation which visited the Western Sudan I ought today — and I am sure that I am doing so on behalf of all the Members of the European Parliament — to express publicly our gratitude to the hundreds of voluntary helpers from the Red Cross, from Oxfam (Oxford Committee for Famine Relief), from the *Kommittee Deutsche Notärzte* and the *Medicins sans Frontières*, to name but a few. They really have worked round the clock, selflessly, to try and get the situation under control. They deserve a public expression of thanks from the European Parliament.

(Applause)

I now turn to Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. What we have developed as short-term disaster aid and those measures which have proved effective in these countries should now be converted in conjunction with the governments of the countries into a medium and long-term plan for rehabilitation. Such a step is just as important as the initial disaster aid from the European Community which was launched last year and continued on into this year.

I should like at this point to repeat something which the President of the Republic of Chad, Mr Habré, said. He asked us, — the European Parliament delegation — to express to the people of Europe the gratitude of the people of Chad because the aid from the European Community, which represented 62% of the overall aid for the Republic of Chad, saved many people in his country from starvation.

In the wake of our disaster aid we must in my view try and help in three areas. First, we must make seed available for 1986 and plant more than just for this year. Second, we must help to develop regional infrastructure, and third, we must back up the first instalment of 10 million ECU, which was used to improve the railway line between Port Sudan and Nyala, by the provision of a second and third instalment so that this railway line can be upgraded throughout its length and

Sudan, the largest land-locked country in Africa, can have an improved infrastructure to tackle famine should disaster strike again in the future.

(Applause)

Mr Bersani (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, the motion for a resolution which is before the House clearly reflects the views of the delegation and sets out firm proposals for action on the part of our institutions for efforts on an increasing scale to tackle the enormous suffering of many millions of people and solve the urgent problems of one of the most sensitive areas in the world from the point of view of peace and international cooperation.

The clear objective of the motions, which the PPE Group fully supports, relieves me of the need to dwell on their specific merit. In general terms, however, I should like to emphasize the positive effect which the delegations' opinion has had and confirm our conviction that the European Parliament should use such powerful Parliamentary missions more effectively, especially in areas such as this in the Horn of Africa where so many problems for the local population are concentrated with underlying local tension.

The delegations are welcomed everywhere with kindness and gratitude, as Mrs Focke has described, and I should like to express my most heartfelt appreciation for the welcome extended.

The Community has provided and is providing some 60% of the aid to help famine in this area. The pipelines, in particular for cereals, operate satisfactorily whereas urgent help is required for the transportation from the ports and between the distribution centres and the villages.

The non-governmental organizations from Europe who, for example, in Ethiopia are distributing about 50% of the aid are effective channels which are highly regarded, primarily because they are in direct contact with the local population. I support what my colleague Mr Fellermaier said as regards the grateful appreciation which European public opinion should feel towards these compatriots of ours.

The same effort and scale of methods can and must underlie our action in the parallel and equally important task of promoting rehabilitation which at the moment is benefiting from substantial rainfall. We must nevertheless urgently make provisions so that before the end of this month seed and agricultural tools are made available.

The emergence in the short and medium term of the prospect of self-sufficiency merits our continued efforts in terms of material and personnel whilst taking due account of the tensions mentioned earlier. With this aim in view the Community must intensify its sup-

Bersani

port for a strong regional policy which is comparable in terms of resources and scale of the strategic plan with that of the SADEC in Southern Africa. I think it is first and foremost important to emphasize, in view of the impending conference of the regional cooperation organization IGAD, scheduled for next December in Djibouti, the relationship between the essential programmes, which are essential because they are saving lives in an emergency and the larger-scale plan which must specify to an even greater extent the lines of thrust of a project based on cooperation and solidarity.

(Applause)

Mr Christopher Jackson (ED). — Mr President, as a member of the delegation and on behalf of my group I fully support this resolution.

However, since I returned to Europe many people have asked me an important question: Is the aid that we have given to charity, the millions of pounds we have raised, being well used to defeat the famine in Africa? I bring back a strong message to those questioners. There is still terrible suffering in Ethiopia and the Sudan, but I saw the funds being raised by so many millions of our people and by the European Community and its Member States being put to very good use. I saw children who had been weakened by famine restored to health. I saw families, who had trekked for days and who were near to starvation, saved by our shipments of food. It was heartening and, indeed, uplifting to see the dedicated efforts of aid workers. They are people who deserve all our thanks.

I will just close now, Mr President, by saying to those people who have been so generous that their generosity is working. It is much appreciated but, alas, it has to continue.

(Applause)

Mr Trivelli (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, as my colleagues have already pointed out there are things which must be done without delay — implements for sowing which are required at this very moment; basic tools; vehicles and spare parts. We call upon the Commission and Mr Natali to adopt emergency measures to provide the necessary resources. The problem of agricultural revival, in other words rehabilitation or the resettling of these areas is more complex and vast and for that reason we should discuss this aspect with the ACP States.

At the moment there are three priority tasks: to send what is necessary so that emergency aid can be as effective as possible; to set out in negotiations with the ACP States the main features of a comprehensive policy for the revival of agriculture in the areas affected and to sensitize to an even greater extent

public opinion so that the support initiatives can be increased.

Ladies and gentlemen, I should like to use the remainder of my time by recalling the image of a baby of a few months — it weighed a few ounces; its father was protecting it because its mother was dead; the tube in its arm was held by sticking plaster which was thicker than the child's own arm. It is my hope that this child can be saved and that with him we can save millions of other Africans.

(Applause)

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a resolution is a collection of words which reflect ideas. We can of course include new answers, denote preference, and if necessary add differences of opinion. In its essence, it is however characterized by agreement and convergence of opinion.

This is the reason for my address. And I call upon you fervently to adopt this resolution. If the word 'urgent' means anything at all that meaning is to be found here. Urgency is imperative. Urgency is absolute.

If I had to convince you I would choose three images. Three images of the most powerful kind. Three images which have filtered through to the memory after the initial visual impact. Three images which I shall never, ever, forget.

The first image is of the Darfur made unreachable to food convoys because of the wadis swollen with the first rains where 50 000 starving people had received nothing for two weeks and the picture of a child like the one Mr Trivelli saw elsewhere whose body was emaciated like that of an old man and whose eyes were swollen by fever, and the vision of mothers with expressions of sweetness and desperation as the child was crying — doubtless doomed to die that evening or the following day.

The second picture is of Nyala where we were climbing up the railway embankment and when we reached the top we were aghast at the scene which was unfolding — a crowd of people with police, mounted on small horses, criss-crossing the crowd in all directions and armed with long lashes and were attempting to disperse the crowd to drive them back to the villages from which hunger had driven them away. For those who have read the book this scene prefigures — Raspail's novel 'The Camp of the Saints' in which men hand us letters stating their name, their marital status and a single cry for help: we are hungry!

The third scenario: the desert. The desert around Omdurman. Children sitting around large bowls and supervised by the twisting switch of an adult. They are fighting over the cereal mash. The switch is there to ensure all get their fair share. The bowls are emptied

Beyer de Ryke

in a few seconds and emptied so totally that they look as if they have been licked clean. Poor children reduced to the state of young puppies. But happy children compared with those in Darfur where parents sometimes have to fight the termites from the food for their children.

Mr President, dear colleagues, in the name of these three scenes, in the name of this triptych of desperation, I call for the creation of a real European intervention force and in the immediate term the adoption of this motion, the words of which — as with any words — show their bareness and their weakness in the face of the tragedy which is calling out to us for help.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, I have five points to make following our mission to Africa. I should like at the outset to praise the excellent working climate and cooperation which prevailed within our European Parliament delegation between members from different parties and different countries.

I should also like to pay homage to the quality, professionalism and dedication of Community delegations working in the ACP States.

Conversely, I cannot let go uncommented the in appropriate statements by the French Minister, Mr Nucci, concerning the peoples of Africa, who are traumatized and who have told us so.

Principally I should like to say that the emergency aid, provided too thinly and by too few countries, must not be seen as a temporary programme for a period of exceptional drought. A programme of this type has become a permanent necessity. The truth of the matter is that the agricultural, human and social environment has been very deeply shattered. Villages are deserted or risk becoming so, the tools, livestock have been sold in order to survive. Wood has disappeared and plantations destroyed, deserts have begun to form and the scene is set for a famine on an unprecedented scale.

The Community must draw up with the other countries supplying aid, and with the recipient countries, a fully fledged strategy to win back the land so that the inhabitants of the areas affected can be resettled there permanently. While on this point, Mr President, it should be stated that the Community will never encourage, even tacitly, the uprooting and separation of families nor the wholesale relocation of populations to distant regions on whatever grounds.

Lastly, and these are my concluding remarks, the Community has a possible role to play in promoting the successful conclusion of the impending conference in Djibouti which will assemble all the countries of the Horn of Africa to fight the effects of the drought and, who knows, to re-establish peace in that area.

(Applause)

Mr Cicciomessere (NI). — (IT) Mr President, I feel that this resolution is really rather a modest one in that it ignores the political problems facing us. Our colleagues have gone to Ethiopia and other areas but I feel that they have not read with sufficient attention the documents produced by Parliament, the documents of the Commission and in particular the draft budget for 1986.

Politically, one essential element and one alone: we have for many years, and in particular with regard to the draft budget for 1986, been witnessing increases in funds earmarked for food aid and a gradual but substantial reduction of funds for cooperation, for structural and infrastructural measures. This is the political element which goes far beyond the realm of words and discussions — either we redress this imbalance and make the Commission's unwillingness to take action or our world will remain just words.

We must merge the moment of food aid with the moment of action on infrastructure. You will have no doubt heard about the damage caused by the severe rains because there is us infrastructure to save the country from such conditions and prevent further degradation of the land. Somebody mentioned a task force and this is the essence of the problem. When and how will the Committee on Development ask the Commission and the Council for a real aid plan, not only for emergency aid but for infrastructure? When will the Committee on Development have the strength to ask that this plan should be adequately funded? There is no point in talking about solidarity with these people when the funds earmarked for the Third World are modest and largely provided from the food surpluses in the countries of Europe.

In the previous session a member of the Commission said that the funds put aside are possibly excessive compared with what is actually purchased, in other words when compared with the real price of the food surpluses. All this means is that we are giving a market value to surpluses which they do not have.

Mr President, in my view the documents which Parliament has already approved — the resolutions of 12 June and that approved yesterday — are much clearer and cover the essential political element much more effectively than this resolution which unfortunately still fails to establish this point.

Mr Wedekind (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, with a few exceptions — and that includes the last speaker — I can fully accept and support that which previous speakers have said. The situation has been accurately described. With your permission I should like to make one or two critical comments which I feel are not out of place in a debate of this type.

In future we must demand of African countries that they accept more responsibility for themselves. We

Wedekind

should not continue to behave as if Africans are children who have to be told what to do. They must accept responsibility for their countries and their people. We should not be supplying free grain when this grain is then left in the ports because the railway workers in Sudan are on strike at the time. We must demand this responsibility from the people in these countries.

When we want to transport grain via Nigeria to Chad, in other words 800 km by road, and the Nigerians close their ports to the grain which we are supplying free to Chad then that is anything but an expression of African solidarity. We cannot help by ourselves. Africans, too, must try to accept responsibility to help themselves. Otherwise no solution is possible. Simply producing plans and money from here is by itself not enough.

Let me quote a few more examples. We should not be sending experts to the Sudan to build wells if these wells are not maintained after the rainy period. In the Sudan this is a real problem because women collect water from the wells they do the heavy work and it is the men who must maintain the wells, particularly after the next rainy period. But they do not! And, as one of the responsible engineers told me, the wells will have collapsed by the following year.

Spending money is in itself not enough. The Africans must change their mentality a little. We cannot do everything from this end, but we Europeans should and must help — particularly in such emergencies as the famine disasters.

I should like to make this point again clearly and quote something that the Sudanese refugee commissioner once said, 'When Africa still had colonies there were no refugees and no famines'. It was not a white man who said that but the black Sudanese refugee commissioner. And in a spirit of self criticism he added 'Should not we Africans stop and think for a moment why that is so?'

And right he is! Since he is being sent to Libya as Sudanese Ambassador I can only recommend that he should convince his friends in the Arab camp to stop supplying weapons and start helping for a change. The Muslim brethren in the Arab countries should supply fuel because the Arab countries are not that far away, after all!

(Applause from the centre and right).

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (IT) Mr President, I should like first of all to thank the members who have tabled the motion and in particular those who went on the mission to Africa and have related to us what they saw and what impressed them.

I must repeat that on a number of occasions when speaking either to this House or to the Committee on Development I have repeatedly stressed that in the countries affected by the drought internal transport was a major problem. We are fully convinced of this and it is also in the light of these considerations that as one of our final acts we approved — as part of the Dublin plan — the implementation of a special programme of emergency aid for transport logistics. This programme, funded to the tune of 19 m ECU, relates to the five countries in which the problems are most serious. I note that evaluation in all cases has been identical.

In the Sudan 8 million will be used to set up a road and air transport operation which is needed pending the reinstatement of the railway for which as early as 4 June we provided project finance, amounting to 10 m ECU. 8 m ECU have also been earmarked for Ethiopia to continue the airlift operation, to contribute towards the United Nations fund for road transport within the country, and to provide replacement tyres and spare parts.

The funds for the airlift will be used to pay for fuel, technical services and general maintenance of the aircraft themselves. A further 2.8 m ECU will be set aside for transport within Niger, Mali and Mauretania. I would further like to point out that we have drawn the attention of the Member States to this problem and during the course of the coordination meetings we were advised that the Member States are on the point of supplying more than 500 new trucks with spare parts and technical workshops, to Ethiopia, the Sudan and Mozambique. I would further add that at the coordination meeting with the Member States on 8 July the latter assured us that they would extend the operations of the Transall and Hercules heavy transport aircraft and that they are prepared to organize an additional airlift for Timbuktu in Mali.

The resolution rightly stresses the problem of relaunching agricultural production. I should like to inform Parliament that as far as seed is concerned our response to governments requesting seed for free distribution has always been positive. We have supplied 25 000 tonnes of seed for free distribution totalling something in excess of 17 m ECU. We are prepared to do more. The problem is one of finding seed and finding seeds which are suitable for the local climate of particular areas, the Highlands of Ethiopia, for example.

We realize that agricultural equipment will be needed to relaunch agricultural production. I should however point out that we have received no requests from governments or any other body. I have been advised — and I thank the Committee accordingly — of the particular situation in Ethiopia where there is a shortage of small agriculture machines. From checks we have carried out it appears that the Ethiopian Ministry of Agriculture has at its disposal a significant quantity

Natali

of small simple machines which are suitable for the tasks envisaged. We realize that there is a problem with the transportation of these agricultural machines and we will study the situation accordingly. I should also like to assure you that should it prove necessary to supply more machinery we will respond positively to such requests.

I should point out, Mr President, that we support the suggestions made in connection with the medium-term action as set out in the resolution and I should like to remind you that in our memorandum to the heads of state and governments, who met in Milan, we stressed the need for an immediate relaunching of economic activity in the countries affected by the drought. With this aim in view we emphasize the need to couple the emergency aid with the supply of basic essentials for reviving agriculture, and, to this end, we recommended the mobilization of all available resources in the Community and Member States for rapid response action programmes, including such projects as 'food for work'.

The resources remaining in the EDF could make a significant contribution to these financing programmes if the next harvest is more normal. Should this not prove the case we must think of channelling the funds into a new emergency plan.

I shall now outline our lines of thrust for the future. We must — and this has already been proposed by others — make massive increases in funds allocated to emergency aid programmes. For the moment I do not consider this to be the real problem. Moreover, as the resolution under discussion states, the immediate requirements will not be met for a few months including those relating to the relaunching of agriculture.

I should also like to remind you — because it is worthwhile reflecting on the effort which we have all invested — that of the amount of food supplies envisaged by the Dublin plan 43% has been distributed and 44% is on the road or in the ports. And we still have resources available under the Dublin plan. At this moment the essential problem is primarily the medium and long-term one and it is in this connection that we must without fail achieve greater coherence between that which the Community does and that which the Member States do. This is the essence of the message which we tried to get across in Milan. We drew the attention of the heads of state to this problem and their reply was favourable on the essential requirement of long-term action to avoid a repetition of the disaster which we have all unfortunately had to witness. Our basic duty now that the European Council has backed us up in this initiative will be to ensure under all circumstances that this indispensable coherence is not lost but that it is constantly and swiftly expanded. In conclusion, Mr President, if new emergencies arise we will tackle them and in this connection I should like to remind the House of the recent statement by the Council of EEC/ACP Ministers expressing their

decision to delegate to the Committee of Ambassadors the responsibility for rapid movement of remaining EDF funds. We have also made provision for the movement as of next year of a strategic reserve of 500 000 tonnes of cereals. We thus feel that we can tackle any emergencies that arise. It is however in the longer term that we must organize, in close cooperation with the Member States, the further course of our final action.

I was particularly moved, Mr President, by the account of some members of the things they had seen and experienced. I, too, have experienced them and seen them. I should just like briefly to add that as far as I and my departments are concerned the task is to ensure that the challenge facing us is one which we can tackle and tackle with a feeling that first and foremost it is a task which by its nature and essence is a moral task.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

EEC/USA agriculture trade

President. — The next item is the joint debate on five motions for resolutions:

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-670/85), tabled by Mr Parodi and others, on the protectionist measures by the United States against imports of pasta products;
- the motions for a resolution (Doc. B 2-674/85), tabled by Mrs S. Martin and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on EEC-US disputes in the agricultural sector;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-694/85), tabled by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance, on the GATT negotiations between the EEC and the USA arising from the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-702/85), tabled by Mr Raftery and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party on recent changes in United States agricultural export policies;
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. B 2-704/85), tabled by Mr Cervetti and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the increase by the United States of customs duties on imports of pasta products from the European Community.

Mr Costanzo (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, for some time now we have been witnessing a continuous gradual deterioration of relations between the European Community and the United States of America with regard to the exchange of agricultural produce.

Totally unexpected and unjustified was the decision by Washington against pasta products originating in the countries of the Community. This decision was unjustifiable both in economic and commercial terms and, above all, in political terms. It has been claimed that the Community, by offering special customs duty relief on citrus fruit imported from North African countries and the Middle East, countries which are known to be poor, would cause irreparable damage to the citrus fruit producers in wealthy California.

This assessment on the part of the Reagan administration is utterly extraordinary for at least two reasons. First, it is strange that the United States disapproves of the Community's policy of assisting non-Community countries around the Mediterranean as if it were not the prime political duty of the entire Western World, and consequently of the European Community and the United States, above all, to foster the social and political development and stability of these Mediterranean countries. The demand by Californian agricultural producers who want the same facilities for their exports to the European market as the Community grants the countries of North Africa and the Middle East truly is a peculiar one.

Second, by their retaliation on pasta products the Reagan Administration would be penalizing the Community's southern regions on two scores: firstly, by virtue of the subsidized imports of citrus fruit from non-Community countries in the Mediterranean and secondly, by virtue of the American retaliation on the import of European pasta products. Citrus fruit and pasta are two basic commodities of the economy of the Community's southern regions. It is for this reason, Mr President, that in my opinion the Community should have reacted more vociferously and firmly to the action of the United States by rejecting the commercial and political grounds for Washington's measures and imposing restrictions on the import of cereals and cereal substitutes from the United States.

Mrs S. Martin (L). — The United States, which is clearly obsessed with the problems of its own agriculture, seems determined to continue its offensive on the world market which could well do without these new disruptions.

It is not enough simply to take note of this new approach for it is backed by measures to protect its own US market. It is well known that the Americans are very capable when it comes to skill and effectiveness. These measures are a follow-up to the 'citrus fruit' panel requested by the United States and which took decisions which were anything but favourable for

the Community. This panel almost certainly conducted a technical evaluation of the preferential agreements but disregarded the political aspect of commercial relations between the Mediterranean countries and the Community which in this delicate part of the world exert considerable influence and the United States would be wrong to ignore this.

After citrus fruit, pasta products, and lemons we cannot embark on a programme of reciprocal retaliation or whatever other measures we can apply in view of the level of American exports to the Community.

That would be ill-advised for all concerned. It would be short-sighted, prejudicial to the interests of commercial and political relations between the Community and the Member States and those agricultural producers who, on this side of the Atlantic or the other, will bear the cost.

Nevertheless, the Community cannot be held responsible, as the Americans would have us believe, for the current situation which is largely the result of the dollar exchange rate.

The Commission should therefore pursue and step-up its discussions with Washington to resolve, item by item, product by product, the current argument so that within the terms of GATT wider-scope negotiations on the commercial problems between the Community and the United States can start. However, the Commission should also consider the longer-term prospects for the world market so that the Community can, in full possession of the facts, decide on its own policy and no longer, as is now the case, be on the receiving end of action by others.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Musso (RDE). — *(FR)* Relations between the United States and the EEC have deteriorated considerably in commercial terms. There are two reasons for this situation.

The first goes back to the time when the US *Farm Bill* was introduced in the United States which is a measure to lower the exchange rate on the world market so that we are obliged to increase the amount we pay if we want to compete in the export market. This is something that we cannot do owing to budgetary restrictions. What can we do and what is the Commission planning to do to ensure that we remain competitive in this market?

The second reason is concerned with enlargement and Mediterranean production. Many speakers, have mentioned the problem already but wine and pasta products were omitted. On the question of enlargement the United States would like to know if it is going to be able to continue to export to the Iberian Peninsula after accession. We can ask ourselves if it is not a mat-

Musso

ter of urgency — and this is more of an affirmation than a question — that negotiations should be opened and we would like to know what position the Commission will adopt in these negotiations, which sectors will be affected, if a compensation scheme is planned and, lastly, if the negotiations can be linked with the GATT forthcoming Round.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — Mr President, it is with regret that I rise to condemn the export policies and import restrictions of the USA, a country which has been both protector and benefactor of Community members in the past. Now, because of its budgetary deficits and balance-of-payments difficulties, the US is beginning to behave more like a predator than a protector in relation to our Community.

It is true that the US has a serious budgetary deficit and a very large, and growing, balance-of-payment deficit. The factors responsible for this, however, as everybody now recognizes, are the fiscal and monetary policies pursued by the US which gave rise to high interest-rates and an overvalued dollar, which in turn reduced US competitiveness, both at home and abroad.

It is also true that the Community subsidizes its agriculture, but so do most other developed economies, including the United States, which according to the Farm Bureau subsidized each farm to the tune of \$ 12 000, which looks very large indeed when compared with the average of \$ 1 000 spent by the Community per farm.

Again, it is true that world surpluses of agricultural products are increasing, but Europe's response to this has been, at an enormous social cost, to impose quotas and other means of restricting output, on the major products, including milk, sugar and wine. By contrast, the US has decided unilaterally to impose restrictions on imports such as pasta and to set aside \$ 2 000 m under the American Bonus Incentive Commodity Export Programme, for what Mr Block described as an offensive on the international market.

Complaints by the US in GATT about EC subsidies on wheat exports were not upheld, while in dairy products the US has decided to withdraw from GATT arrangements. Despite US complaints about a loss of its market share due to EEC export methods, the US should remember that in agriculture it still has a balance-of-payments surplus with the Community in excess of \$ 5 000 m and that American sales to third countries have grown faster in recent years than Community exports. Furthermore, the US has refused to discuss the question of market share, partly because the high value of the dollar has reduced refunds to a fraction of their previous level, while the US at the same time operates blended credits which are, in fact, a subsidy on exports.

The present action of the US will do immense damage to farmers abroad, particularly farmers in the Community, while doing nothing to remove the basic cause of their problems at home. I therefore appeal to the US to solve these problems with us at the negotiating table, rather than by using its muscle to disrupt world agricultural trading. I appeal to the Members of this House by supporting this motion here today, to show their support for a strong stand by the Commission in the face of these clumsy attempts by the United States to brow-beat the Community into submission.

Finally, Mr President, I should like to remind the US that its proposed actions in relation to agricultural trading will do immense damage to farmers in the Third World, by disrupting their local markets. This will, in turn, reduce these countries' prospects of solving their food shortage problems, thereby prolonging the agony of the hungry millions.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Gatti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, even if the United States and the Community have suspended and postponed for a week by common agreement the application of duty on agricultural products, the compromise resolution on which Parliament is about to take a vote and which will be supported by the Communist Group is important and, above all, of topical interest as it offers a clear indication that the avenue to be pursued is not one of unilateral decision-taking. We have condemned the action taken by the Americans but are also somewhat puzzled by the position adopted by the European Community. We should not be thinking in terms of retaliation measures because it is too dangerous a path. It is particularly dangerous for us, in other words for Europe, because Europe not only needs but also has the political will, at least on a majority basis, as shown recently at the Milan Summit, to launch a new era of economic and social cooperation with the rest of the world — cooperation with the developing countries, the Third World, with America and Comecon. Clearly, then, we must avoid the path of retaliation. Ladies and gentlemen, it is immaterial whether the amount of duty on pasta and other products is large or small for it is the principle which we do not support and these protectionist measures which confuse us. We welcome the fact that there is no mention of this in the compromise resolution.

Yesterday the Commission presented its Green Paper, which was introduced by the Member of the Commission concerned, who is here with us today, and is responsible for the reform — although in my view somewhat scaled-down — of the Common Agricultural Policy. As far as the export of finished and semi-finished products is concerned, it has been said that this is a central problem. And it is for this reason that it is our desire to see progress towards cooperation. Consequently we want discussions to start and bilateral agreements to be drafted and consideration be given

Gatti

to the political and social needs and advantages which cooperation between these countries offers. This is the only road open to us and consequently we will support the compromise resolution.

Mr Eyraud (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is right for the problem of agricultural trade between the EEC and the United States to be raised now in connection with the urgent debate. We will be able to consider the problem in more depth when I present the opinion for discussion in September to the Committee on Agriculture, and later at a subsequent session during the discussion of the report presented by Mrs Roberts on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

However, I should like today to stress three points of topical interest: citrus fruit, pasta products and cereals. The United States started by claiming within GATT a right to compensation in exchange for a so-called commercial loss that they had suffered as a result of the Community's granting preferential duties to the Mediterranean countries. In real terms, the Community has no more than helped these economies, whose weakness has on occasion had serious political consequences, to bear the effects of Spain's and Portugal's accession to the Common Market. By so doing, the United States is simply breaking the agreements, tacit though they be, made in 1978 and known as Case and Voames, whereas the Community is acting fully within the terms of the GATT agreements. Such a turn-around on a promise bodes ill for the new GATT round! The firmness of President Mitterrand at the Bonn Summit was also in defence of Community interests.

Pasta products were the target of the retaliatory measures by the American authorities, who decided to increase the customs duty on imported pasta without eggs from 1 to 25% and for pasta with eggs from 1 to 40%. At the same time the Community unilaterally reduced by about 30% the export refunds for pasta products. Even if a decision to postpone these measures has been taken there is a case for asking whether the attitude of offering the other cheek when our face is slapped is not only just dignified but whether it pays off.

However, in the interests of objectivity, I feel that the Community's countermeasures affecting imported lemons and nuts from California should also not go unmentioned.

However, we are now in a dreadful muddle because the United States has apparently provided 2 000 million dollars credit for its agricultural exporters as part of the BICEP programme. The effects are already being felt in the contracts for the export of cereals to Algeria and Egypt where Community cereal is at a disadvantage.

On the basis of the latest figures for the exchange of agricultural produce between the EEC and the United States it can be seen that the EEC's balance deficit was of the order of 7 000 million ECU in 1984 while it was already 5 600 million ECU in 1983.

The United States is forgetting too easily that it is our prime supplier of foodstuffs. This is bad business sense because normally your best customer gets best treatment!

The United States is also forgetting that by continuing to keep the prices high for meat and milk the Community has eased the import of alternative products. Thus, through these imports it is subsidizing American agriculture. I doubt whether the Community taxpayers and consumers — who are often one and the same — will except for much longer an aberration on this scale!

Mr Dalsass (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, it is regrettable that the European Parliament is obliged to conduct a debate of this type here today. Agricultural trade between the Community and the United States has unfortunately been severely strained for some time now so that if nothing is done the long-term result may be that the general relations between the allied western democracies may begin to suffer. That is something which must be avoided under all circumstances. I had a presage of this when during the Green Week in Berlin in 1984 I heard the American agricultural Minister, Mr Block, speaking on this subject. He stated clearly that agriculture in the United States was in a very difficult situation and that the reasons were the same as those underlying the problems of Community agriculture. We, like the Americans, have produced surpluses, and sales of these products have declined on the world market, the results being higher costs for agriculture and reduced income for agricultural producers. These developments forced the American Government (for reasons of domestic policy) to the unusual steps that it took. By severely undercutting competitors' prices it gained inroads into traditionally European markets, examples being the sale of butter and cereals to Egypt and Algeria. In addition, trade barriers to the import of European wine to the United States were erected. I have listed these points in a question to the Commission and requested it to take a clear stand on the issue. It is now the turn of European pasta products to be barred. Trade relations between the Community and the USA in the agricultural sector have thus reached a regrettably low level.

The USA claims that these measures are necessitated by excessive promotion of agriculture in the EEC although this policy was never contested by the USA in the past when times were not so difficult. These measures are also to be understood as an American protest against the preferential agreements concluded between the EEC and other Mediterranean countries, but this must be seen purely and simply as an excuse

Dalsass

because the Community derives no commercial benefit at all from these agreements.

All these points must be made clearly here today, not with a view to fanning the fire of contention but in order to call upon the Commission to adopt a clear stance in this affair in the interests of European agriculture. It is our duty mainly to take a stand against this unfair pressure. The aim of this motion is to encourage the Commission in its efforts to arrive at an amicable agreement with the USA so that a way out of this precarious situation can be found in the interests of both sides.

Both sides must make an effort. It is my belief that Europe has already started along the right road by cutting back on surplus production in certain areas.

If the other side adopts a similar approach it must be possible to resolve this point of contention quickly.

(Applause)

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, I do not think this is a day for inflammatory rhetoric, because I believe we have seen too much inflammatory rhetoric, especially on the other side of the Atlantic, in recent months — in fact, in recent years. I believe that this is a time for cool heads and for trying to understand each other's problems. Otherwise we shall drive ourselves into a trade war that would be to the advantage of no one except our enemies.

We are, of course, both facing the same problems of over-production, and we have both got budgetary problems. For the first time, it is interesting to note that the Americans are having to admit that they are subsidizing their farmers, because they, too, want to make government savings in the agricultural field.

I think we must also realize that we are the Americans' biggest customers. They know that, and it would be folly on their part to upset the trade flows between Europe and the United States. What we all want to achieve is viable rural populations, and I ask our Commissioner, who is now coming forward with his Green Paper, to stand firm in GATT, to stand firm in our relations with the United States and to stand firm and make sure that there is not a trade war in the future.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, having stepped up pressure on Community agriculture, either directly or through their agencies in the Community, the United States has now decided to launch a large-scale offensive. The aim is to force the Community into the role of a scapegoat and make it bear the cost of the serious crisis in American agriculture which is sending incomes tumbling and thousands of

farms into bankruptcy. Instead of tackling the real causes of the crisis the American government is trying to offset the falling income subsidies by an unprecedented attack on the world market in an attempt to establish new outlets for itself.

To this end the United States has developed, and is on the point of deploying, a series of political and financial measures ranging from direct or indirect pressure to fierce confrontation on the markets: new farm bills, BICEP operations for export subsidies and deliberate attacks on the Community's traditional markets. At the same time, the pressure being exerted by the United States is intended to break any resistance aimed at achieving a renegotiation of the GATT agreements so that the CAP will have to be dismantled and the Community transformed into a free trade area.

How should the Community react to such an offensive? Up till now the Commission like the Council, has never demonstrated great resolve. Complaints to GATT were formal, the negotiations on limiting the import of maize gluten are becoming bogged down, the tax on fats has been abandoned and, above all, the Community has launched a reform of the CAP along the lines of the American policy incorporating price-freezing and the establishment of quotas to the detriment of family farms. These are not the goals set out in the Green Paper, which are inconsistent with my interpretation. All the repeated gestures of goodwill have, in the final analysis, served only to encourage the American offensive. We need a change of course, a different line of action such as that called for by the House recently when it voted on the Pranchère report on agricultural prices.

We do not want a trade war — that would not be in the interests of either party. What we want is good relations. But there is no point, as was said earlier, in offering the left cheek after the right one has been struck. We should reject the United States' accusations on CAP and improve its operations. We must demonstrate greater resolve by preparing a series of appropriate and graded measures. With its threat of retaliatory measures the Community has at least for the moment warded off the tax on pasta products. The resolve paid off. That is the paradigm for the future.

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr Chairman, Commissioner Andriessen, ladies and gentlemen, what on earth are the proponents of free trade actually protesting about. After all, what they want is free trade when it is to their advantage and protection and subsidies when it suits them. That is indeed the basis of the EEC and of the United States and governments are repeatedly used to intervene to achieve this.

The word tradewar has been mentioned and that is precisely what it is. War is waged not only with weapons but also with money. The dollar kills, the ECU

Verbeek

kills, it is over-production that murders people. The Third World is paying for the theft by the rich trading nations and the impoverished countries pay with lives. However that is obviously of less importance to those putting forward this urgent pasta resolution. They are interested in the money aspects of this tradewar. They are equally uninterested in the fate of small farmers, the ones producing the grain. Their interests are not even mentioned in this resolution. Apparently, those putting it forward are concerned only about the interests of the agro industries and agro traders. They are interested in high profits and low shop prices. That way, wages can be kept low. The small farmers, who form the best guarantee for independent, domestic, stable, adequate and responsible production of food, these small farmers are being condemned both in the EEC and in the United States to perish in this trade-war.

For this reason, Mr Chairman, the Rainboog-GRAEL Group will not vote for this resolution but we will take up the issue again when Commissioner Andriessen's Green Paper is being discussed.

Mr Pordea (DR). — (GR) Faced with the important problem confronting us I should like to say that although I accept that there are major differences of opinion between us and our American allies on the subject of agricultural trade, I refuse to support a demand couched in terms offensive to the United States. It is a demand containing several examples of the regrettable, even reproachable, tones emanating from a political grouping which is systematically anti-American.

What is needed in my view is a new conference between the European Community and the United States to decide on responsibility-sharing between the United States and the EEC on the subject of trade with developing countries. A conference of this type would of necessity involve a review of the Community's North-South policy as well as that of Washington. It could produce useful results if we have the will to support the policy pursued by the American administration in Central and South America instead of opposing it in an underhand manner as is done persistently in Nicaragua and Cuba.

For these reasons I shall vote against the motion for a joint resolution.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, if my understanding of this morning's debate is correct, a

strange kind of war has broken out. Not in Vietnam or Afghanistan or even between the Eastern and Western blocs but between two allies — the United States of Europe and the United States of America. A novel feature of this war is that military weapons are no longer used and have been replaced by another weapon — that of food. Both superpowers are among the world's richest countries. They own the best lands both at home and in the Third World. They possess superior technology to make that food grow quickly and abundantly and yet both are faced with a food mountain and many poor people. That's where the action begins. Either secretly or openly, food exports are granted subsidies to eliminate competition. Just think of Algeria. The result is that the usual systems no longer work. The monetary system gets out of control. International trading agreements, GATT, no longer function. Solemnly signed treaties become just worthless pieces of paper. The markets collapse. As always, the major victims of this food war are the very poor both here and in the Third World. Farmers are driven from their land by large scale monoculture. I will give you an example to illustrate this. The best land in the Philippines is used for monocultures of such products as palm oil, bananas, pineapple and sugar. The representative of the Philippine peasantry is here and can testify to this. Farmers are driven from their own land. The lucky ones get work at starvation wages on plantations but most are unemployed and hungry.

Mr Chairman, this will be the unhappy consequence of the food war which is quite likely to impoverish and kill on a larger scale than the preceding World Wars. It is particularly the peoples of the Third World that will suffer from these food policies. They will have no land and no domestic food production while the land will be exhausted, erode and turn to desert. The most that we can do is to toss them a little food as charity and even then we will complain that they upset the food transport system.

Is it not time to completely reorganize international treaties and institutions such as GATT, IMF and the development banks in the interests of self-sufficiency and of small-scale agriculture that cares for the land, a qualitatively better and more labour-intensive approach, with the end effect of stimulating the regional markets?

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, it is not only in the agricultural sector that trade relations between the European Community and the United States have come to a dangerous confrontation because there is a similar situation in the industrial and commercial field. The powerful inaugural address by the new US trade delegate, Clayton Yeutter, for which we politicians have a professional understanding, changes very little in practice, however. His representative, Mr Michael B. Smith, similarly offers little help by claiming that for 16 years the USA have in vain been trying to prompt the Community to reach a set-

Blumenfeld

tlement on the Mediterranean preferential duties before Washington opted for punitive duties to support its citrus fruit.

The threat posed by the policy adopted by the United States can be summarized as follows: in the agricultural sector, the USA, with its BICEP programme, which in political jargon has also been described as a war chest, has opted for large-scale export subsidies in order to penetrate the world markets. They have also imposed punitive levels of duty on pasta products exported from the Community to the USA.

May I remind you that the Community's Mediterranean preferences are unilateral preferences for which the Community requires nothing in return. Consequently, the Casey-Soames agreement, in other words the US-European Community agreement concluded in the 1970s, has not been broken. The Community has therefore decided to exercise its GATT rights and apply retaliatory measures if no agreement can be reached. We hope nevertheless that the US will discontinue its line of action.

Since the beginning of this year restrictions have also been applied to the mild steel sector and consequently pipe exports from the Community to the USA will now also come under the terms of this agreement. The latest information indicates that the USA is calling for import restrictions to cover the entire range of what are known as consultation products and this regardless of the fact that it was the Community by being the first to restrict its exports made a contribution to the American restructuring effort in this sector. The shoe and textile trade is also a possible target for export restrictions from the Community to the USA. One cannot fail to get the impression that the American Government is no longer able to keep the powerful lobby groups in their place. Our real adversary is on Capital Hill, however, in other words the US Congress. Protectionism has been given the green light and GATT is disregarded, having been discarded in favour of bilateral agreements.

The following questions urgently need answers: how can the position of the American Government be reconciled with the repeatedly expressed desire for a new GATT round? What does the Commission intend to do to offset the increasing protectionism of Congress? And lastly, does the Commission believe that given the importance of the trade interests in question and their political repercussions, these problems can be solved by private negotiations or does it consider that there is a need for comprehensive political discussion to relieve the transatlantic tension?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, it is a fact that under normal conditions the United States gives as much in the way of subsidies to agriculture as the Community does. It is a fact that our agricultural balance of trade with the

United States is clearly in deficit and it is also a fact that the high value of the dollar is one of the major causes of the trade problems facing the United States. It is a fact that the European Community is the United States' best customer and, as has been so rightly pointed out in this debate, it is rather a strange approach to pick a fight with your best client. It is also a fact — as I found for myself during a visit to the United States a few days ago — that American public opinion and even political leaders are badly informed about this and other issues such as, for example, the fact that Americans are talking about reforming agriculture policy at a time in which we are actually doing it. I believe that one of the causes of the problems being discussed here today is that the United States is inadequately informed about the real facts. I see it as one of the Community's tasks, both within the negotiations and elsewhere, to ensure that the United States is better informed about the real aims, results and efforts made in the Community's agricultural policy.

I would then like to make a few comments on the three points on the agenda, i.e. the general trade policy of the United States which has been expressed in the so-called BICEP program — which already has another name —, the problems of subtropical fruits and pasta products and the difficulties associated with enlargement.

Let me begin by saying that the Commission has not, and will not, set out to sour the atmosphere but on the other hand the Community cannot be expected to sit back without taking specific, clear and effective action if unilateral and unjustified measures are taken against it. The Commission has given that kind of response in the case of pasta products and it will continue to do so wherever necessary for the defence of the Community's interests. I said that quite clearly to our American friends when I had the opportunity to exchange views with them on this issue. Sometimes a certain level of escalation is necessary before a point is reached at which serious negotiations can begin and these are what the Community should aim at achieving. We would of course prefer multilateral negotiations, i.e. within GATT, as well as bilateral ones where there are specific outstanding trade problems such as the ones we now have with the United States. The Community favours cooperation but it has to be on the basis of equality.

(Applause)

If that is not conceded, then the Community must be expected to take a clear stand on these issues.

I would now like to expand a little of the three points I cited earlier. First, the export stimulation programme . . .

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Will the Commissioner give way? Will the honourable gentleman give way?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — The honourable gentlemen will give way for the Commission, and for the Community if necessary!

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — I am very grateful to the honourable gentlemen indeed!

Would he not agree that one of the difficulties between the United States and Europe is that we have taken a lot of their markets in, say, the Far East, the Middle East and South-East Asia by our subsidies and that this is one of the problems that is causing the difficulties between us.

Would he like to expand on that, please?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — Let me reply to you. In the last four years we have maintained our share of the world market in cereals. So if the Americans have lost markets, it was not to us but to other partners on the world market.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

I will go on, Mr Chairman. The export stimulation programme, which has since been given a number of names but which is still known in this Assembly as BICEP, has been sharply criticized by the Commission and also *bilaterally* within the United States, particularly because of its political presentation. The programme is directly focused against European exports even though there are at least grounds to look at other activities. As far as the facts are concerned, the final form of the programme is still not yet exactly known. Two initiatives have been announced, one concerning Algeria and one concerning Egypt. In both cases, we are still waiting to see how the Americans will implement their programme. On the basis of information available to me, my impression is that this will be relatively carefully done. For this reason, it is not yet possible to say to what extent the programme will conflict with GATT regulations. That will depend on the manner in which the Americans implement their programme.

Secondly, I would like to draw attention to the sum committed to the programme. Two thousand million dollars seems extremely impressive but it is spread over three and a half years which does make its impact rather less severe than would first seem to the base. The Commission will follow the implementation of the programme very attentively and will not hesitate to act wherever circumstances make this essential.

The second point I refer to is the question of pasta products and subtropical fruit. The first comment I would make is that the United States does not sufficiently understand the geopolitical dimensions of our preferential agreements with the Mediterranean countries. It has been quite rightly pointed out this after-

noon that these preferences are not in own interest, quite the reverse. We are admitting additional competition to our markets and we have good reasons to do so. I cannot understand that we have not yet managed to convince the United States of that aspect of our preferential agreements. One thing is clear, it would be quite unacceptable to us to have penalties being invoked under the GATT agreements to make our policy of preferential agreements impossible. The Community is not prepared to accept that as our American friends very well know.

Secondly, the dispute over subtropical fruits has been going for quite some time. Nevertheless, the Commission considers that there are no grounds to take unilateral measures, particularly now when a special GATT committee on trade policy issues in agriculture is trying to find solutions allowing better application of the GATT regulations. I consequently believe that the timing would be quite wrong for such an action not least because the Community would be required to justify the way it had acted. Thirdly, since the two decisions were taken, the Commission has taken steps to determine a negotiating position and to come to a settlement of the points at issue with the United States. Whether that will succeed I don't know. Today, right now probably, top level discussions are going on in Canada and we will have to wait and see whether these will yield a possible course of action.

Finally, Mr President, we come to the matter of the Community's enlargement and the negotiations within GATT about all the consequences this will have for trade policy. That is a pretty complex technical matter that amounts in effect to the following. The Commission will propose that the Council gives it a mandate to conduct negotiations with our GATT partners with a view to determining a new tariff and then to study, in bilateral negotiations, the extent to which that new tariff and the differences between it and the old one have had effects on the trading situation that would call for compensatory action to be taken. At the moment it is not possible to say which sectors and which products will be concerned. Our experience of earlier negotiations, both when countries joined the Community and when the Community itself was formed, indicates that these are unlikely to be easy negotiations.

I would like to make one final point. Some Members have said the Commission should act more forcefully and dynamically. I believe it would be fair to say that, on these issues, the Commission has acted immediately and precisely, not because we are overly fond of reprisals but because we believe that negotiations with the United States must be conducted on the basis of equality and from equal negotiating positions.

(Applause from the centre and right)

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the five motions for resolutions)¹

Human rights

President. — The next item is the joint debate on five motions for resolutions:

- by Mrs Péry and others (Doc. B 2-698/85), on the illegal detention of the French journalist J.P. Kaufmann, the sociologist Mr Seurat and the two French diplomats, Mr Carton and Mr Fontaine
- by Mr Saby (Doc. B 2-699/85), on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the situation in Chile
- by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and Mr Arndt (Doc. B 2-700/85), on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the Community's relations with Pakistan
- by Mr Mallet and others (Doc. B 2-707/85), on behalf of the PPE Group, on the situation of Renata Lesnik and her family, and
- by Mr Wurtz (Doc. B 2-710/85), on behalf of the Communist Group, on the threatened execution of four Indonesian political and trade union leaders

Mrs Péry (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, this is the fifth day of captivity in Lebanon for journalist Jean-Paul Kaufmann and sociologist Michel Seurat, a fate similar to that of the two French diplomats, Mr Carton and Mr Fontaine, who were kidnapped previously.

In our first topical and urgent debate this morning we condemned all acts of terrorism. We now condemn just as strongly the taking of hostages as an unacceptable form of blackmail. These four Community citizens disappeared while performing their professional duties. I hope that we will agree unanimously to use all the Parliament's moral and political influence and, through our institution, all the influence of the European Community to make the kidnappers understand that this situation is unacceptable to us.

I testify before you to the reaction aroused among the public and in the journalistic profession, in particular, by this new evidence of the risks which journalists run

in the course of their duties. I would remind you here that only a few months ago our Parliament voted unanimously to call for the release of Jacques Abouchar and that we had the satisfaction of learning of his release during our October part-session.

I do not know if we will enjoy the same satisfaction today. I cannot help thinking, over and above our concern with international law and order, of the anxiety experienced by their wives and families. Since they were kidnapped no doctor, lawyer or journalist has been able to see them. The uncertainty which was relieved briefly last week is all the more difficult to live with today. I call upon the European Parliament, through its President, to urge the President-in-Office of the Council to establish at the highest level the necessary contacts to secure the release of these four European hostages whose peaceful intentions cannot be questioned by anyone, including their kidnappers.

(Applause)

Mr Mallet (PPE). — *(FR)* We are taken up with the sad tale of Renata Lesnik who, since 1981, has been trying in vain to obtain permission for her mother and brother to come to France where she is living at present. The Soviet authorities have responded by committing her mother to a psychiatric hospital. This is one case among thousands, among millions. Here we are thinking, of course, of Sakharov, Charansky, Solidarnosc in Poland and the increasing repression of both Jews and Christians, particularly in the Soviet Union.

At the end of July we shall be celebrating — in fact, a rather inappropriate word — the tenth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act. To say that the results are disappointing is an understatement. It is a failure, a serious failure in terms of the implementation of the measures foreseen in the third round of agreements. As the Lesnik affair shows, violations of the most basic freedoms are on the increase. Should we then denounce the Helsinki Act, as some people advocate? I do not believe so. Instead of denouncing the Helsinki Act we should urge that it be put into effect. It is one of the rare but necessary channels of dialogue which we have between Western Europe and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. It is also a means of exerting pressure which we should use unremittingly on the Soviet authorities and on the governments of Central and Eastern Europe.

Ten years ago, in Helsinki, the people of Eastern Europe, prisoners of a totalitarian regime and its relentless imperialism, saw the door of their prison left ajar. Since then the door has almost shut on them again. Let us keep our foot in the door so that it cannot close completely. A little air and light will reach the prisoners through this opening, however narrow it may be. In this way we will help to keep alive a flicker of freedom and hope, however faint it may be. We hereby appeal to the ministers of the Community

¹ Amendment No 1 by Mr Raftery, Mr Debatisse, Mr Dalsass and Mr Früh, on behalf of the European People's Party; Mrs S. Martin, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr de la Malène and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Democratic Alliance; Mr Cervetti, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Woltjer, Mr Thureau, Mr Eyraud, Mr Saby, Mr Hapart, Mr Dido, and Mr Mattina.

Mallet

meeting in Helsinki to remember all the Renata Lesniks and to recall the principles which they once solemnly proclaimed. As Mrs Charansky said a few days ago in Paris, do not separate the two ideas of peace in the West and freedom in the East.

(Applause)

Mr Wurtz (COM). — *(DE)* Mr President, their names are Ruslan Widjan Sastra, Gato Lestario, Djoko Untung and Rustomo. They are aged between 60 and 69. They were arrested in 1968 after having escaped the massacre of more than 500 000 Communists perpetrated in Indonesia in the name of the defence of the free world by the Suharto regime three years previously. These four men, condemned to death along with 50 of their comrades, a full list of whose names we have in our possession, have been left to rot in Indonesian prisons for almost 20 years. Today, and I repeat, almost 20 years later, they risk being put to death by dictatorial decree, just like Mohammed Munir, President of the Indonesian trade union movement, on 14 May.

The day after this most recent outrage, the Union of groups for the defence of democracy, a secret organization grouping all the opponents of the Suharto terrorist regime, be they Communist or Muslim, launched an appeal for solidarity which reached us only a few days ago and which is addressed to this Parliament by name. I quote, 'We would like, say these men, to find once more peace of mind and calm, a life free from anxiety in which racial, political and religious discrimination does not exist. We hope that the European Parliament will one day be able to take note of the historical event, the victory of democracy over military power. You and your solidarity with us are our hope.'

The Communist and Allies Group hereby request you to respond to this appeal, first of all by voting for the motion for a resolution which has been submitted and then by bringing pressure to bear on our respective governments so that they will at last make real use of their influence in the defence of human rights to stop the killers of Jakarta.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Saby (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, the message I have to convey to you is a true one, a message which was imparted to us by the mission which visited Chile on behalf of the Socialist International and the International League for Human Rights which also has the distinction of being the only mission received by the Chilean government since 1980.

It is a message aimed first at the European Parliament. It is a message directed also at the democracies of

Europe and last but not least a message to the Christian community of our continent. On whose behalf was the message sent? It was sent on behalf of the Chilean Commission of Human Rights; on behalf of the Chilean church and, in particular, the Priesthood for Solidarity which represents today the only glimmer of hope for the Chilean people; on behalf of all the political parties from across the political spectrum, the right having joined the opposition which today represents 80% of the Chilean people; on behalf of all the students, the Catholic university and others, which today all form part of the opposition; on behalf of the National Movement of Workers and a union of all the professional sectors; and last but not least, after a personal interview lasting one-and-a-half hours, on behalf of the current president-in-office of the Supreme Court of Chile.

The three messages are clear on what they have to say about the current situation, one which changes at alarming speed. Ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, there cannot be a return to democracy under the 1980 constitution, when Article 24 provides for a temporary state of emergency. On the other hand, and this is their message, not mine, there exists a real democratic alternative in Chile in the form of a national consensus of all the opposition forces, and this without the need to resort to violence.

The third message is that the economic situation in Chile has become extremely worrying. There has been and continues to be a dangerous deterioration in the economy. More than 35% of the active population is unemployed, production levels are falling, the national debt is now more than 22 billion, the currency has depreciated in value, there is an increased dependence on outside and a continuous social decline. Last but not least, the earthquake of four months ago destroyed more than 10 000 homes and the relief aid sent to Chile from the free world did not reach those who most needed it.

I therefore urge the Parliament to impress this message strongly on all its people. I appeal to all the free countries of Europe and to international pressure to extend their support to the Chilean people.

It is also necessary, ladies and gentlemen, that our institutions, following the example of the Parliament, send emergency aid to Chile, whatever the cost, via the nongovernmental organizations if we want to see an improvement in the situation.

To finish I would like to say — and this is putting all kinds of sentimentality aside — that the situation is very serious. A visit to the 'poblacions' where Father Puga was murdered proved that today the Chilean people cannot wait any longer. Giving our support to the Chilean people can be seen as a humanitarian exercise on the part of our institution. I urge the Parlia-

Saby

ment to vote unanimously in favour of this motion for a resolution.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (S). — *(DE)* Ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group urges you to approve the motion for a resolution tabled by us for the following three reasons. The first is of an institutional nature: this resolution is intended to prevent the Council from signing the proposed cooperation agreement with Pakistan in July this year, as the European Parliament has not received any information on it nor has it been asked to collaborate in any way.

(Applause from the left)

The Commission did not give us any information. The Luns-Westerterp procedure was not used, and the President of the Council was not present on 25 June when he should have been. We were not to blame that the procedure did not come to anything. Now the signing ceremony is planned for the end of July and it would amount to a complete snub for this Parliament if the Council were to go ahead with it.

The second reason why we must prevent the agreement being signed at this particular point is based on objections to its content. Martial law is still in force. The elections which took place at the beginning of this year — now five months ago — were intended to create the semblance of democracy for the benefit of outsiders. The political parties were in any case excluded from the elections, and Amnesty International still reports widespread violations of human rights.

We are not against the conclusion of a cooperation agreement in principle, but are of the opinion that genuine steps must be seen to be made in the democratic process. For that the Community needs to familiarize itself well with the region over a longer period of time and incorporate the area in a regional policy.

Such a thing, however, does not exist. In addition, we believe that the dialogue should be continued with Pakistan on whether she now finally intends to become a signatory of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(Applause from the left)

We consider it to be quite unacceptable if this issue is not discussed.

Thirdly, before the Commission signs a separate, more comprehensive agreement with Pakistan, it should make it clear what kind of policy it intends to pursue *vis-à-vis* the whole region, otherwise it could lead to contradictions in policy. We would like to know the overall outline first before we agree to individual measures.

For the benefit of those Members who are still in doubt as to whether they should vote in favour, I would like to remind them of the following arguments. There already exists a trade agreement between the Community and Pakistan which has been in force since 1976. There is therefore no pretext for any particular urgency. Secondly, if you believe that we should help the Afghan refugees, we too are one hundred percent in favour, but we also agree with Mr Davignon who said before this House on 23 May 1984 that the European Community should provide this kind of aid as part of refugee relief granted by international institutions.

Ladies and gentlemen, do not reject this motion for a resolution! Take your duty as a Parliament seriously and do not shirk your responsibility!

(Applause from the left)

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, the remarks which have just been made are wrong from beginning to end.

(Protests from the left)

Firstly, we are not dealing with an institutional question. The blame lies at our door if some institutional mistake has been made, and not at that of Pakistan. Secondly, the situation in Pakistan has been interpreted completely wrongly. Do not forget that the Afghan war is raging on Pakistan's borders, that there are constant border violations on the part of the Soviet forces and that there are 3 million refugees in that country. But we do not care about them, we are interested only in other things. In reality we are dealing with a quite special situation which we must take into account when concluding an agreement with Pakistan.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

I would also like to point out that all the facts have been misrepresented from beginning to end: of course there is no democracy in Pakistan as it exists in the Federal Republic of Germany. But, Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul, what is it like in Nicaragua? Is it by any chance far better? Certainly not, but your heart bleeds for Nicaragua.

(Protests from the left)

I would just like to stress that Pakistan has a constitution, that elections have taken place — even if they were not the elections . . .

(Protests)

. . . which measure up to our ideals — and that there is a certain degree of freedom of expression there. If we were to apply the loftiest European criteria to all our partners, we would not be able to conclude agree-

Habsburg

ments with any of the ACP countries. I would therefore urge you to vote against this motion for a resolution and to do what is in the interests of Europe, freedom and the people of Pakistan and Afghanistan.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Prag (ED). — Mr President, we as a group have no problem with the resolutions by Mrs Péry, by Mr Mallet or by Mr Saby. We shall vote for them. But on the other two we have the gravest misgivings.

On Indonesia, let me say first that I personally am against the death penalty, but my group is certainly not in favour of a French Communist — a member of the most Stalinist Communist party in Western Europe

(Mixed reactions)

— attempting to give lessons in democracy to a friendly country.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

That is either a joke in the worst taste, or an outrageous piece of nerve.

On Pakistan, well, I can only say that I am amazed that Mr Arndt has seen fit — perhaps in an unguarded moment — to sign this resolution. This is a mass of inaccuracy, innuendo and political ineptitude. Perhaps Mr Arndt failed to read it.

The resolution talks about general elections being preceded by mass arrests of opposition party leaders — wrong, it was not so. Indeed, now there are perhaps half-a-dozen or eight political prisoners in Pakistan.

(Protests from the left)

There is no use shouting, the facts speak for themselves. There is no press censorship in Pakistan. Martial law continues only with regard to a few paragraphs, and those will be abrogated shortly. The resolution talks about a new constitution. The constitution now in force was promulgated in 1973. What on earth is this extraordinary resolution talking about? No one claims that the situation in Pakistan is perfect, but it is nothing like what we see here.

Mr De Vries (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, a few months ago our Parliament passed a dignified resolution protesting against the death sentence passed on Mr Munir, the former trade union official, and which was carried out after long years of imprisonment.

The resolution was proposed by four of the largest groups in this Parliament and was based on the universal declaration of human rights. It emphatically urged

the Indonesian government to refrain from further executions.

Mr President, this resolution did not go unnoticed in Indonesia. Our Parliament was able to profit this week from the visit by a delegation of parliamentarians from the ASEAN countries to clear up some of the misconceptions that they held. I hope that the Indonesian authorities will heed the urgent call by this Assembly which represents 270 million Europeans.

In that context, Mr President, the Wurtz resolution is superfluous. It is framed in provocative language and my group has no wish to provoke.

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — *(IT)* Mr President, although the Commission has not been called on directly to give its opinion on the questions regarding the resolutions tabled by Mrs Péry, Mr Saby, Mr Mallet and Mr Wurtz, we would nevertheless like to express our deep concern for the low regard in which human rights are held in certain countries and our solidarity with those whose lives are in jeopardy.

Turning to the resolution tabled by Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul and Mr Arndt, it is also clear that the Commission cannot tolerate any violation of human rights and indeed it has never hesitated to make this clear to the Pakistan authorities. The Commission would remind the proposers that until the date of the elections was announced, no negotiations were held with Pakistan. The Commission also agrees that the election campaign was not carried out in accordance with the standards which would be required in the Member States of the Community. Nonetheless, and one passage in the resolution points this out, there was a high turnout at the ballot box and the voting conditions did not prevent the downfall of a good number of government ministers. The newly elected Government and Parliament have on several occasions expressed their desire to put an end to the exceptional measures introduced under martial law. The Commission therefore feels that a first tentative step has been taken towards the restoration of democracy and that this should be encouraged. In view of the constitutional changes underway in Pakistan, the Commission feels that the maintenance of the political balance between the countries of the region, the geopolitical position of Pakistan in relation to the conflict in Afghanistan, which is placing an extremely heavy burden on Pakistan with many millions of Afghan refugees fleeing to that country, justify the negotiation of an agreement providing for wider cooperation.

As to the procedure, the Commission regrets that it was not possible to hold the customary meeting between the President-in-Office and the various parliamentary committees under the Luns-Westerterp procedure. These meetings were postponed twice in succession and on neither occasion was this the fault

Ripa di Meana

of the Commission, which is aware that there has been frequent contact between Parliament and Council about the negotiations and hopes that they can take place as soon as possible so that the agreement can be signed on 23 July, as scheduled. The Commission feels that a decision not to sign the agreement could damage relations between the Community and Pakistan. I would remind the honourable members that the signing of the agreement in no way prejudices the right of the Parliament to express its own opinion on the subject. Only after Parliament has expressed this opinion will the Council be requested to approve a regulation concluding the agreement between the two parties.

President. — The debate is closed.

(By successive votes, Parliament adopted resolutions Docs. B2-698/85, B2-699/85 and B2-707/85, and rejected motions for resolutions B2-700/85 and B2-710/85)

Lord Bethell (ED). — Mr President, there have been a number of requests to you to check a number of these votes. The rules are quite clear on this point. If one Member asks for a vote to be checked, you do, as I understand it, have to have an electronic check.

President. — Lord Bethell, on the basis of the check which I took, there was a clear majority against. All the other votes have gone exactly the same way, and I think it would be wasting the time of the House.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S). — *(DE)* On a point of order, I should like to ask whether half of this Parliament still takes itself seriously if it allows itself to be deprived of a parliamentary right, namely that of stating an opinion.

President. — Well, I am afraid that that was not a true point of order.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, after three hours the topical and urgent debate has come to an end. I should like to make one remark: we have just had, at the end of the debate, a number of clear attempts to delay matters, for example by the honourable Member Lord Bethell, who requested an electronic check after a motion had been rejected against which he had also voted. So his aim was not to maintain his position, he was simply out to cause a delay.

(Protests and applause)

I can only say that, if some people try in this way to force an item off the agenda, in future we shall have to take a roll-call vote on every single word, and I should like to see what will happen then. I can only urge you

to refrain from this kind of filibustering tactic in future, since otherwise others could try the same thing. This House will only be able to prove itself if it agrees on the basic concept of democracy. In the last half hour we have seen that there is one group which simply does not wish to grasp this.

(Applause from the left)

President. — Mr Arndt, I have noted your comments. You are in a position to bring this up with the other political group leaders, and perhaps it can be sorted out for a future debate. Unless someone wants to raise an absolutely different point of order . . . Mrs Castle, is it completely different?

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, I really do think there should be some protection for those of us on this side of the House against the cowardice of the British Conservatives.

(Protests from the European Democratic benches)

I want to ask, Mr President, whether you will now put to the House the proposal that we vote on all the remaining urgent resolutions without debate. If there is any sense of justice and fair play among the right in this Parliament, they will accept that motion.

(Applause from the Socialist benches)

President. — Under the rules of the House, the only way I can do that is to ask all the speakers to give up their speaking time. If they are not prepared to do that, then we cannot take the motions.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I note that a certain number of Socialist speakers greatly exceeded their speaking time and that you had to urge them to finish and, when they continued speaking, switch off their microphones. This cost us at least five or six minutes.

In this way we have wasted the time which we would have needed to vote on the two motions for resolutions.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — Mrs Veil, I have to say that since I have been in the Chair almost every speaker has gone beyond his time, including one speaker from the Liberal Group who exceeded their speaking time by 50%. It is a fault right around the House and so we get into the situation where we cannot take motions for resolutions under urgent procedure.

(Applause from the left)

President

I ask those speakers who remain whether they will give up their speaking time. If anybody shouts no, then I cannot put the remaining motions to vote.

(Cries of 'No !')

In that case, I am afraid I cannot put them to the vote.

Mr West (S). — Mr President, it might very well be the case that the response to your request did indicate that the remaining speakers, were unwilling to up their speaking time but you did not identify who shouted no and that could have come from anywhere in this Chamber, not necessarily from anyone who had the right to speak. Therefore, I ask, Mr President, that you repeat the request and ask if someone does shout 'No' that they identify themselves.

President. — Mr West, one of the speakers down was Mr Brok, from the European People's Party, and he shouted 'No'. He was one speaker that I knew was on the list, therefore I had to rule as I did.

4. *Income and equal treatment for men and women*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-55/85) by Dame Shelagh Roberts, on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights, on the memorandum presented by the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 695 final — Doc. 2-1759/84) on income taxation and equal treatment for men and women.¹

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, this report which is now before the House is the response of the Committee on Women's Rights to the Commission's memorandum on equal treatment in taxation for men and women.

Perhaps it would be helpful if initially I recalled the history of the events leading up to the publication of this memorandum. It started with a resolution passed by Parliament in 1981, here in Luxembourg, which dealt with a number of aspects of women's rights, including a call for the Commission to present a proposal for a directive on equal treatment for men and women in the taxation systems.

As a result of that resolution, the Commission set up an action programme for 1982-85, which, it is interesting to record, the Council endorsed. The action programme contained proposals; provisions and a statement of intention to implement the principle of equal treatment in taxation. The Commission, as part of the

programme, undertook an analysis of the different tax systems in the member countries, and they have published the results of that very comprehensive study. The results of that study were taken into account in the Commission's memorandum, as is stated on pages 17 and 18.

In the meantime, when the action programme was published, the Committee on Women's Rights decided to monitor the action and the result was that amongst other matters, a report which was prepared by myself was debated in this House in January of 1984. The report contained a detailed analysis of the taxation systems in the various member countries. As I had help from the Commission in drawing up the report they too had the necessary information. The result of that investigation was that I put forward a conclusion and a recommendation to this House that the tax systems in the Member States should be neutral as between married couples both in paid employment or where only one was in paid employment and that the long-term objectives should be a mandatory system of independent taxation. Those recommendations were approved by Parliament and they are endorsed in the Commission's memorandum.

Now given the commitments to equality of treatment and given the three directives already in existence, I think that Parliament is entitled to express keen disappointment that all that has emerged at this stage is a memorandum and not a proposal for a directive.

My report addresses itself to three objectives. First, to place on record our disappointment. Secondly, to reiterate our support for equality of treatment in conformity with the resolution of January 1984 and thirdly, to emphasize that the necessary studies have been undertaken both by this Parliament and by the Commission and that it is time now for action. That is basically the thrust of my report.

If I could just comment on the amendments. They fall broadly into two categories: those which either do not accept the principle of equal treatment or are not satisfied that the arguments have been adduced to justify it and therefore want further studies, and those who would use the report as a vehicle to graft on various aspects of social policy, for example, policies to encourage larger families. I would submit to the House that such amendments are not appropriate in what is a quite clear and straightforward document calling for the directive on the equal treatment for men and women in taxation. It is not intended to promote all sorts of other social policies.

I have spoken as rapporteur. I would like now to take some of my group speaking time to make just a few personal comments. Paragraph 8 of the report before the House was inserted against my wishes in committee by a majority of one. It is my view that this paragraph is largely in the same category as the amendments dealing with social policy. It gives scope for

¹ The oral question, with debate (Doc. B 2-596/85) tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and others to the Commission was included in this debate.

Dame Shelagh Roberts

endless argument. Allowances and reductions should relate to the income of the person who has actually incurred the expenditure, but suppose they had incurred it on behalf of somebody else. The costs of childcare and domestic help incurred to enable a job to be held must be tax deductible; is that to be without limit, and if so what would it cost? Flat rate allowances relating to household expenditure should be shared on a proportional basis between the two partners; why only between the two partners? There may be other members of the household with incomes. These are aspects of social policy which may in themselves be very desirable but I do not want them cluttering up my resolution and giving the Commission an opportunity to say that there is much in my report which needs far more examination and far more discussion. I hope therefore that the House will pass Amendments Nos 1 and 2 which were tabled by Mrs Daly. If they do, the report will return, in my humble opinion, to its former pristine self as succinct, straightforward and simple! A call for action. We want a proposal for a directive and not further talk!

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE), *draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.* — (NL) Madam President, like the Committee on Women's Rights, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has devoted a great deal of attention to the tabled memorandum on equal treatment and taxation for men and women. The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment does, however, regret that this is only a memorandum and not a draft directive as has frequently been demanded by Parliament. I am referring here to reports and debates on the position of women in Europe in 1981 and in 1984. In both reports and debates, there was extensive coverage of the unequal position of women as far as income tax is concerned. In 1984 Parliament even made a full analysis of the situation in the various Member States and here I refer to the first report by Mrs Roberts. In itself, it is quite understandable that the Commission should want to repeat this analysis and I am referring here to the study by experts on which the tabled memorandum is based. What is incomprehensible is that the Commission, though reaching the same conclusions as the Parliament in 1981 and 1984, merely produced a memorandum that again repeats all the issues involved. Everyone had expected the Commission to put forward a directive and if the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment had its way, we would want the memorandum withdrawn to give room for specific legislation with the memorandum serving as additional information.

Having said that, Madam President, I would like to make a couple of comments on the contents of the memorandum. In the European Community four income tax systems are in operation: a joint-assessment system, a splitting system, a family quotient system and a system of separate assessment. The Commission on Social Affairs and Employment has again studied

all four systems. Firstly, we examined whether these systems respect the European principle of equal pay for equal work. The research report on which the memorandum is based shows that every system in which taxation is based on the combined incomes of the man and the woman results in heavier taxation for married people, unequal treatment for married women and sometimes also unequal treatment for married men. Unequal treatment for married women is most serious with the joint assessment system. It is, however, also apparent with the splitting system and with the family quotient system although here the prejudice to the wife is to some extent eased at the expense of the husband. The system of separate assessment is the only one to give some guarantee of equal treatment and you will therefore not be surprised to hear that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment prefers a system of separate assessment.

The second criterion on which taxation systems were assessed, was the woman's equality of access to the employment market. The Commission's study shows that where the incomes of the man and woman are combined for taxation purposes, women could be discouraged from carrying out paid work. That is particularly true of the joint-assessment system but also for the splitting and family quotient systems and is particularly true where the woman's income is lower than that of the man, for example because she is working part-time or because her qualifications are lower. Here too, separate assessment systems are not effected in this way and that is a second point in the system's favour as far as the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment is concerned. Incidentally, these two features, equal net income and the discouragement of paid work by women, have a side effect on married people who are both working. The increased taxation can discourage young people from marriage and we believe that this can be a particularly harmful situation. We can therefore also say that the splitting system and the family quotient system do in fact militate against marriage.

The third criterion for assessing taxation systems was the pattern of tax deductions. Not much need be said here. Anyone looking at the range of deductions in the Member States cannot but see that these often concern aspects that are important for men and much less so aspects important for women. For example, day care is deductible in only a few Member States and then only to a limited extent. Everyone knows that day care is often a prerequisite if a woman is to be able to go out to work. We therefore urge that these kinds of costs be deductible in all Member States so that the taxation systems are not only more 'family friendly' but also more 'children friendly'.

It is clear from the proceeding comments that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment prefers a system of separate taxation that does not discriminate against people, that does not discourage them from working, from marrying or from remaining

Maij-Weggen

unmarried if that is what they wish and a system that fairly and evenly divides tax deductions and takes into account the needs of children. The Netherlands, Ireland and Denmark almost meet these criteria and Italy does so almost completely. If the other Member States are to reach this point, it will be necessary to have a directive including all these features. The Roberts report provides a well-worded analysis of all these issues particularly in Article 8 and I am extremely surprised that in her personal statement Mrs Roberts should have said that Article 8 concerns social security. Article 8 contains 8 lines and only one of them refers to social security. All other lines concern taxation and therefore consider that no false arguments should be advanced in order to have a very useful Article scrapped. And I hope that no group will fall into that trap.

Madam President, if Article 8 can also be accepted, I believe that we have a very good report from Mrs Roberts and I hope that, for this reason, every group will be able to support the report including Article 8.

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), rapporteur. — I don't know whether there was an error in the interpretation or whether Mrs Maij-Weggen misunderstood me. I did not refer to social security. I referred to social policy, which is a totally different thing.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S), draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. — (NL) Madame President, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy has studied the Roberts report and the memorandum from those points of view within its jurisdiction, i.e. in essence the economic ones.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs supports and welcomes the recommendations against fiscal cumulation of the incomes of married people as laid out in Mrs Roberts report. This is first and foremost because it is of course economic nonsense to discriminate against women who comprise a valuable contribution to the economy. The analysis shows quite clearly that aggregation of the incomes of married people, whether or not tempered by a splitting system, almost always results in discrimination against a married working woman. That discrimination is therefore economic nonsense. Moreover, we have established that the taxation systems vary from Member State to Member State. They range from a full joint-assessment system to separate taxation of married people by way of a splitting system. In this way, the same gross wages or gross income would result in varying net incomes depending on the Member State in which the work was carried out. This can influence the free flow of manpower and services since these measures mean that employers do not have the same access to part of the employment market. If work by married women is punished in this way, married women will be less likely

to join the labour market. In this way, incidentally, there is a distortion of competition even if it is between employers.

An employer wishing to give his employees in the various Member States the same net income will have to pay a much higher gross income in a Member State where joint-assessment exists than in another Member State where married people are taxed separately. This can influence the choice of a firm's location and therefore distort the operation of the Common Market.

Finally, the tax deduction system, as I believe Mrs Roberts has already pointed out, is completely different from one Member State to another — including the deductibility of costs for the rearing of children. We therefore think that there should be a directive that not only forbids aggregation for tax purposes but also standardizes the tax deduction system.

Miss Tongue (S). — Mr President, I welcome the opportunity to debate this important subject, although I do have to say that I regret that it has taken the Commission four years to come forward with its memorandum. This is how long it has been since Parliament first called for a draft directive on equal treatment and taxation. I do appreciate, however, that a lack of staff could well have been one of the reasons.

We would naturally have preferred a draft directive rather than a memorandum as a legal basis for Community action in eradicating indirect discrimination against women exists and has existed for over a decade.

I would also like to thank the rapporteur for the work she has done in preparing an admirable report. I regret, however, that some people who failed to engage in our discussion in the committee have seen fit to table a plethora of amendments with which we do not agree.

Whilst we have seen a prolonged economic crisis, during which women's unemployment has soared and the policies of many right-wing governments have forced many women back into the home, into unpaid caring work, the Commission has, thank goodness, forged ahead with legislation to improve equality between men and women, particularly in access to employment.

Needless to say, indirect discrimination still exists wherever one turns. This is very much the case with the majority of tax systems in the Member States, which work to benefit the so-called 'traditional' family, e.g. husband working outside the home with dependent wife and two children. This so-called traditional family now only represents 10% of all families in my country and, I am sure, elsewhere in the Community. Many of these tax systems involve a very heavy marginal taxation of the family's second income

Tongue

earner, which, given that women do not enjoy equal pay, invariably means that the woman of the household is the lower wage earner. So in many situations such tax systems serve as a strong disincentive for a wife to join the labour market. The Dutch Government has recently changed its tax system for the worse, so that now two salaries are taxed higher than one. Again this will deter many women from taking up work outside, the home.

The first three EEC directives, as we know, outlawed direct and indirect discrimination based on sex or marital status. However, here we are in 1985 with the majority of EEC Member States having tax and social security systems which treat men and women differently and women as inferior to men. These discriminatory systems also run completely counter to the small progress we have made in promoting equality in employment and in promoting the independence of women working inside and outside the home. In my own country it is the man of the household who fills out the income tax returns and is under no obligation to declare his income to his wife. She, however, has to declare hers to him. Under this system she is considered merely as an appendage to him. She does not exist as far as the tax system goes. I cannot underline enough how I deplore the failure of governments of all political philosophies to eradicate such discrimination against women.

I would, in fact, like to see Mrs Heinrich's amendment as an amendment to the original text. Women feel a deep sense of injustice and a distorted view of their earning capacity, as Dame Shelagh Roberts has said, under the present system. However, as Mrs Heinrich pointed out this is also a result of the continuing low esteem in which society holds women's gainful employment. Worse still, in the United Kingdom we have something that I believe exists nowhere else in the EEC, unless possibly it exists in a more disguised form. I refer to the famous MMTA — the married man's tax allowance. This is a rather outdated institution that should have been made extinct a rather large number of years ago. It is an insult to women and should be paid to the parent in principal care of children in the form of increased child benefits. In the United Kingdom alone this would mean a cool £ 4 240 million for redistribution in child benefits.

I trust the Commission will bear this point in mind when drafting any future directive in this field. That is why I ask the House to support the amendments tabled by Mrs van den Heuvel.

I do not think, as the Commission seems to, that we need more discussion at European level. This is a euphemism for delaying action. Much the same reason is behind Mr Bøgh's amendment. The discrimination is obvious and contravenes EEC legislation and philosophy on equality between men and women. You do not have to be a genius to come to this conclusion when:

1. a women's income is often treated as invisible and as the property of her husband;
2. the State does not think a woman is fit to be considered as an individual, a person in her own right who has a separate existence from her partner;
3. a woman has no privacy in respect of her own income;
4. a woman is not considered fit to handle her own tax affairs.

I would finally reiterate that I look forward to receiving a very rapid response from the Commission in the form of a draft directive ensuring an end to discrimination in taxation. I would like to emphasize that any directive in this field will in no way interfere with Member States' individual control over fiscal policy.

(Applause)

Mrs Braun-Moser (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, the memorandum on income taxation and equal treatment for men and women which we have before us deserves praise for taking up the points which Parliament raised in February 1981 and in January 1984 regarding the position of women. In doing so it acknowledged the unequal treatment in fiscal matters which exists today, and proves that this contradicts the fundamental statements made by Parliament in response to the corresponding three Directives on equal access to the labour market and equal promotion opportunities for women. The memorandum before us is particularly welcome since the Commission has put forward a special programme of action to promote equality of opportunity for women, of which a central theme will be a comparative analysis of the various systems of taxation.

Current evidence shows that with the number of working women in the Community on the increase — now standing at an average of well over 38% of the active population — there has been a change in the structure of the labour market. The traditional family with only one breadwinner which received tax concessions is becoming more and more rare. In most cases the access of women to employment is hampered by the various tax systems; in addition, the woman can be taxed as highly as the man after marriage with the result that she can be discouraged either from getting married or from carrying out her profession because being employed has this disadvantage.

Even though the tax systems differ from one another, we can still ascertain three main obstacles. Firstly, in the case of a joint assessment a sliding income tax scale can lead to a greater tax burden which can deter the woman from working. In any case the married woman pays more tax when assessed jointly than if she were treated as a separate tax unit, and this discrimination can even discourage her from getting married. There

Braun-Moser

are many married couples today who get divorced and then continue to live practically under the same roof whilst enjoying a lighter tax burden.

Secondly, the splitting system has a positive effect only when the wife draws no or only a low income. Since it favours the single earner, it is no longer in keeping with the real situation as it exists today. With both the splitting and the family quotient systems the tax burden has been distributed until now between two or more people. The splitting system presents a particular obstacle to wives who would like to return to work because the tax relief has more or less existed since the date of their marriage. Thirdly, it can be established that it is usually the spouse with the higher income who benefits from the tax-free allowances and tax concessions, and sometimes even only the husband or head of household. Efforts should be made instead to introduce maintenance or child allowances which are paid directly to the eligible parent.

The different forms of discrimination range from tax-free allowances which only the husband receives — as in Greece or the United Kingdom — to taxation systems, such as that in the Netherlands, where the husband receives more tax concessions or the tax-free allowance is not granted to the person who bears the cost of child care. In addition, there is evidence that, for example in England, the tax declaration may only be signed by the husband, who is not required to divulge details of his earnings to his wife.

On behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, and in support of the Dame Shelagh Roberts report, I urge that a Directive be issued as soon as possible which provides for a change in the taxation laws in the Member States and thereby introduces a taxation system which grants equal treatment between men and women as well as between married and unmarried women. Any kind of discrimination should be avoided here. It should also be kept in mind that women should not be denied access to employment and that they should not be discriminated against because of either their sex or their marital status.

The amendments tabled here originate mainly from Mr Van der Waal, who seems to have no faith in the Commission memorandum, or any desire to see an improvement in the position of women. My Group would like to make just two formal amendments to the Roberts report, which receives my full support; apart from these points, I would approve the rest as it stands.

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

Mrs Daly (ED). — Mr President, my group welcomes the Commission's initiative on the subject of income

taxation and equal treatment for men and women following the 1984 Roberts report into the situation of women. Indeed we congratulate Dame Shelagh on the work she has put into this report and the work that she has pursued unequivocally on this subject in the past.

We very much regret that the Commission has not yet put forward any proposal for a directive on this extremely important subject. The Commission indeed appears still to be content with the recommendation. We sincerely hope that the initiative taken by the British Government in promising a Green Paper to propose the separate taxation of men and women will be seen as a step in bringing about some genuine reform of fiscal legislation. What we do not want is to wait another five years. We hope that it will come about much more quickly and that the Commission will take note of this move.

I said 'important subject' because in substance it relates to much more than money. In answer to a question in our national parliament recently, as to the impact on jobs of single transferable tax allowance, the Minister of State's reply was that the move to fully transferable tax allowances would alleviate the poverty and employment traps both of which are to be discussed in the forthcoming Green Paper.

There can be no doubt that existing directives have proved inadequate to ensure equal treatment in fiscal matters, in that discrimination is seen still to subsist in certain cases. There are still countries in the Community whose fiscal legislation deters women from pursuing their right to equal access to employment and to promotion. As previous reports have shown, there are areas of discrimination which do need correction. It has been shown that a woman's income is often treated as belonging to her husband so that the woman has no separate existence as a taxable person. It is quite possible that in many cases a married woman is completely ignorant of household income and declarations for tax purposes.

Secondly, a married woman has no privacy in respect of her own income. Thirdly, a woman is not entrusted with the handling of her own tax affairs. Indeed, tax deductions are often set against the husband's income and not the wife's, which means that where income tax is withheld at source by the employer, the wife will have *vis-à-vis* her husband a proportionately greater amount of tax withheld.

The idea that the husband as head of the household was the provider and thus responsible for the financial support of the family may have reflected social reality in the past. But we are now in 1985 and it no longer corresponds to the modern woman's conception of her role in society. Our group believes that a woman in salaried employment is entitled to the responsibility of managing her own income, and for these reasons we consider that a Community directive is essential. We think it should establish two fundamental principles. I

Daly

want to repeat 'fundamental principles'. The income taxation system should avoid any form of direct or indirect discrimination against women by reference to their sex, marital status or family situation. Secondly, the income taxation system should avoid any direct or indirect fiscal pressures which deter women from working. We know that other groups in Parliament agree with these principles and we want to stress to them the need to make progress in this field with a greater sense of urgency. For that reason we urge them to support Amendments Nos 1 and 2. My group believes that paragraph 8 as it stands only dilutes the case. Miss Tongue said that we had already waited four years for the Commission to come up with the latest document. The case has already been proven and if we dilute the case by bringing in these other social policies, we will, we believe, wait at least another four years before any action is taken.

In fact, there has been no examination of the implications of the additional points made in paragraph 8. There is no doubt that if we pass paragraph 8 as it is, we will only give national governments and indeed the Commission an excuse for procrastinating again over drawing up a directive which all of this House has on a number of occasions said they feel is necessary. I urge Parliament to ensure that we take one step forward and not three steps backwards. We have called for a directive twice before. May I please beg the Commissioner to ensure that this time we will be 'third time lucky'.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I would be grateful if you would not begin my speaking time yet, because I would like — if I may — to raise two points of order.

The first is to say that, although certain worthy members are managing to do so, keeping within the speaking time is practically impossible, since there is no 'timer' here as there is at Strasbourg.

The second point is to protest against the fact that the previous speaker did not allow me to speak in the previous debate, although I asked to do so. I was evidently too far away, or maybe I was on the wrong side.

My speaking time can begin now.

Mr President, I want to start by discussing the question tabled by a number of members of the Communist Group and which was included in the debate on the Roberts report. It concerned the forthcoming Conference in Nairobi and requested a clarification of the position of the ten Member States of the European Community, a position which will be of some importance as the Women's Decade, which we hope will be followed by a second, draws to a close, because there remains so much to be done for women.

Our request to the Commission to ensure a common position stems chiefly from the very unsatisfactory document presented by the Commission itself, with its very grudging acknowledgement of the positive role played by Parliament in the discussion on equality, equal opportunities and positive action. The Commission document seems to have been put together very hurriedly and its tone is very bureaucratic. We are sorry to have to say this. It does not even acknowledge what has been achieved by the Commission itself, nor the working party set up for equality, nor the European Parliament's Committee on Women's Rights, which has done so much in this field, some of it in conjunction with the Commission.

May we remind you that the Commission will not be represented in Nairobi, although the European Community and its institutions, in other words the European Communities' Delegation, will have to present a united front. True, Parliament is only an observer, but it is precisely for this reason that the Council, at the request of the Commission, must see to it that there is a meeting with the delegates of the ten states so that there will be a constructive exchange of views and so that we can adopt a common position.

One more point on this subject. Why is the Commission against a second Women's Decade? Is it perhaps, as has been suggested, because of the cost? This is not a valid reason in my view because the cost should always, and especially in this case, be weighed against the benefits. Let us not forget the total failure of the Summit of the Social Affairs Ministers, at which not a single directive which affected women was approved. We cannot accept that the women of Europe do not need a second decade. With the Nairobi Conference just around the corner, we need answers.

I have very little time left, Mrs Roberts, to give my opinion on your resolution, which my group will also support. As an Italian, I can assure you that the separation of incomes — which has existed in Italy for ten years — is very satisfactory and has not engendered family conflict. If anything, it has prevented taxation punishing the married woman and thus marriage itself. If nothing else, it has prevented fictitious separations for tax purposes and it has in many cases prevented women from voluntarily giving up work outside the home because they were paying too much tax. So, in the light of our own experience, we support any attempt to achieve individual taxation.

Here, briefly, is the reason for our amendment deleting paragraph 8, which is in agreement with what the rapporteur has already said. This paragraph really has nothing to do with taxation, even though it is introduced as a fiscal point. The concept which this paragraph introduces makes it even more inappropriate to a directive regarding equal treatment for taxation of men and women. Paragraph 8 should, in fact, request that the criteria for a directive be laid down. Instead,

Squarcialupi

as it stands, it does not define a fiscal criterion but something very different, as Mrs Roberts said.

I have mentioned the word 'Directive' more than once because we are in favour of a directive and we feel that a recommendation would be totally inadequate. We know that this is an ambitious goal but it is what we must press for if we really want to serve our citizens, in this case women in particular, who should be individually taxed. It should not be forgotten that women are people too!

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, it is good to see that women in all the Groups broadly agree with one another. Now I hope that this will also be apparent in the voting and that the men will also do their bit.

In its memorandum, the Commission rightly argues that equal treatment of men and women in taxation legislation is a necessary supplement to the three existing European directives on women. Equal treatment should namely not stop at formal recognition. The aim is to guarantee fully, in practice as well, the independent and equal position of women in society. And thus of course also in taxation legislation, for here too women should not be regarded as — occasionally pretty — appendages of men.

As many have already stated, various Member States still have systems of tax legislation that discourage married women from taking up part-time or full-time employment. These systems we would classify as 'negative activities'. They are reprehensible. Even my own country, the Netherlands, which broadly speaking does not come off too badly, still has various discriminating elements in its income taxation. The tax-free allowance for single earners, for example, is considerably higher than that for joint earners. This in indirect discrimination giving an advantage to one sex since it so happens that single earners are still generally speaking men. Furthermore, the costs of rearing children are not tax-deductible, which again deters women from seeking work.

My country has recently introduced a so-called 'joint earners' law. This is a piece of careless legislation. Extremely detrimental to low-earning women, who unfortunately still make up the majority. As a result, around 15 000 women left their jobs in the first six months of this year because the joint earners law removed the financial incentive to continue working. Although a so-called correction mechanism is now being introduced, those 15 000 women have lost their jobs all the same.

This careless attitude to the interests of women was also evident when Dutch social security legislation was modified. As with taxation legislation, the issue at

stake was the fundamental question of whether women can be active on the labour market with their own rights and duties or whether the traditional idea of the family is to be maintained — with the man earning the bread and the woman slicing it.

Fortunately, the Dutch and European Parliaments, together with the Commission, have performed their watchdog function here. This case shows that we have to be extremely alert on tax legislation questions and that a compulsory directive is indeed necessary. A minimum solution, or a non-committal memorandum as proposed by the Commission, will not force governments to act, allowing them to leave it at high-sounding words.

Unimpeded access for women to the labour market is also important for women returning to employment after working in the family, a subject on which I am drawing up a report for the Committee on Women's Rights.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal and Democratic Group will gladly vote for the Roberts Report, and endorses the call for a directive based on an individual approach to men and women in taxation legislation. Solidarity with women should not stop when the tax-man enters the scene.

(Applause)

Mrs Lemass (RDE). — Mr President, I wonder what is the significance if any, of the fact that all the speakers on this topic have been women. I hope it doesn't mean that the men are somewhere else and are not going to support us in the equality that we are seeking. I wish to congratulate Dame Shelagh Roberts on the excellent work that she has done in preparing her report and to state publicly that I very much support the conclusions contained in that report. I welcome the fact that this report does not confine itself solely to theory and is more than just a simple plea for equal treatment of men and women with regard to income taxation.

In the area of personal taxation, equal treatment for women means not only separate taxation of their income, but also a reduction in the costs which must be covered by that income. I am referring to the outgoings in respect of daycare for young children and, subsequently, their schooling. Separate taxation would ensure respect for women as individuals, whatever their personal circumstances, single, belonging to a couple or single parents. Separate taxation should also allow women to choose to go out to work or to choose to bring up their children without being subjected to pressure because of the tax implications for their income or for the joint income of the couple. Laws on social matters must take account of the changing relationships between couples. The traditional relationship of the 1960s, where the man was

Lemass

almost always the only one to go out to work and occupied a dominant position as head of the household, has given way to more equal arrangements in which both parents pursue a career. This, I believe, is true of two out of every three couples under the age of 40 in France.

Another social trend which has been confirmed by recent surveys is the general attachment to the idea of the family. Ironically, however, the taxation systems in certain countries, while originally designed to promote the family, marriage and childbearing, actually penalizes married couples. This fact has been recognized and many people declare that they are single and living alone or cohabiting because the tax advantages in respect of their children are then double those of a married couple.

It is certainly not for the state and the governments of the Member States to influence the personal choices of the individual. It is, however, their duty to take measures to facilitate the choices made by families and women. Separate taxation has the merit of both respecting the choice made by women and protecting their individuality. However, I cannot help wondering what action will be taken on those ideas, and on the proposals by the Committee on Women's Rights given that the Commission has played into the hands of the Council of Ministers by submitting a memorandum rather than a directive which would have obliged it to take some step forward.

Separate taxation for men and women touches on the sensitive issue of a Community tax policy. This is why the Council, I believe, is being careful and the Commission has been diffident.

(Applause)

Mrs Piermont (ARC). — *(DE)* Mr President, I would like to comment briefly on three points, and at the same time make the request that our amendments be approved. Firstly, to submit a new memorandum on the equal treatment of men and women in fiscal matters would appear to us just about as effective as giving the governments of the Member States a legal treatise for bedtime reading. It was with good reason that Parliament called on the Commission for a binding Directive 18 months ago, on 17 January 1984. As we can see, this was in vain. The Commission was composed and is still composed today only of men. The likes of them benefit from the existing legislation. Why then should they hurry to change it?

Secondly, it seems that the rapporteur has herself become a victim of the prevalent ideology when she says in point D that fiscal discrimination leads many women to have a distorted appreciation of their earnings capacity. The opposite is in fact the case. Their assessment is extremely realistic given today's situation. The discriminating tax laws are an expression of

how low society rates working women and at the same time perpetuates this attitude. To offload on to women some kind of guilt complex on top of the clear material disadvantages encountered seems unacceptable to us.

Thirdly, a number of tax-free allowances are envisaged under point 8, in the fifth and sixth indentations, to cover certain expenses, such as child care. Tax-free allowances, as we know well enough, only benefit those on a high income and therefore discriminate against the majority of women who earn less. Over and above that, paid domestic help, which is intended to allow a married woman to go out to work, is only feasible for the few people on a high income. In effect tax-free allowances or not, this lies beyond the reach of most people anyway. What we need here are flat-rate allowances across the board for child care or household expenditure, which would be paid out to the one who has responsibility for the children. If both spouses share this responsibility, the allowances would likewise be shared between the two.

One word now about the amendments which have been tabled. One of the anonymous macho members of this Parliament has deservedly been exposed. Mr Van der Waal dares to speak of 'apparent unequal treatment', to demand the removal of the most important demands in the motion for a resolution and to support the continued use of the title head of household. We urge him to donate his outdated ideas to a museum for their antique value, so that when reading the name of the donor future generations will be amazed at the absurd ideas which once existed.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Lehideux (FR). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think you can sum up the Dame Shelagh Roberts report by saying that it is outstanding in every respect and that it covers in exact detail all the aspects of the situation. Everyone who has spoken before me has referred to it and explained the situation in their respective countries.

I would like to say finally that Europe, such as it has been referred to during the course of this part-session, is without doubt under threat in its institutions and no-one knows how it will develop in the years to come following the Milan summit. However, it is being threatened even more by a fall in the birth rate and by a still more dramatic decrease in population. We think it would be a good idea to harmonize the tax systems throughout the Community and are, understandably, enough, very much in favour that there should be equality of taxation between men and women. In addition, we very much regret that certain systems of income tax penalize, sometimes very unjustly, married couples, notably in my country, where privileges are given to couples who live together out of wedlock. However, it is above all the family unit which serves as

Lehideux

a basis of society to which we should give priority, which we must help first and foremost with all the measures, particularly fiscal, which we have at our disposal. It is in fact the family unit which will save Europe, since Europe depends on it for its survival.

We would therefore have liked to see Parliament implement a forceful and dynamic family policy. Since I was elected to Parliament I have been calling for the implementation of such a family policy but still no-one has listened. We want financial aid: a salary for mothers, a pension for mothers of families, tax concessions and a housing allowance. We would also like to see special emphasis given to tax measures applicable to families because, and don't be mistaken, fiscal policy is one of the means at the disposal of Member States which would serve to redress the dramatic population balance in Europe. I felt that Dame Shelagh Roberts was alluding to the amendments which I have tabled on behalf of my Group. Unfortunately, I think that these amendments will be rejected. They are amendments referring to the family. For it is still amazing to see in this Parliament that reports presented on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights never refer to the family. Of course we would like to see the lot of European women improved in many respects but we would also like them to realize that they are the mothers of families and that they must think about the family unit. Perhaps they can earn their living together with their husband, Mrs Larive, but they can also earn it along with their husband for the benefit of their children and share it within the family unit. Perhaps this would be the best solution.

(Mixed reactions)

President. — I now call on Mr van der Waal, the first male voice!

(Applause)

Mr Van der Waal (NI). — *(NL)* Thank you, Mr President, I will wait and see if this applause is still forthcoming when I have finished what I have to say.

Mr President, choosing a particular taxation system is not purely a technical matter. Such a choice is also based on standards governing one's view of man and society. If we go by the Bible, we do not see society as a collection of independent, equal individuals, but as a structure consisting of families, the smallest but at the same time most complete communities in which man and wife, together with other members of the family, carry a unique form of responsibility for one another. Splitting this nucleus of society into separate parts will we believe have consequences no less drastic than splitting the atom in physics.

This view of the family as the cornerstone of society is a confirmation of the fundamental equality of man

and woman and does not prejudice the equal rights of women to access to the labour market. On the other hand, the value of women does not depend mainly on their economic dependence or independence of men. We accordingly advocate a tax incentive system that benefits those people who have opted for a situation in which one of the two partners is the breadwinner. In addition, such a system should prevent the family from being placed in such a financial position that the woman is forced to acquire her own income or be economically dependent on the man.

Although the present report does not totally ignore the 'ability to pay' principle that we advocate, it nevertheless opts for an individual approach to taxpayers. Our view of the family, however, leads us to advocate a splitting system. We believe this is in line with the PPE election programme, which likewise rejects the individualistic approach in favour of the family. Within the splitting system, the level of the family coefficient can be varied to take into account differing situations and incomes and avoid unfairness. At all events, such a system does away with the tax progression which may otherwise deter many women from working. It can also take account of the savings that arise from living together in a single household. The objection that single persons would pay more tax than married people under this system, as argued by the Commission, can be met by introducing a division factor or a higher tax-free allowance.

Finally, we would argue that any directive advocating an individual approach should offer people the chance of opting for taxation on an individual basis or in accordance with the splitting system.

(Applause from the right)

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, Mr Van der Waal stated that the philosophy he had just expounded is in line with my party's programme. However, I should like to emphasize that he would do better to leave the interpretation of this party programme to those members representing this party, and that he should desist from giving a one-sided account of our programme. I find his action extremely regrettable, and should like to have my comment included in the minutes.

President. — Mrs Maij-Weggen, I do not think we can call for a debate on that basis, but you have got your point across and I presume that was the purpose of the exercise.

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I would like to comment not on Dame Shelagh Roberts' report but on the question regarding the World Women's Conference in Nairobi, listed on the agenda to be debated along with the Roberts report.

Lenz

In the next few days the first delegations from all the various countries will be arriving in Nairobi for the World Women's Conference. We will also be going there this weekend. The European Community could have represented its achievements far better at this world conference if it had done what we have been urging it to do over the past few months, namely to prepare with us a document to be presented at this conference. Even today the European Community has not agreed on a document suitable for submission to the World Women's Conference in Nairobi. I would like to point out strongly that this is not the fault of the President-in-Office of the Council, who is to represent the Community there in the next few days, but is because the previous presidency of the Council and also the Commission did not see fit to prepare such a paper in time. The draft with which we are familiar is a particularly weak and vague document. It represents a one-sided summary of the achievements of the Commission and is by no means a document which also reflects in some way the collaboration between the institutions of the European Community. In my opinion the European Community is more than just the Commission, however important that body may be. I do not intend to go into details just now but the Commission could have made it quite clear in this report what it means in this important area of introducing equality for women when the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the ACP Assembly take important measures to back up the Commission's work.

I would like to ask the Commission quite frankly at this point what it actually had in mind by submitting this document in draft form to a World Women's Conference. The draft paints idyllic pictures of the role of women in the Commission's development projects. We have asked the Commission again and again in which area women are actively collaborating and have never received a clear answer. Here, however, we are being treated to a glimpse of some beautiful apparition.

Apart from that, the European Parliament, thank goodness, has passed a resolution to mark its contribution as it were; however, there is not one single reference in the whole of the Commission's document to the European Parliament's questions and resolutions on Nairobi. We will form part of the Community delegation, and you can be sure that I will make a point of discussing this matter with the President-in-Office of the Council in Nairobi. I would like to say one thing to the Commission: it is the guardian of the Treaties, but that does not mean that it should concentrate only on its own achievements; on the contrary, it should concern itself more with the whole of the Community! If the Commission comes out against a new 'women's decade' in its draft, we can still discuss its arguments, but whom did it actually consult about this and with whom did it discuss it? The Commission is against it for reasons of expense. If the flexible approach it advocates means only deadlock or inaction until the

year 2000, then evidence must be brought to show what progress it still has to achieve in this area. The European Parliament will not remain silent.

(Applause)

Mr Filinis (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, we agree with the report drawn up by Dame Shelagh Roberts on equal tax treatment for men and women, a report which acquires particular topicality and importance since the debate on it coincides with the conference in Nairobi to mark the end of Women's Decade.

Roles and values today are different from those of yesterday, and any kind of dependence deprives women of the ability to function as free agents, and this leads to the familiar social and economic impasses. In the belief that making women independent as regards taxation reduces the enormous social and economic imbalances, we agree with the proposals set out in the report on the equal tax treatment of men and women.

However, we should like to point out that the parental or care allowances which it is proposed should replace special tax concessions for men whose wives work exclusively in the home do not help to achieve the more general aim, which is equality between men and women, and for the following reasons:

1. it will mean that women are permanently marginalized;
2. it will mean that women are cut off from the world of work;
3. it will perpetuate the 'man at work, women in the home' pattern.

Despite this, we would regard as a positive move the introduction of a pension for women over 50 who are unable to get work on the one hand because of their age and on the other because of the general economic and social situation during the present crisis.

We should also like to point out that in Greece the wife does submit an individual statement of income, but her name does not appear anywhere on it, and it is the husband who is responsible for settling tax obligations, and it is in his name that the relevant tax receipts are issued.

This is why we have tabled an amendment to paragraph 8 (3), since we consider that it is not enough for each taxable person simply to be taxed separately but that each taxable person must be shown as a separate taxable unit.

We shall vote for the Roberts report and we hope that this resolution goes out as another wish for a successful outcome to the Nairobi conference.

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, may I begin by putting Mrs Piermont's mind at rest because, although I am a member of an all-male Commission, I am also from Italy which, as you are aware, has a system of separate taxation. I therefore do have some understanding of your questions and I believe I am fairly well informed about the subject.

Let me say first of all that Mr Alois Pfeiffer, who is unable to be with us today owing to illness, asked me to say how much both he and the Commission welcomed your lively and enthusiastic support for the Community's initiative on income taxation and equal treatment for men and women.

As you know, the initiative is based on a very detailed analysis of the income tax systems in all the Member States, an analysis which in the main reached the same conclusions as Dame Shelagh Roberts' report, presented on behalf of the committee of inquiry set up to examine the situation of women in the European Community. I intend to talk specifically about taxation and the particular problems faced by women.

The resolution adopted in January 1984, based on this and another eighteen reports, requested the Commission to approve a directive which would ensure equal treatment in taxation.

Now you are coming back to the Commission to ask it again, in very clear terms and with one voice it seems to me, to approve a directive on this subject. You are asking it in fact to speed things up and to clarify its own position. On behalf of the Commission, I take note of the widely supported and urgent request which has resulted from the debate.

Commissioner-in-Office at the time — Ivor Richard, the predecessor of Alois Pfeiffer — told Parliament, in January 1984, that the Commission did not feel that this issue was suitable for Community legislation, partly because the Treaty of Rome gave only limited powers on the matter of income tax and partly because the Commission felt it would be wiser, initially, to raise the issue at Community level by approving — as it did last December — a memorandum to be sent to the Council of Ministers.

After approving your resolution and that of the Economic and Social Committee, the new Commission is hoping that the Council will undertake a more detailed examination of the problem.

The Memorandum was intended basically to illustrate the different tax systems now in force in the European Community and to highlight the problems relating to the equal treatment of men and women for each individual element of the systems.

The Commission still feels that this document contains the necessary facts for a political assessment of the

problem: I think I must stress this, though it must be said that the value of a definition of this kind does have its limitations. Another point is that the Memorandum does not have sufficient technical details. While we accept these limitations, it was not our intention to draw up a document complete in every detail for each individual system, which would be obsolete within as little as six months. The Memorandum in fact illustrates the systems in general and presents many aspects relating to equality in taxation which would require a more detailed discussion and political action.

I, like you, am convinced that it is the Council of Ministers which should now be dealing with this problem. The Commission therefore urges you to press the different ministers to agree to discuss the issue in the Council. There has been strong resistance and Mrs Squarzialupi referred to this in her speech.

The Commission in any case intends to remedy the paucity of technical details in the Memorandum by holding a seminar — which we hope can be organized for early 1986 — to update the more detailed information contained in the 1982 analysis of the income tax systems and submit recommendations for changes to certain systems, to ensure equal treatment for men and women.

As the Commission Memorandum says, its aim is to initiate a Community-level discussion on the effects of the differences in the income tax systems on the equal treatment of men and women on the labour market. The discussion should centre on the diversity of the systems in the Member States and could, we believe, lead to a better understanding of the problems it causes and encourage a more thorough investigation of the current regulations in the Member States.

But after the technical details and discussions comes, ladies and gentlemen, the moment for decision and action. The new Commission is fully aware of this. It does not intend to neglect its official duties, as outlined in its right of initiative.

I will conclude, in reply to requests for clarification in Mr Cinciari Rodano's oral question and in the speeches made by Mrs Squarzialupi and Mrs Lenz, by pointing out that the Commission has taken note of the repeated criticisms of its preparatory document for the Nairobi Conference and acknowledges that a certain amount of self-interest, albeit unwitting, may have entered into it. However, I must point out that when the European Parliament quite rightly asked to be able to be present at the Nairobi Conference the Commission gave its immediate support to this request, which was ultimately accepted. The Commission is also well aware of the considerable part played by this House and by the special Parliament Committee which untiringly pursues the problems of women's rights.

Any point which has not been given adequate attention in the preparatory documents can be looked into

Ripa di Meana

properly at the Nairobi Conference. There will be regular coordination during the Conference itself; the Commission has already approached the Luxembourg Presidency to ensure that, as well as the Commission, there will also be a representative of each Member State of the Community continuously present.

Nothing has been lost. It is simply a matter of overcoming a momentary disagreement and continue to do so in the decisive days at Nairobi.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

5. *Specific regional development measures*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-72/85) by Mr Hutton, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on

the proposals from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 715 final — Doc. 2-1556/84) for:

- I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2617/80 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to overcoming constraints on the development of new economic activities in certain zones adversely affected by restructuring of the shipbuilding industry
- II. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 219/84 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to overcoming constraints on the development of new economic activities in certain zones adversely affected by restructuring of the textile and clothing industry
- III. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2619/80 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to the improvement of the economic and social situation of the border areas of Ireland and Northern Ireland
- IV. a regulation instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to the development of new economic activities in certain zones affected by the implementation of the Community fisheries policy
- V. a regulation relating to the establishment of specific Community regional development measures in 1985 and amending Regulation (EEC) No 1787/84 (COM(85) 243 final — Doc. C 2-52/85).

Mr Hutton (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, this afternoon we are discussing one of the successes of the

European Community's regional policy — the non-quota section of the European Regional Development Fund. Although this has been operating for only three years, it has already had a successful impact well beyond the very limited sums of money which are available through it. Today, the House is being asked to consider whether or not we should approve the Commission's proposal to continue the measures to help create new employment in areas affected by the rundown of the shipbuilding and the textile industries in certain parts of the Community and to improve economic activity along the border in the island of Ireland, as well as adding a new measure to help create new employment in certain areas affected by the rundown of the fishing industry.

In the motion for a resolution the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning broadly welcomed the Commission proposal. We have not attempted to make detailed criticisms in the motion but have restated the principles — such as additionality, participation of the regions and transparency of selection criteria — which Parliament set out in 1979 in its opinion on the first series and again in 1983 in its opinion on the second series. We have tried to be consistent with the positions we adopted on those occasions.

The amendments tabled by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning to the regulations concern two principal matters — the criteria to be used for the selection of the areas which are to benefit from the aid and the level of publicity which should be given to the ERDF contributions to the programmes.

The regulations adopted in 1980 — the first series — did not contain comprehensive and objective criteria for selecting regions, nor did the Commission's proposals for the second series. Parliament adopted amendments to the second series of draft regulations which established much more specific criteria. These were adopted in a modified form by the Council after the Commission had amended its proposals. The committee has retabled the criteria in almost exactly the form adopted by Parliament in 1983. The essential point is that we have established that objective criteria and not political manoeuvring in the Council should determine which region should benefit. In addition, we must insist on the deletion of the criterion stipulating that an area must be nationally assisted before it may benefit under the non-quota programmes, for an essential feature of the non-quota instrument is its flexibility. It should be regarded as a precision instrument which can be applied to relatively small black spots which may be situated in areas not eligible for aid under the ERDF quota section.

Parliament has always tried to ensure that adequate publicity is given to the funding which the ERDF provides. On my visits in Scotland, Northern Ireland and France, I found that whereas a signboard is usually

Hutton

erected on large infrastructure sites, this was not the case on smaller premises. That is why the committee has proposed that we insert a new paragraph in the regulation to reinforce this important principle by imposing a duty on the Member States.

In the course of preparing this report, I visited ERDF-funded non-quota projects in Strathclyde, Armagh and Down, and Toulouse. It seemed to me important to appraise the operation of the existing non-quota measures before coming to a judgement on this proposal to extend them.

I am delighted to be able to report to Parliament that even the relatively small amounts available under the ERDF non-quota section can, if applied in the right way and at the right time, have a substantial effect. It was abundantly obvious that while many people have considerable skills, they are less experienced in running a business. In all of the areas it was interesting to find that ERDF funding was being used as a catalyst to provide advice on business planning and marketing to supplement existing expertise.

ERDF funding has often been the key which has unlocked other sources of finance and assistance far beyond the cost of the aid. In all the places which I visited I was given examples of ways in which this comparatively modest funding had helped not only to establish businesses but to save others and to help others to expand much more quickly than they otherwise could have done, and consequently to expand employment much faster than they had expected to be able to do.

I have no hesitation in recommending to this House both that the existing non-quota measures be extended and that the best of the non-quota programmes should be continued under the new ERDF regulations.

(Applause)

Mrs Mattina (S), *draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy*. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy has examined the four regulations proposed by the Commission to the Council.

Initially, there was no legal basis for the specific measures proposed, because the 1975 regulation on the Regional Development Fund, as you will be aware, was repealed and replaced by the regulation now in force and no provision was made for an extension for specific measures of this type. The Council, should not, therefore, in the first instance, have been able to adopt the regulations in question on the basis of a legal instrument which had expired.

On 29 May this year the Commission did, however, put forward to the Council a proposal for a regulation

to provide the necessary legal basis and funding. Although this has come a little late in the day, it may nevertheless enable a Community measure proposed before in 31 December 1984 finally to get off the ground.

The procedural problems thus dealt with, we come to the proposals themselves. Four regulations are proposed: the first is to extend the geographical scope of ERDF measures to other zones adversely affected by the restructuring of the shipbuilding industry. The original regulation, in fact, concerned only the United Kingdom. It will now extend to a number of areas in France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy.

May I say first of all that I find it very regrettable that when the Council first amended the original regulation in 1984, it did not take into account the requirements of the the Regional Development Fund regulation amended in 1979, which provided that the choice of the zones and regions in which special measures are to be taken be made by the Council on the basis of the Commission's proposal and — I stress — after consultation with the European Parliament.

Furthermore, this choice was to be made without specifying the criteria on which it was based. This time the criteria are specified, but perhaps they are not specific enough. I am thinking primarily of the socio-economic climate in the regions concerned and the assessment of per capita gross domestic product.

The Committee on Economic Affairs feels that it would be better to calculate gross domestic product on the basis of the country's actual economic resources, in other words, the rate of exchange. For the rest, you have only to look at the second periodic report on the social and economic situation in the regions of the Community to realize the difference. Gross domestic product, calculated on the basis of current exchange rates gives a far more accurate reflection of the differences between the regions and their real poverty than does gross domestic product calculated on the basis of purchasing power. The Committee on Economic Affairs therefore wants the criterion proposed by the Commission to be amended, to ensure that gross domestic product is expressed in ECU.

Naturally, the same holds true for the proposal for a regulation on the zones adversely affected by restructuring of the textile and clothing industry and for the proposal for a regulation on the zones affected by the implementation of the Community fisheries policy.

I feel, finally, that a number of large production centres which do in fact satisfy all the criteria laid down by the Commission should not have been omitted from the selection of the areas affected by the crisis in the shipbuilding industry.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

Mr Newman (S). — Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group I would like to say that the proposals from the Commission to the Council for the five regulations that have been described — that is, the regulations as amended by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning — do deserve support. They are constructive measures that will help areas of industrial decline in the shipbuilding, textiles and fishing industries. At least they will do something, and that is obviously worthy of the support of Parliament. It is just a shame that all these various strange mechanisms and procedures have had to be used to extend old regulations into years that those regulations were not supposed to cover.

It is well-known, of course, that areas in which shipbuilding, fishing and textiles have traditionally been the major industries have been particularly hit by Community policies. The whole point of the non-quota section of the European Regional Development Fund was to assist those regions that have been hard hit, particularly by the effects of Community policies, with Community aid programmes.

Very little has been done really if you look at the overall level of unemployment and if you think of the measures that need to be taken. 133 million ECU over five years is not going to make a great deal of difference. The fishing areas regulation, which is in fact a new regulation — the others have to do with extending existing measures of support into new countries and extending the areas that will be eligible for support — involves an expenditure of 35 million ECU over five years. This is very welcome. Nevertheless, there is no way that the problems facing people in areas of decline in the fishing industry are going to be solved by 35 million ECU of aid over five years, although, of course, it is better than nothing.

I would take issue with one small section of the motion for a resolution. I feel that, unfortunately, the committee and its rapporteur were being rather tentative in paragraph 20 of the motion for a resolution, which states that the underlying economic difficulties affecting the regions covered by these proposals will only be resolved by policies which encourage entrepreneurship and so on. It goes on in that kind of vein. The Socialist Group will vote not just for the regulation but also for the motion for a resolution, because we are taking it as a whole. Obviously, however, that does not mean that we accept the inference in that paragraph that it is entrepreneurship — whatever that is supposed to mean — that is going to solve the underlying economic difficulties. It is only massive investment in new economic policies that is going to solve the underlying economic difficulties.

However, with those reservations and putting the aid in the context of the major problems which it cannot entirely solve but can certainly help to solve, we do welcome the proposals.

I have not yet mentioned the Irish regulation. The aid which goes to the border areas in Ireland and Northern Ireland will also be of help, though again it will not be able to resolve the problem by itself. We need far more funds coming from the Common Market to assist areas of industrial decline within the Community.

Mr Poetschki (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, my Group welcomes the Commission's proposal for a Council Regulation instituting specific Community regional development measures. Even though there is no provision for a non-quota section in the new Fund Regulation, the extension provided for in Article 45 for the purpose of implementing the four proposals for supplementary measures is to be welcomed. It certainly makes sense to provide aid for regional economies if less-favoured areas are thereby given a chance to develop or traditional industrial regions which are undergoing restructuring are helped to create new jobs. This is the aim of the Regulation before us.

I would like to comment on the part of the Regulation which deals with textile industry areas in the Federal Republic of Germany. I myself am from the Westmünsterland, which for many years has been experiencing a crisis due to the fact that its economy is based primarily on the textile and clothing industry. In the last 15 years some 50% of jobs have been lost, a figure which is much higher than the average for the country, and the effects are particularly felt in an area where in many places 90% of industrial workers are employed in the textile industry. Despite the considerable efforts of the industry itself, which have resulted in efficient and modern factories, the textile industry has found it hard to withstanding the pressure caused by cheap imports from State-trading nations and low-wage countries in the Far East. The distortion of competition resulting from State aid and subsidies in various European countries has also contributed to the critical situation in the German textile industry.

Certainly, other branches of industry have also suffered similarly distressing job losses in recent times. The difference is that in the coal and steel industries such losses occur in a small number of large cities in the regions concerned. If 10 000 steelworkers suddenly have the misfortune to lose their jobs, the event usually hits the headlines. But if 10 000 weavers are made redundant, hardly anyone notices, as weaving is a small-scale industry and job losses are spread over many different places. The resulting damage is the same. Only the solution to the problem is different. That is why it is good to have different programmes for shipbuilding, fishing and textile industry areas.

I welcome the programme with its 16 million ECU spread over five years. It will really help the textile areas concerned to improve their structure. We will vote for Mr Hutton's worthy and well-drafted motion for a resolution and ask the Council to adopt the four

Poetschki

programmes without delay, so that there can get under way this year. The preparations and studies have taken many months, which means that there may now be other textile regions where the situation has become as bad as in the four which are mentioned. For this reason provision should be made, without too much dispersion of efforts and resources, for a possible extension to other regions.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, along with the European People's Party and the Socialist Group, I feel sure that the European Democratic Group will also be supporting Mr Hutton's excellent report on the non-quota system.

Mr Poetschki has just given specific details about how the non-quota measures affect the Federal Republic. I wish to concentrate on that part of the report — Chapter 4 of Mr Hutton's report, page 20 — which relates to his visit and, in particular, his visits to Toulouse, the area of Aquitaine, Languedoc-Roussillon and Midi-Pyrénées, because I think this might help to illustrate to those, such as Mr Newman, who find it difficult to understand what entrepreneurship is about.

As I understand it, in this particular region of the Community the non-quota measures have specifically helped small businesses and medium-sized enterprises. This of course, with the decline of the heavy industries of Europe — shipbuilding, textiles — is really what these non-quota measures are attempting to achieve. I understand that very practical measures have been undertaken as a result of help from the non-quota measures in this area, particularly in terms of bringing together the resources from universities and laboratories, helping to develop new products, or sharing telex and secretarial measures for new businesses attempting to get off the ground.

This is something which I think is of great interest to many regions of the Community which have suffered, not from the measures of Community policies, but from the historical decline of the heavy industries which affects so many parts of Europe.

In these areas there are a number of things which can be achieved. I mentioned small businesses. Rural tourism is something else which I understand has received encouragement through these measures. But, while I agree with what Mr Newman said, the problem is that it is really a very small amount of financial resources that we are talking about. It is only 5% of the entire ERDF budget; which itself is extremely small to achieve its aim of offsetting the difficulties suffered in the regions — of course, in this case, the difficulties suffered in those areas of the Community, which do not benefit from regional aid.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would say that this report is extremely interesting and demonstrates what

can be done with a very limited budget. But I think that one of the conclusions to be drawn is that the whole regional programme of the Community needs to be expanded — not at the extent of other Community measures, but nonetheless needs to be expanded if the regional programme is to come anywhere near achieving its purpose.

As Winston Churchill remarked in a rather different situation, 'Give us the tools and we will finish the job'.

(Applause from the European Democratic benches)

Mr De Pasquale (COM), Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. — *(IT)* Mr President, as Mr Hutton has already pointed out in his excellent report, the Committee on Regional Policy has always supported the non-quota system for two reasons: firstly, because the Community as a whole can derive benefit from these measures and, secondly, because it enables the most acute problems facing the Community to be identified and appropriate measures to be taken to resolve them.

In this way, regional policy can become more dynamic, more relevant and more meaningful to our citizens, enabling the Community to play an active rather than a passive role. This vindicates all those who maintained that Community intervention in regional policy was crucial. Even the most avid upholders of the criterion of the national quota have, I am sure, learnt from the little that has been done that Community action is not damaging but beneficial and can be used to guide the regional policies of the individual States.

This is, of course, the last non-quota measure because we will now have to move towards Community programmes based on the new regulation. In other words, the non-quota system will have to be extended on the basis of the new Regional Fund regulation, which will affect these programmes in particular. The new regulation will enable the ludicrously low financial ceiling of 5% to be exceeded. The requirement for unanimous approval of these programmes, which was completely unacceptable, can now be bypassed by means of new instruments provided by the Regional Fund regulation and more particularly by the integrated Mediterranean programmes regulation. This, basically, is the way Community regional policy must continue, to make it more coherent and more effective in dealing with the real problems of the imbalances in Europe.

Mr MacSharry (RDE). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in welcoming the report presented by Mr Hutton today I am pleased to note that the Commission's proposal extends for a further five years the non-quota cross-border regulation. I welcome in particular the intention to include my own country in that

MacSharry

cross-border programme. I fully endorse the proposal to allocate funds for the construction of a gas pipeline network in the border areas of Ireland, including the counties of Leitrim, Cavan, Monaghan, Louth and Sligo. The Commission, in its explanatory statement, underlines the point that the natural gas supply and consumption in some of the areas located in Ireland could, while enabling the economic development base of these areas to be reinforced, contribute to the realization of Community energy policy objectives by reducing dependence on oil and by increasing security of energy supply.

A major objective of extending natural gas supply must also be to provide a new source of energy, to local industry in these counties. Our unemployment rate has consistently topped the EEC averages. If this programme helps to secure alternative energy supplies for industry, new jobs could be created and existing jobs retained. We must avail ourselves of every opportunity to tackle this overriding problem. However, I find it extraordinary that in paragraph 11 of Article 8 Donegal has not been included within the framework of the special programme. This makes a nonsense of our efforts to aid the most disadvantaged peripheral areas. A new and recent gas find off the south-west coast of Ireland has given us hope that gas will provide a cheap source of energy for many years to come, longer than may have been originally foreseen. For this reason my group called for the inclusion of Donegal in the gas pipeline proposal, a view which I am glad to say the Regional Committee, supported.

Perhaps as well the UK Government might now reconsider its position with regard to the extension of the gas pipeline over the border, thereby introducing a greater degree of cross-border cooperation. I am happy to say that the committee also supported demands for the continuation of the cross-border tourism programme and for its extension to my country, where it has not operated in the past. But it is disappointing that the very good work carried out under this programme will not continue, and I urge the Commission, the British and Irish Governments to reconsider. I hope also that the necessary resources will be made available. Finally, I would like to refer you to our amendment urging the Commission to draw up proposals for the development of fishing and related industries in areas where this sector has potential for job creation and expansion, such as the fishing ports on the west coast of Ireland.

Mr Gautier (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to say that I shall be brief. As far as the subject in general is concerned, everything that I wanted to say has already been said by the previous speakers.

I would just like to comment on one or two particular aspects of the various Regulations. Looking at the Regulations — particularly, for example, the one on

fisheries — we see a list of criteria to be applied when regions where fishing is in decline or which are highly dependent on fishing submit a request for aid. Taking the list of areas to be given aid in the annex to the Commission Regulation, my knowledge of the fishing situation in Europe suggests to me that it is not the areas which are really the most dependent on fishing which have been selected, but instead the areas have been selected according to political criteria. For this reason I would like to echo the comments of the previous speaker from the Christian-Democratic Group on the textile sector, though referring more particularly to fishing. In other words, the Commission should again think about whether the list ought to be re-opened. I am from northern Germany, am relatively well acquainted with the situation in Cuxhaven and Bremerhaven and cannot understand why such areas, for example, are not included.

The same, Mr Varfis, applies also to the Directives and Regulations on shipbuilding and the textile industry. I hope that the Commission can arrange for areas where problems have only arisen in the past twelve months — for example, in the shipbuilding industry in Emden, northern Germany — also to be covered by such Regulations.

(Applause from the left)

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Mr President, I am going to address myself to the proposal for a regulation for the spending of money in the border regions of Ireland. It is not that I want to show any discourtesy to the other proposed regulations, but I am not a member of the Regional Committee and I am not competent to make a decision. However, I am fairly familiar with the situation in the border regions of Ireland and I intend to address myself to this particular subject.

Many of us had hoped that on joining the EEC the border would become irrelevant as a result of the free movement of capital, goods and persons. Before we joined, we had free trade with Britain and a currency that was linked in parity with sterling. Since we joined, we have the problem of MCAs, the divergence of currencies as a result of Ireland's joining the EMS and, in addition, the ever-increasing burden of indirect taxation which makes life for business on the southern side of the border almost intolerable. All this, together, with the unreasonable and ineffective security policy being pursued by the British Government, has conspired to build the border even higher today than it was when we joined the European Community ten years ago. Now this and previous measures proposed for Irish border areas are supposed to ameliorate the negative effects of the border on economic development.

What we have here are two separate measures, neither of which, I suspect, resulted from a single Commission proposal but are the result of two proposals by two

McCartin

individual Member States with an eye to their own political objectives. We have had a number of economic studies carried out in the border regions of Ireland, financed by the Community, but we ignore these and produce new ideas when we have money such as we have now to invest. We also had a good study and proposals last year by the Economic and Social Committee. Why does this Community finance studies and then ignore them when we want to invest money to resolve the problem?

This particular measure seems to me not designed to promote economic convergence in the border regions; in fact, it could have the opposite effect. On the northern side I do not believe that the spending of more money on small business will improve its performance. It will simply be a substitution for the very generous aid that is already given by the British Government to business in that area at the moment. If it were additional, it would have the effect of further distorting competition in the border regions.

On the southern side, unlike my colleague, Mr MacSharry, I do not believe that the idea of extending the gas pipeline is a good idea. I believe it is a waste of resources, particularly since it is hoped, but not established, that we already have reserves of gas in that area, and I am shocked that nobody who has been a party to the making of this decision seems to have considered that there is a strong prospect of gas reserves in that region already. This may be complementary to the idea or it may not, but the idea that we should not have taken it into consideration seems to me fairly shocking. The scheme seems to have originated with the idea of the Dublin-Belfast gas pipeline, and that in itself was a good idea. But, of course, it accommodates the east coast and neglects the wider and poorer border regions.

I believe that a regulation along the lines of the regulation which has just expired, which was a genuine cross-border measure calculated to improve the infrastructure for tourism on both sides of the border, a scheme which would be a singular scheme and would complement itself on either side, would have been much more suitable, and I believe that even at this stage the Commission should reconsider this proposal. I think that the idea of piping gas from Dublin across a thinly-populated and not very industrialized region is a waste when we have bigger and more industrialized towns beside the source of the gas in the first place.

Mrs Faith (ED). — Mr President, Fleetwood, a town in my constituency with a population of 24 000 people, has an historical background of a long association with the fishing industry and emotional ties with that industry which will never be forgotten. In Britain the name of Fleetwood is synonymous with fishing. Fleetwood relied on its distant water fleet and therefore fared badly when its ships could no longer fish in Icelandic waters. People who know Fleetwood's former

reputation are amazed to hear that fish is now brought overland to Fleetwood.

Because of the delay in the implementation of a common fisheries policy, Fleetwood's industry was drastically diminished and is now reduced to an in shore fleet of 68 vessels and two middle-water vessels — a shadow of its former self. In 1963, 1 583 people were employed in the fishing industry in Fleetwood. By 1981 there were only 243 people. If Fleetwood were considered on its own it would easily fulfil all the required criteria for its inclusion in this regulation. However, its unemployment figures are calculated within the Blackpool travel-to-work area which registers an unemployment rate of 14%, while in Fleetwood male unemployment is currently running at 19.5%. This is indeed a black spot as referred to by the rapporteur.

The main alternative sources of employment are chemicals, building and service industries. These have diminished and hence there is a core of long-term unemployment. Unlike Hull and Grimsby, Fleetwood port cannot benefit from increased trade with the Community because of its situation on the north-west coast of England. Wyre council looks after the district in which Fleetwood lies. That council working with private industry, ICI, has formed a business agency. It is to be commended. It helps to provide premises and advice to small businesses.

But entrepreneurs still need more economic incentives. The British Government and the Department of Industry are most sympathetic and would like the town to receive some compensation from the European Regional Development Fund. The Commission is currently looking at the problem. The council does qualify for non-quota aid under the textile regulation, but this only applies to a rural area. Therefore, they cannot utilize this facility.

I therefore ask Parliament to vote for my amendment to include Fleetwood in the list of towns able to benefit from non-quota ERDF funds. The town has suffered from the implementation of the common fisheries policy. The fishing industry will always be in the hearts of the people of Fleetwood. They accept that this industry can never be revived to its former glory, but the people of this town do not want to feel forgotten and overlooked by the European Economic Community. They want recognition of their problem and practical assistance!

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

Vice-President

President — We shall now suspend the debate, which will be resumed at 9 p.m.¹

¹ *Membership of the ACP-EEC Joint Assembly: see Minutes.*

6. *Votes*

Report (Doc. A 2-35/85/rev.), drawn up by Mr Rothley on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, on the:

proposals from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 680 final - Doc. 2-1539/84) for regulations

I. introducing special and temporary measures applicable to the recruitment of officials of the European Communities in consequence of the accession of Spain and Portugal;

II. introducing special measures to terminate the service of officials of the European Communities;

III. amending Regulation (EEC, Euratom, ECSC) No 260/68 laying down the conditions and procedure for applying the tax for the benefit of the European Communities;

IV. amending Regulation (Euratom, ECSC, EEC) No 549/69 determining the categories of officials and other servants of the European Communities to whom the provisions of Article 12, the second paragraph of Article 13 and Article 14 of the Protocol on the privileges and immunities of the Communities apply.¹

Mr Rothley (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Madam President, following the first discussion of the Commission's proposals in this House, Mr Luster, Mr Price and myself attended a meeting with Mr Christophersen. The meeting was very useful, as it enabled a number of differences of opinion between the Commission and the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights to be resolved. I am therefore very grateful for this discussion. Our Committee then rediscussed the Commission's proposals, as a result of which some motions were withdrawn and others amended. In principle, the Commission and Parliament both agreed that the basic philosophy of the proposals, i.e. greater flexibility in order to make the service more efficient, is acceptable. This is why we would also like these proposals not to be limited in time. However, I would like to point out once more that in the long term the regulations protecting Community officials are incompatible with modern management methods, and a clash is inevitable.

(Applause)

If the aim of the measures is to make the institutions efficient, the same principle must also apply to our groups. For this reason the question of temporary staff was just as important as that of social security. The Commission, of course, was not prepared to include temporary staff in the Regulation. However, the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, in a

motion for a resolution in the form of an amendment by way of a compromise, had insisted that an identical Regulation covering temporary staff be presented in November. Otherwise Parliament ought not to approve the appropriations for officials leaving the service. I therefore repeat my urgent request to the Commission for a proposal, by the date mentioned, for an identical Regulation covering temporary staff.

The second point is that we consider the proposed conditions (55 years old and 10 years' seniority) to be insufficient, as they would lead to inconsistencies in practice. Our Committee therefore suggests extending the Regulation to cover all officials with 25 years' seniority, regardless of age. We also suggest giving preference to officials according to age and seniority. Consequently we have withdrawn our original proposal that applications from officials who are 60 years old must be approved. In our motion for a resolution we also call for the cost of the measures to be shown separately in the budget. Furthermore, we insist that officials who leave the service under this system must not be re-employed by the Communities in any capacity.

I would also like to comment on the first Regulation concerning measures connected with the accession of Spain and Portugal. The Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights twice expressed the unanimous opinion that there should be no competitions for certain grades. The Group of the European People's Party also agreed to this on both occasions. I am very pleased that the Commission was prepared to accept this recommendation, which is also consistent with the Commission's original concept. Therefore I would today like to appeal once more to the House not to introduce discriminatory measures prejudicial to the interests of Spain and Portugal, but to approve the Committee's proposal.

Finally, I would like to point out that all the proposals put forward by the Committee today were agreed unanimously.

Madam President, I propose that we ask the Commission representative to comment on our amendments in their entirety.

(Applause)

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Madam President, I should like to start by thanking Parliament for finding time to discuss this matter in an over-full agenda. These questions are namely extremely urgent and essential for implementing enlargement.

After the discussions at the June part-session and then with my colleague, Mr Christophersen, in the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, I shall be extremely brief and confine myself to the following main points:

¹ See debates of 14 June 1985.

Andriessen

Firstly: the Commission accepts Amendment No 1 concerning the regulations for the recruitment of Spanish and Portuguese officials. Secondly: as regards the regulation for terminating the service of officials, the Commission is prepared to act in accordance with Amendment No 29 and submit a special draft regulation for temporary staff in all the institutions on the basis of the present proposal as soon as possible — and I emphasize as soon as possible. Thirdly: should Parliament adopt Amendment No 25 to include officials with at least 25 years of service in the regulation, the Commission is again prepared to agree.

Finally, Madam President, the Commission is willing to accept Amendments Nos 10, 12 and 21 and agrees to Amendments Nos 20, 26 and 37. The Commission is thus prepared to amend its proposals on this basis, subject of course to the results of Parliament's vote.

*Proposal for a regulation II**Amendments Nos 30, 31/corr., 25, 27 and 36*

President — Amendment No 31/corr. has been judged inadmissible because it has nothing to do with the text which it seeks to amend. In fact, this text concerns solely the officials of our Community institutions and not workers in the steel industries.

Mr Falconer (S). — Madam President, the point is that the Commission will take note of the amendments which have been rejected by the President because those amendments are relevant to other grades of workers in the Community — either that or this class document. That is what it is, a class document which only avails those at the back of you, Commissioner — those at the back who wish to maintain a class war by dealing out privileges to those who serve their interests.

(Applause from the Socialist benches)

Mr Curry (ED). — Madam President, Mr Price has asked me to explain Amendment No 36, which has been altered with the agreement of the rapporteur.

(Protests from the left)

It now constitutes an amendment of compromise, as I have had explained to me. That should now read:

'The figure of 70% mentioned above shall be reduced to 60% in the case of officials with less than 15 years' service.'

You are aware that there has been a change. This is simply to explain to you what the change is. It has been accepted by the rapporteur.

President — Mr Curry, we have a lot of texts to vote on, and last-minute oral changes to the amendments sometimes lead to very intricate debates. I would prefer to refuse your request.

Mr Curry (ED). — On Amendment No 36 I shall ask for a split vote. That will mean our voting it in five parts, but we shall end up with what I proposed in the first instance.

If you will give me the floor, I will try and navigate you through that procedure; but we shall end up with a compromise amendment.

President — We shall vote item by item. I shall read out the text:

The figure of 70% mentioned above shall be reduced to 50% in the case of officials with less than 10 years' service and to 60% in the case of officials with more than 10 years' but less than 15 years' service.

Does that satisfy you, Mr Curry?

Mr Curry (ED). — That is the original amendment, Madam President. My wish is that we should take it in the following manner, that you vote on the text up to and including the words 'reduced to', you then vote on the phrase up to '60%', you then vote on the phrase from '60%' to 'officials with', you then exclude the following phrase and you end up with 'less than 15 years' service'.

I can read the amended text if you like, which is really much simpler, Madam President. This has been discussed with the rapporteur; he is in favour of it, it is not my particular idiosyncrasy.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* The day before yesterday there was a compromise amendment on the motion for a resolution by the Committee on Institutional Affairs, and it was pointed out that our Rules of Procedure do not allow us to debate an amendment which has not been translated into all the languages. This was approved by the House. So I think we cannot have more than one precedent. If we decided once that even compromise amendments must be translated and that they cannot be put to the House unless they have been translated, I think that this rule must also apply today. Without knowing the background to this, I would say that it is a question of principle. We cannot change the rules from one day to the next.

(Applause)

President — Mrs Veil, we shall do exactly as you suggest: the change has been refused, and Mr Curry is

President

now insisting that we vote item by item. The difficulty is that the text is worded in such a way that it is very awkward to vote on it item by item, so that we shall have to vote on little bits of it but for my part I cannot refuse a request for an item-by-item vote.

Mr Rothley (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Madame President, the sentence contains two amendments to the substance of the text. Firstly:

The figure of 70% mentioned above shall be reduced to 50% in the case of officials with less than 10 years' service.

That is the first part. The second part reads as follows:

The figure of 70% mentioned above shall be reduced to 60% in the case of officials with more than 10 years' but less than 15 years' service.

The first part cannot be adopted, because in the regulation we have provided for a minimum period of 10 years, so that the case of less than 10 years' service simply does not arise. So the first part must be rejected, whereas the second is acceptable.

Mr Curry (ED). — I am very grateful to the rapporteur, Madam President. What he has said is precisely the fact of the matter. In the English text it does make perfect sense, Madam President. If you will permit me, I can give you the divisions and I guarantee you that at the end of the day it will end up either rejected totally or it will end up making sense.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Madam President, we can simplify matters if you propose that first of all we vote by yes or no on Mr Rothley's proposal. That would settle the matter.

President — Mr von der Vring, I now put Amendment No 36 to the vote.

After the rejection of Amendment No 36

Mr Rothley (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Madam President, I think you have put the wrong thing to the vote. I shall repeat my proposal: the sentence beginning *The figure of 70% mentioned above shall be reduced* is admissible as an amendment, but not the other one. What matters is that in two cases a reduction is envisaged: firstly, to 50% for less than 10 years' service, which is not admissible, and secondly, a reduction to 60% for more than 10 but less than 15 years' service. In both cases a reduction is proposed.

But in the first case that is not admissible, whereas in the second case it is. So you should let the House vote as follows, since it simply makes sense that way: firstly, whether there is to be a reduction from 70% to

50% in the case of less than 10 years service. In my view this is impossible and should be rejected. Secondly, whether there is to be a reduction to 60% in the case of more than 10 but less than 15 years' service.

What you put to the vote was whether the above-mentioned figure should be reduced at all. This makes sense in the second case, but not in the first.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) Madam President, I think that something which is really a sub-amendment is being presented as an item-by-item vote. This means that in fact they wish to change the wording.

I think that by rejecting the first sentence we rejected the whole of the amendment, and that is what Parliament wished. Because if it has wanted to accept either of the two figures in the proposal, i.e. to accept an item-by-item vote, it would have agreed to vote on the first sentence, then we would have voted on the second part, then on the third.

Since we rejected the first part of the sentence, it means that we actually rejected everything.

(Applause)

President — Ladies and gentlemen, that is also my opinion.

Explanations of vote

Mr Falconer (S). — Today we have again seen the Conservatives putting their weight behind a class document which the Commission has brought out to benefit even further those who serve them. Our colleague, Mrs Dury, has tabled a motion for a resolution under Rule 47 which points to a provision in Belgian law cutting widows' pensions by 30 to 40% while we are asking for a pension increase to 70% maintained until the age of 65 and beyond. The Tory Government — and the Commission should take note of them, since after Brecon and Radnor they are a dying breed — are now abolishing the State Earnings Related Pension Scheme at present in operation in our country, which is even means-tested. The Tories are now sitting back here, pushing through proposals to maintain 70% pensions for those who continue to serve them.

This is a class document, it will remain a class document and we, for our part, will vote against it. And we ask the Commissioner to take note.

(Laughter from the European Democratic Group benches)

It is no good laughing. You are only an appointee, and one day we who are elected will get rid of you — and the quicker the better.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

Mr Cryer (S). — Well, if there was ever a need for an explanation of vote, it was after the effete and comfortable laughter from the Tory and other benches. My comrade put down a resolution, as I had put down several resolutions, to relate these payments to steel workers and the payments that steel workers get. The steel workers in Sheffield and elsewhere won't find it very amusing to hear that comfortably-off, well-paid people find it funny that there should be a suggestion that Commission officials should go home for a few years to allow other people from Spain and Portugal to come in on their redundancy terms. The Conservatives feel that the redundancy terms are so modest, indeed they do!

In Sheffield the 500 workers facing the dole queue at Sheffield Forge Masters and the 100 workers facing the dole queue at Sheffield Tinsley Park, a 20-year old factory, will ask the question: 'Since I have been put on the dole by a combination of Commission policies and Tory Government policies, why can't I have the same terms and conditions as they dole out for Commission officials?' And I say this, that if Commission officials were made to retire on the same terms and conditions that they give to steel workers, they would not be so damned keen to get home and retire early. So I am going to oppose this wretched instance of double standards, which is very typical of the whole rotten common market.

(Protests from the European Democratic benches)

Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC). — (DE) We shall be voting for the Rothley report, but only with considerable reservations, since an important condition has unfortunately not been met, namely that this regulation unfortunately does not apply to the approximately 3 000 temporary staff at the Commission and the Parliament. Amendment No 29 contains only a pretence of a solution and is, I'm afraid, a poor compromise, for which we were also unable to vote. Today we have missed the chance of including the temporary staff. If we postpone it to October/November we risk being unable to have the temporary staff included with completely equal treatment, since then we shall be even more dependent on the good will of the Commission. Nevertheless we shall reluctantly vote for the report.

Mr Ford and Mr Hughes (S), in writing. — Since this report was referred back to committee during our last part-session, a number of changes have been made that improve the proposals it contains and substantially reduce the scheme's likely cost.

The proposal to extend the scheme on a wide basis to those down to the age of fifty has now been narrowed

considerably, while the inclusion of A 1 and A 2 grade staff has been dropped along with the inclusion of temporary staff. Equally some improvements have been made in that there is now a provision to try to prevent the re-employment within Community institutions of individuals who have benefited from *voluntary* early retirement.

Yet, while we welcome these improvements to the proposals, there are still a number of elements which we find gravely disturbing. Firstly, there is no provision to only allow staff to leave when this is in the interest of the efficient running of the Community. As we said, when Parliament debated similar proposals last year for Ispra, without this barrier it will be the best people who leave. Secondly, despite the improvements mentioned above, the monitoring still seems woefully inadequate, particularly to prevent former officials from taking new posts whose remuneration plus the 70% of former salary paid for by the Community will give them a total income exceeding that last received from the Community.

Thirdly, *and most importantly*, when we discussed similar provisions for the Joint Research Centre at Ispra we were promised by the Commission that they would look anew at voluntary early retirement schemes to reduce the cost to the Community. We can almost understand the need to take urgent action over the recruitment of officials in consequence of the accession of Spain and Portugal. What we cannot accept is the way in which the Commission has attempted to smuggle through permanent proposals to allow the acquisition of staff with new skills *without* re-evaluating previous schemes to reduce cost as promised.

In consequence, while welcoming the marginal improvements made, we will be voting against the proposal as a whole.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Interim report (Doc. A 2-70/85, drawn up by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on vandalism and violence in sport

Explanation of vote

Mr Stewart (S). — Some of the amendments have been adopted and I am very grateful for that. Mr Botha in South Africa would have enjoyed the type of

¹ The rapporteur was.
IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 2, 10, 21, 24-26, 28 and 29;
AGAINST Amendments Nos 12-17, 18, 22, 23, 30 and 32-38.

Stewart

document presented to this House today. It infringed on so many personal liberties that I just could not possibly support the resolution and will have to vote against it. It ignores the finding of the inquires carried out by the Belgian authorities and puts the blame fairly and squarely on the football clubs as such.

Once again we have asked for an inquiry and, thank goodness, we have got that request in black and white in the amendments. No inquiry has been carried out. I am hoping that one will be carried out in the future. The resolution makes too many impractical suggestions. For example, I do not know how it is possible to search 50 000 football supporters. It is ridiculous. It is not even clearly thought out.

I shall be voting against the motion for a resolution and I hope that the next report will be far better than this one.

Mr Gerontopoulos (PPE). — *(GR)* It is strange that we are discussing the rise of violence in the countries where normally there should be fair competition. There are positive points in Mrs Larive-Gronendaal's report, and so we shall vote for it. However, there are other very important aspects of the problem to which no reference is made at all. The fanaticism of the fans if often sparked off by the governments of the Member States trying to make political capital out of sporting success. The use of anabolic steroids is one of the main reasons for the destruction of the sporting spirit, and unfortunately their use is often tolerated, if not instigated, by leading government figures. We must united against this scourge. Another extremely serious matter is that of transfer negotiations and the enormous sums paid for transferring players. This merry-go-round of millions must be curbed. We cannot speak of economic depression while at the same time enormous amounts are being spent for players and we base our hopes for solving the problem of unemployment on the good progress of the team. Perhaps you find it strange that this has happened. However, there are also accusations against the international sporting authorities on the grounds of unfairness to certain countries or of rigged results. Perhaps there ought to be a study in this area as well. I am afraid that the whole of international sport is sick. And we shall have to coordinate our efforts to make stadiums once again places where the sporting spirit is fostered.

Mr Buttafuoco (DR). — *(IT)* Following on from the comments made by Mr Almirante in the general debate, the Group of the European Right will vote for the Larive-Gronendaal report. We feel that the European Parliament has a fundamental right to make proposals and to put forward solutions and remedies, to analyse what it is that drives ever-growing numbers of so-called fans to commit unacceptable acts of violence.

My group believes, ladies and gentlemen, that if we are to lay the blame anywhere, it should be primarily

at the door of a twisted logic which makes sports champions into demi-gods and hankers for more and more sensational news — very often inaccurate — cashing in on skills which should have been used for a very different purpose, logic which has turned sport, once an arena for true sportsmen to pit their skills, into an outlet for those whose only interest lies in the victory of their own team or their own favourite and, more important, the defeat of the enemy.

Unfortunately, any hint of aesthetic, symbolic or plain competitive spirit has been lost from what now passes for sport.

We therefore support the report before us which aims to prevent and repress any acts of violence, although we would refrain from labelling groups which have nothing to do with politics.

We would also agree that these measures should be exceptional and temporary. Otherwise, we would see our stadiums reduced to something resembling concentration camps, which would signal the slow death of sport.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Papapietro (COM). — *(IT)* We are not satisfied with the result of the vote on this resolution. We seem to be trying to establish a state of emergency in our stadiums. We had considered the possibility of voting for the report, in view of the importance of the issue and the positive aspects of the resolution, but the rejection of all the amendments which could have improved it prevents us from doing so. We will not vote against it for the very reason that this is a very serious subject and the resolution does have its positive side. The Italian Communists have therefore decided to abstain.

Mr McMillan-Scott (ED). — What is needed now is not words but action along the lines of that taken by the United Kingdom Government to control spectator violence before the opening of the new season. I hope that other Member State governments will take note of that action.

Mr McMahon (S). — A great deal of work went into this report and a great deal of enthusiasm too. Unfortunately, I think the rapporteur got carried away with her enthusiasm and shows a lack of knowledge of what actually happens at football matches. We tried constructively — both at the committee stage and in the plenary part-session — to put in some sound, practical amendments. Unfortunately, as these amendments have been defeated, I am recommending to the Socialist Group that they oppose the report.

Although we have got one or two amendments adopted, we have not got the major ones that we

McMahon

wanted. For example, the report contains such draconian suggestions as a European blacklist and a ban on anyone who commits an offence at a soccer match, no matter how trivial. Many people in Glasgow get into trouble for urinating at football matches. If the proposal went through, someone who urinated against a wall at a football match would be banned for ever after and be prevented from going to another football match anywhere in Europe. This thing is absolutely ridiculous. It is not on the lines of the McElhone report of 1977 and 1980, although there are some ideas culled from that report.

I regret therefore that I myself will have to vote against the resolution and I hope the Socialist Group will follow me.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Dury (S). — *(FR)* First of all I want to say that I shall abstain on this report. Nevertheless, I would like to make one observation. I noticed that Mr Deprez, President of the Christian Social Party, voted in favour of every part of this resolution. I hope that he regards this as a sign to his Minister of the Interior. Tomorrow in Belgium there will be a debate on events at the Heysel Stadium and we expect Mr Nothomb to make an honest statement in response to the report by the Chamber of Deputies, which implicates him in the disaster. I would like to say that I am abstaining because I believe that action is necessary. I am thinking of sport and the 36 victims of Heysel, Mr Deprez!

(Protests from the centre and the right)

If you are a Minister you accept responsibility, and if you are in favour of measures such as those proposed by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal you are expressing a political viewpoint.

I shall abstain on this report.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — *(FR)* I would like to make just one remark: the conduct and attitude of the Belgian Minister of the Interior can be interpreted in different ways. But this is not a matter for debate by the European Parliament.

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* First of all let me say one thing on behalf of my group: in my opinion anyone who demands that others assume responsibility and at the same time says that when practical measures are taken he will abstain is himself shirking responsibility.

(Murmurs of dissent)

Mrs Dury should not therefore be so hypocritical and should not try to introduce national party politics into

this House, but should make an effort to help us achieve something in this matter.

I would like to make just one more brief remark: originally the report had proposed a series of measures which I cannot exactly describe as liberal. A number of amendments from our group were accepted on these points. But according to this report all spectators at a football match are still to be searched and all fans supervised and transported together, which seems to me to be impractical and incompatible with a free society! This point should be corrected in the final report.

However, bearing in mind the general importance of the subject, my group will vote in favour of this report.

Mr Ford (S). — I would like to refer to recital D in the motion for a resolution, which deplores the exploitation of this situation by fascist organizations and other extremist groups. It is clear that in the Heysel Stadium disaster there were some extreme right-wing elements amongst the Liverpool 'supporters.' Mr John Smith, chairman of the Liverpool Football Club, has stated that members of the National Front were present. We also know that British National Front Party leaflets were found in the stadium, as shown by Mr Stewart in last month's debate. The *Ordine Nuovo* were present amongst the Juventus fans.

If one looks at the situation in Europe, one can see that the extreme right wing in Europe have been using football grounds for recruitment. The young National Front magazine in the United Kingdom — called *Bulldog* — has a 'League of Louts Table' which describes the Chelsea fans, for example, as still being top of the racist league. We also have the same problem of fascist involvement in football violence in West Germany, France and Spain.

I had a letter recently from a member of the British National Front Party, in which he says:

It is now our party policy to conserve our funds for organization rather than squander them on elections where our vote is at present small. We now concentrate on secondary schools and groups. We are having good results in gaining young members.

It is important that we are aware of that. We must identify the guilty rather than punish all those who follow football matches.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* The Liberal Group is going to vote for this report, and we are going to do so because it outlines measures to stop things like Brussels from happening again. We cannot bide our time and wait until we have found the ideal solution. We know that this is an interim report and that it has not covered everything; in particular, there is still a lot to be done

Veil

for young people and for sportsmen and to ensure that situations where there is tension of this kind do not arise.

The fact is that we cannot allow the situation in our stadiums to go on as it is just now. I am amazed that some people who are always going on about safety and prevention do not want to take vital measures today. In taking measures which may seem strict, it is not because we want to place restrictions on sport but because we love sport and we want families to be able to go and we want sportsmen to be safe and, above all, we do not want the image of sport to be tarnished by such scenes.

(Applause)

Mr Ephremidis (COM), in writing. — (GR) The Youth Committee's report calls for measures to combat violence at stadiums, but it does no more than touch superficially on the real reasons for the phenomenon of violence, not only at stadiums but also at other sporting or musical events etc., to which no mention at all is made in the motion for a resolution.

We consider that the main reason for violence is the social situation in which today's youth finds itself and the basic manifestations of which are unemployment and underemployment.

The broad policy of the EEC Member States seeks to remove young people from politics, and this prevents them for organizing and using their free time meaningfully, makes them obsessed with sport and leads to fanaticism. The same thing results from efforts, of certain governments to give a chauvinist character to sporting events, as President Reagan did, for example, at the Olympic Games in Los Angeles.

If we do not tackle the root of these main causes, which are of course specific political choices, there is not chance of solving the problem of violence either.

We consider that the existing legislative and policing arrangements in the Member States for dealing with violence at public events are on the whole adequate to prevent it, and so we are against the adoption of new measures for policing hundreds of thousands of citizens, various forms of which are proposed in the motion for a resolution.

On the contrary, we think that popular mass sport must be supported by local authorities and the mass organizations which will attract young people, given them creative outlets in their free time and educate them properly. At the same time they will give them the possibility of protecting the peaceful nature of the events in which they participate.

Lastly, we should like to refer also to the large financial interests which have been created with the com-

mercialization of sporting events and of sportsmen themselves and which bear a great deal of the responsibility for the atmosphere of hooliganism which reigns at stadiums.

Something which proves this is the ultimate decision to carry on with the match at the Heysel Stadium, where thousands of millions in fees are at stake for advertising and television coverage.

The merry-go-round of these thousands of millions (transfers etc.) stirs up public feeling particularly during the present crisis, and it creates and fosters fanaticism and the selfishness of the consumer society. This vast and perhaps most important question concerning the very structure and organization of sport and of the measures which might be taken is virtually absent from the motion for a resolution.

For the above reasons, and following the rejection of almost all the amendments which would have improved the text, the Members from the Greek Communist Party of the Interior will vote against the motion for a resolution.

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) Mr President, we agree in principle that more effective measures must be taken to eliminate violence in sport. However, we are against more stringent controls at sports grounds, the thorough searching of all spectators as proposed in the report, the mobilization of large numbers of police, which will lead to a police State, the drawing up of a 'black list' of people who have been violent at past matches, and the imposing of sanctions on clubs. With the preventive measures proposed in the report our attention is being concentrated on the symptoms rather than on the deeper social causes. If I may refer to the recent tragic events in the Heysel Stadium, the violence of the Liverpool fans is not unconnected with the economic and social crisis which is affecting that part of England, where there is a 50% unemployment rate among young people. The report contains proposals for stringent measures to tackle violence, while overlooking that its social causes are features of our society and are closely bound up with the high level of unemployment, the limited chances which young people have for social advancement, the commercialization of sport, especially of football, the nationalism and parochialism, which is cultivated, racism, the marginalization of sections of the population, and the lack of access to other forms of more intellectual entertainment. The report proposes that young people should be taught tolerance and the rules of decent behaviour in sports grounds, but that is not enough. We must go further by setting up a number of social programmes for organizing the lives of young people, giving them access to culture, and giving them some social opportunities.

The positive point about this report is, of course, that at last we are realizing that the spirit of fair play has

Filinis

declined in our countries. But we shall abstain from voting on the motion for a resolution because of the rejection of the amendments which would have served to improve the report in the way we explained previously.

Mr Kolokotronis (S), in writing. — (GR) Nowadays football matches are the greatest spectacle. National, European and international games attract enormous and ever-increasing numbers of fans. The result of this development has been the permanent involvement of financial, political and social interests in general sporting events. In fact, sporting events with a broad popular following are the place where more and more often differences, animosities and rivalries are expressed. The result is violence both inside and outside the grounds.

I believe that violence manifests itself at grounds when various interests may lead players or personalities to break the rules of competition, and worse of all to question the referee's decision. I also believe that the deviation from the real aims of mass spectator sports, particularly football, inevitably leads to violence both on the pitch and among the spectators in the stands. Violence at sports grounds is spreading very rapidly and affects all countries. In my country, Greece, there is a risk of similar destructive phenomena taking a hold, despite the traditional civilized relations between players and spectators, relations which have their roots in the ancient spirit which we have inherited from the Olympic Games, which have gone down in history as a symbol of peace and reconciliation between nations, States and people. I therefore think that the European Community must tackle this phenomenon in time. In my view, taking stringent measures for policing sports grounds will not help to curb violence tendencies but will, on the contrary, aggravate the problem in future, since violence at sports grounds is a social phenomenon and consequently firm educational measures are needed to schools and clubs. I therefore think that the adoption of guidelines is in fact the most suitable way of, among other things, strengthening the position of the national, European and international federations.

With these remarks I should like to state that I shall vote against the report by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal as amended by the amendments which have been adopted.

Mrs Lizin (S), in writing. — (FR) I congratulate Mrs Larive-Groenendaal for the measures she proposes and shall vote for her report, but with a few regrets. I should like to draw attention to the importance which this matter has taken on in Belgian politics. A crucial debate will be held in the Belgian Parliament at the end of the week on the basis of the report of the committee of enquiry headed by Mr Collignon.

The serious lack of coordination between the Ministry of the Interior and the gendarmerie — and the Lar-

ive-Groenendaal report rightly stresses the need for such coordination — played a large part in the way the Heysel tragedy developed.

Ministerial responsibility is total in this question, and the Minister of the Interior will have to explain himself democratically. My only regret is that the report by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal does not stress more clearly how essential it is for this link between gendarmerie, police and the Minister of the Interior to be compulsory and institutional in each Member State.

Mr Marshall (ED), in writing. — I have the honour to represent Tottenham, which is the home of one of Europe's finest football clubs. I should like to support this report and welcome the moves being undertaken by the British Government to eliminate the scourge of football hooliganism.

When I was a schoolboy, football was very much a family sport. Today that is no longer the case. I hope that we can soon reverse this trend if only for the very selfish reason that I would like eventually to take my sons to see the glories of Spurs.

Action to curb football hooliganism must be related to the fact that many of the worst scenes are alcohol-related. In Scotland, once the scene of disgraceful behaviour, alcohol was banned at football some years ago. Since then there has been a dramatic improvement in behaviour at these games. I believe that the proposals of the British Government will result in a dramatic improvement in the behaviour of fans at our football grounds.

May I also say — without wishing to seem to be preaching — that football hooliganism is part of a wider problem, that of a lack of faith on the part of many people. This lack of faith has resulted in various forms of escapism — drug addiction, violence, alcoholism, hooliganism. Let us hope that these behavioural patterns can change as young people regain a faith in the future.

Until this happens we will have to take preventive measures, such as those proposed by the British Government, and also ensure stiff penalties for those found guilty of hooliganism and violence. Recently some hoodlums in Cambridge were sent to prison for substantial periods of time. I believe that penalties such as this will have a significant deterrent effect.

Marshall

When we next have a debate on sport, let us hope we can concentrate on the skill and sportsmanship of our sportsmen rather than the behaviour of our fans!

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-54/85), drawn up by Mr Seeler on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the future development of economic and trade relations between the European Community and Hong Kong: adopted²

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-74/85), drawn up by Mr Hindley on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-39/85 - 4745/85) for a regulation concerning the conclusion of a trade and economic cooperation agreement between the European Economic Community and the People's Republic of China

Explanations of vote

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) The Communist and Allies Group supports the proposal contained in the report presented by the Committee on External Economic Relations.

The proposal very rightly points out that the new agreement between the European Community and the People's Republic of China represents an important step in the improvement of bilateral relations. It illustrates a very important point — that different economic systems do not represent a major barrier to trusting relations if there is a political will.

I would, however, like to stress one point in the agreement which I consider important. Article 11 says that the two contracting parties will endeavour to promote, amongst other things, the transfer of technologies. This brings us to the recent discussions in Washington between the delegations of the European Parliament and the US Congress.

During these meetings, the Americans clearly stated that the United States was determined to apply restric-

tions on the transfer of technologies to Europe. Does this mean that European firms would be banned from working with China if they had business relations with American companies? It would not be acceptable for commitments to the People's Republic of China to be dependent on the goodwill of the United States. The Community must assert its independence and insist on making its own decisions.

Finally, Mr President, allow me to express my surprise that our agenda should at the same time contain both a report on relations with the People's Republic of China and a report on Taiwan. This House sometimes seems to lack a sense of appropriateness.

I would like to warn Parliament and make it aware that by accepting, even indirectly, the principle of two Chinas, which has been rejected by all the Member States of the Community, it is helping to cast doubt on whether it really wishes to contribute towards the improvement of relations.

I said that the principle of two Chinas has been rejected by all the Community Member States and that the position of Parliament on the von Aerssen report would help to raise doubts about its real desire to contribute towards the improvement of relations with the People's Republic of China; at the same time it would be detrimental to the good intentions and efforts of the Commission.

Mr Battersby (ED). — I shall be voting for the Hindley report on commercial and economic cooperation with the People's Republic of China because, firstly, this report establishes the Parliament, through its institutional powers as budgetary authority, as an active participant in the Community's relations with the People's Republic of China; and secondly, this Parliament, as the elected institution representing the political will of almost 300 m people, has shown that it has the ability to ensure that this most important agreement will be honoured and will make a positive contribution to developing and expanding the friendly and mutually advantageous relations now existing between the People's Republic of China and the European Community.

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) We shall vote in favour of the motion for a resolution by the Committee on External Economic Relations on the conclusion of a trade and economic cooperation agreement with the People's Republic of China. In fact, particularly in recent years, this great country has seen the launching, with particular success, of a remarkable broadly-based effort aimed at developing the economy, taking up the technological challenge, and accumulating considerable national wealth while at the same time raising the standard of living. So it is certain that this whole process will lead to changes with international repercussions, and this makes it

¹ The rapporteur was
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 9-15, 17, 20, 21, 29, 37-39 and 44
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1-3, 5-7, 10, 16, 19, 22, 24, 26-28, 30-33, 36, 40, 41, 45 and 46.

² The rapporteur was
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 3 and 5
— AGAINST Amendment No 4.

Filinis

essential for us to develop cooperation between the EEC and China and to take prompt and mutual advantage of the vast opportunities.

I should like particularly to stress one interesting, and in my view positive, point in the report. Within the EEC an effort will have to be made so that all the Member States can participate in the development of trade and economic relations with China. The method of 'total solutions' referred to in the motion will have to operate in such a way as to enable those countries which so far have had very limited trade with China to benefit as well from the development of relations. We shall succeed in doing this only if the Commission familiarizes itself with the details of these total solutions, so that we are aware of what the Chinese side wants and what it can offer. If these total solutions are negotiated exclusively by business concerns, we very much fear that it will not be the EEC as a multinational organization which will expand relations with China, but certain individual concerns which have already gained access to the Chinese market.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A-2-29/85), drawn up by Dame Shelagh Roberts on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 739 final - Doc. 2-1543/84) for a regulation on the entry into the accounts and terms of payments of the amounts of the import duties or export duties resulting from a customs debt: adopted²

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-43/85), drawn up by Dame Shelagh Roberts on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1542/84 - COM(84) 737 final) for a regulation amending for the third time Regulation (EEC) No 1430/79 on the repayment or remission of import or export duties: adopted³

*
* *

¹ The rapporteur was
— IN FAVOUR of Amendment No 1
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 2 and 3.
² The rapporteur was
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments No 3
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 and 2.
³ The rapporteur was
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1-3.

Report (Doc. 2-1765/84), drawn up by Mr van Aerssen on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on trade with Taiwan.

Mr Bombard (S). — (FR) Pursuant to Rule 85 of the Rules of Procedure and as Vice-Chairman of the European Parliament Delegation for relations with the People's Republic of China, I request that the van Aerssen report be referred back to committee. In fact, it seems to me completely abnormal to adopt what we adopted on Hong Kong, to adopt what we adopted with regard to relations with the People's Republic of China, and then to weaken all that by adopting a resolution on Taiwan. I suppose that an official must have thought it was all China, but we know that Taiwan is not recognized by the Community countries.

(Parliament rejected Mr Bombard's request)

Explanations of vote

Mr van Aerssen (PPE). — (DE) I should just like to thank the House very much for appreciating that, although the Republic of China calls itself Taiwan, I have not mentioned this at all in my report — that we concentrated exclusively on trade, that we stressed our intention to maintain good relations both with Taiwan and with the People's Republic of China, that we admire Chinese culture, and that we in the European Parliament are doing our best to bring about the reunification of China one day.

Mr Rossetti (COM). — (IT) We are very concerned about the effects which the adoption of this report — and it seems likely that it will be adopted — may have on relations with the People's Republic of China.

It is not — let me be quite clear — that we do not appreciate the value of the economic interests which link many European firms with those in Taiwan, nor would we deny either the commercial importance of this island or its place among the major world traders. What we are concerned about is that this trade is being built up to the point where it is putting a strain on extremely delicate political relations, bearing in mind that we recognize the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate government. We are also concerned that we are trying to give the Commission and the European Communities a more or less official role in their relations with Taiwan, while at the same time declaring that we do not recognize it as an autonomous State.

If this attempt to put the relationship between the Commission and Taiwan on an official footing is approved, as it probably will be it can only open the way to a 'doctrine of two Chinas', which is unacceptable both for the People's Republic of China and for the European governments.

Rossetti

After some consideration, we have noted the substantial changes made by the rapporteur to the original report. However, the fundamental ambiguity still remains. We cannot understand why, at the very moment when a new era of agreements with China is opening up, which promises to be of tremendous value to the European Community, Parliament is moving towards measures which could not but jeopardize relations with that country.

Just yesterday, we saw that we are not the only ones seeking to benefit from the opening up of China and that other economic powers, primarily the United States and Japan, are doing the same. And so we wonder whether Europe really stands to gain from approaching this new era of economic cooperation with China in the way we are now doing, which will cast a shadow over our bilateral relations.

May I add in conclusion that the speech made by the deputy rapporteur only served to strengthen our conviction that the choice was not based solely on legitimate economic interests but was also influenced by political leanings, and this is totally unacceptable.

Thus, while appreciating the efforts made by the rapporteur, we have no choice but to vote against this resolution.

(Applause from the Communist Group)

Mr Battersby (ED). — I recognize that Mr van Aerssen's report is, in principle, of a very high professional standard. However, out of respect for the government of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese people, I will be abstaining. Firstly, to dissociate myself from the unacceptable remarks made yesterday by Mr Zarges and also to show that I, and I am sure the responsible majority of the House, deplore the use by an individual Member — especially one taking advantage of his position as deputy rapporteur — of the floor of this House to make a deliberately unfriendly gesture towards a government and people with whom we have the most friendly relations.

(Applause)

The Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal government of China, and I deplore and reject any attempt by individuals in this Parliament deliberately to harm our relations with that great nation.

(Applause)

Mr Nordmann (L). — *(FR)* I should like to read out the memorandum given to French Members of Parliament by the Minister of Foreign Affairs on this subject:

In view of the negative effects which it might have on our relations with the People's Republic of

China, it does not seem to us desirable to urge, in an official and public recommendation, the Commission to improve existing trade and economic relations with Taiwan.

This sentence might have been published by a government other than that which is currently in power in France and which I do not wish to criticize. It expresses in a most revealing way the hypocrisy with which we approach this problem. No-one wishes to reopen the question of the two Chinas. It is simply a question of doing the right thing in certain areas of the non-political trade and relations which we have with the human reality which is Taiwan. This is what Mr van Aerssen's report is all about and that is why I shall vote for it. And, from a personal point of view, I shall simply say to those who are worried that we ended up by recognizing two Germanies that perhaps one day we shall recognize two Chinas.

Mr Hindley (S). — When this report came to the Committee on External Economic Relations, I supported the right of the rapporteur to actually make the report. I was going to abstain today, but something that Mr Zarges said yesterday was so deliberately provocative and mischievous that I have changed my mind. During his speech he took full advantage of the absence of the rapporteur to say that this group was in favour of full recognition for Taiwan. I understood that Mr van Aerssen was going to dissociate himself and his group from that statement. Mr van Aerssen has not dissociated himself from that statement, and I find that quite shocking because it places on record that the EPP Group is in favour of full recognition of Taiwan — that has not been repudiated. In those circumstances I believe that this report will be used by right-wing elements to further the cause of the recognition of Taiwan. Taiwan is an integral part of China, as is Hong Kong, and will return to her. I think that such attempts to recognize Taiwan are deliberately provocative and do not help the cause of world peace. I therefore shall vote against this report and advise the British Labour Group to do so.

Mr Bombard (S). — *(FR)* I shall vote against this motion, and I would appeal to the House to do likewise. We have just celebrated the tenth anniversary of our political and economic relations with the People's Republic of China, which we recognize as being the sole government of China. This text claims to be a commercial text, but it would make it look as if we were publicly recognizing Taiwan. Let those who wish to trade do so, but do not let Parliament make such trade official. The future belongs to the People's Republic of China, with which we have been working for ten years. Let those who sign agreements with Taiwan realize that they are making a great mistake about the future. The People's Republic will remember its friends.

Bombard

Lastly, China believes in Europe, hopes for its success and considers that it will have a role to play between the two superpowers, the USSR and the USA. Are there many great nations which, like the People's Republic of China, opt for Europe for the future? Are we not likely to damage our relations with China for the sake of private business with Taiwan, and are we not giving the Community an approving role which will surely cause difficulties with the Chinese Government and reduce our influence and our credibility?

Mr Wedekind (PPE). — (DE) There is one thing which always amazes me: there are people who are for self-determination and freedom in this world, but when one of the powerful threatens that he is not going to like it if self-determination is recognized, then they crawl back into their holes! It is inadmissible simply not to recognize a government because the government of another country does not want it!

Wooing the representatives of a dictatorship in Red China and not recognizing Taiwan, where there are after all the beginnings of a genuine democracy, surprises me. This just shows how untruthful this Parliament is when it comes to freedom and the lack of freedom. And when even a Conservative like Mr Battersby states that the only government of all the Chinese is the one in Peking, I know what Conservatives mean by freedom — nothing!

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Motions for resolutions on security in Europe:

- Doc. B 2-630/85: Vandemeulebroucke and others
- Doc. B 2-631/85: Le Pen and others
- Doc. B 2-632/85: Pöttering and others
- Doc. B 2-685/85: Piermont.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Hammerich (ARC). — (DA) It is not often that we are able to vote for a motion in this House, so we are extremely pleased today to say that we wholeheartedly support Dorothee Piermont's motion on behalf of the Greens. It is a reasonable and well-thought-out resolution.

First of all, it notes that the Community has no right whatsoever to concern itself with defence, military and

arms production issues, and the constant attempts along these lines are an affront to the countries opposing such a step, e.g. Greece, Ireland and Denmark.

Secondly, Dorothee Piermont's notes that Community involvement in these matters would not serve the cause of world peace. What the world needs today is neither a new sabre-rattling superpower nor a gigantic military-industrial complex selling its arms with the aid of cold or even hot wars. We also share the concern about the military aspects of Eureka. The Danish Parliament has stated that Denmark is opposed to stationing weapons in outer space and to research in this field. We are thus concerned that the Milan summit agreed to the Eureka project without fully examining the military applications and aspects.

I would conclude by saying that, while a civil Community is hardly tolerable, a military Community would be totally unbearable.

Mrs Piermont (ARC). — (DE) Yesterday I made it clear that we are against discussing security and disarmament within Community institutions, as we do not want the Community to be militarized or Europe to become a military power.

Now some of you might think that if the Foreign Ministers meeting in European political cooperation were to deal with security matters in the right way — in other words, aiming at disarmament — the problem would be solved, as stated in motion No 630. The objectives listed in that motion are important. However, in our opinion the authors have fallen victim to the serious illusion that the only thing needed to make the Ten turn from joint arms research, development and production to disarmament is the personal goodwill of the Foreign Ministers. The reality of the situation is quite different; the Foreign Ministers represent States whose 'economic well-being' depends more and more on arms research and the armaments industry. Take Eureka, for instance. Allowing the representatives of these interests to talk about security matters in the hope that the result will be disarmament is tantamount to setting a fox to keep the geese; the indirect result will be more orders for the armaments industry, in other words more and not fewer arms. A few minor concessions to appease the gallery — in this case that would be ourselves — will change nothing. The only solution therefore is our motion for a resolution, and I ask you to vote for it.

(Applause from the left)

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED), in writing. — One of the most burning problems of the moment for the Community's aerospace industry is the need for agreement on the European Fighter Aircraft; the future of an estimated 250 000 jobs in France, Germany, Britain and Italy is at stake, and many more jobs too if Bel-

¹ The rapporteur was against all the amendments.

Sir Peter Vanneck

gium, Holland and Denmark join in the project. The market for the European Fighter Aircraft and spares is estimated at \$100 billion over 20 years.

Equally at stake is an important tool which must be effective and economic. The same freedoms have to be protected in France as in Germany, in Spain as in Britain, indeed in each Member State, against an enemy determined to secure by force, if appropriate, the ends of scientific socialism. This enemy deploys the same standardized equipment, numerically two to four times greater than that available for Europe's defence, against a motley of European defensive equipment.

Also at stake is Europe's ability to harness its own technological skills at a time when the USA and Japan are successfully providing millions of new jobs based on new technologies.

Now France already hosts the Airbus, the joint European company established to design, develop and sell European civil aircraft.

Germany hosts Panavia, the joint European company established to design, develop and sell European fighter aircraft. Panavia has offered to be restructured in order to accept new participants. Holland, Denmark and Belgium have learned from bitter experience that there was little or no technology transfer with the assembly of US F16 fighter aircraft and a large export of capital.

But experience shows that a sophisticated engineering project, such as the European Aircraft, requires a single organization with total responsibility for the project. It must be stated, frankly, that Avions Marcel Dassault does not possess the expertise in international management and cooperation which AIRBUS and Panavia have successfully built up since the 1960s. It has taken 15-20 years and much painful learning to achieve the solidarity and teamwork essential to success, efficiency and pride in the project. This was the case with the Panavia Tornado aircraft programme, now nearing its end.

This is not the time for national governments to champion national companies. This is the time for the European Community to champion a Community effort. The Community has the technologies, and human and financial capital to make a success of the European Fighter Aircraft. The Panavia consortium has the European marketing vision and the single-minded commitment to the clearly defined business of making and selling the right fighter aircraft with limited patronage from national governments. Europe needs a fighter aircraft designed and built to satisfy its own defence needs; it is not the Community's purpose to design aircraft for export markets — since Europe's own defence market is large enough if we organize ourselves to satisfy it, perhaps 2 500 aircraft.

Avions Marcel Dassault, British Aerospace, Messerschmidt-Bölkow-Blohm and other firms ultimately

weaken themselves when they seek preservation and wet-nursing by national governments. Let Europe build its civil and defence aerospace industries on the comparative engineering and managerial advantages built up patiently down the years by such as Airbus and Panavia. I vote for the resolution.

(In successive votes Parliament

— rejected the motions for resolution Docs B 2-630/85, B 2-631/85 and B 2-685/85

— adopted the motion for a resolution Doc. B 2-632/85)

(The sitting was suspended at 8.05 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

7. *Specific regional development measures (contd)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report (Doc. A 2-72/85) by Mr Hutton.

Mr Rossetti (COM). — *(IT)* We cannot but welcome this third series of Community non-quota measures aiming to maintain employment in areas which have been particularly hard-hit either because of their location or by restructuring in sectors such as shipbuilding, textiles and fishing. The sums involved are not in fact great but, coming as they do on top of national and regional efforts and intended to be used as incentives, they could provide a stimulus for an albeit modest new beginning or for alternative deployment of the labour force in the areas affected by the crisis.

However, I would like to make one remark on the regulation on the shipbuilding industry. A number of amendments have been tabled on this by the Italians which seem to me to be very significant, aiming to increase the number of beneficiaries of Community aid: to the provinces of Gorizia, Trieste, Palermo and Genoa, it is proposed to add Venice and Naples, the last two Italian shipbuilding centres which have been omitted from the list. This seems to be in contradiction with the contents of earlier Parliamentary resolutions which stressed the importance of concentrating on a small number of support measures to ensure their effectiveness. And yet the enlargement of the list — and my group will vote in favour of these amendments — is quite justified because the fact is that the restructuring of the shipbuilding industry has meant that

Rossetti

shipbuilding and repair in the whole of Italy are affected by the crisis. This then is why the amendments are significant. However, this listening to this debate, it seems that the problem does not concern Italy alone. The problem, then, is to see how the Commission can hope to get to grips with the issue of the shipbuilding and repair industry. We have already fallen to rock-bottom: any lower and the European shipping industry will be unable to compete on an international level already only 21% of world demand is met by Community producers.

The problem is made even more serious by the fact that the European Community is the leading world trading power and can certainly not allow itself to become dependent on third countries for building and repair of ships. But the cuts continue: on top of the 90 000 jobs lost between 1975 and 1983 in this sector, thousands more jobs are now threatened in Italy alone, in the towns of Monfalcone and Genoa Sestri in particular. Those who have experienced it know how grave the situation is, understand what the residents, not just the workers, in these areas are going through.

This is why we believe that this provision is useful but certainly not enough and that the efforts made by the Community to reorganize and modernize the shipbuilding industry are totally inadequate.

What we want is a change of direction towards a global policy of modernization and protection of the Community shipbuilding industry. While the extension of the Directive to cover the shipbuilding industry is unfortunately necessary, it is not enough. New and positive measures are needed because what we are discussing today is only a stopgap, which can relieve the problem but on its own cannot inject new life into the sector. I believe, for example, that we should develop cooperation between the shipping industries within the Community to improve production methods and research and to harmonize the sector. We should stimulate demand in European shipyards, giving them a true 'Community preference'. We should establish an active policy of support aiming at the modernization of the Community merchant fleet. We need to take measures which would protect Community interests against the unfair competition policy of the Eastern Bloc and Far East countries.

This is why, while we agree with and welcome the provisions of the Hutton report. We feel that there is a need to jolt the Commission's out of its present inertia in this sector and establish a global policy of stimulation.

Mr Hutton (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, I want to make it clear to Parliament that I am now speaking in my capacity as a member of the European Democratic Group and not as rapporteur. I want to give the House the apologies of my colleague, Mr Provan,

from the north-east of Scotland, who has tabled an amendment to this report seeking to add the port of Fraserburgh to the areas benefiting from the measures for those areas affected by the run-down of the fishing industry.

If the Committee on Regional Planning and Regional Policy's amendments to this report are passed, they will, as you will have noted, delete the criteria which insist that measures are put into effect only in assisted areas. If that is passed, this would open the way for the Commission to look again at some of those areas, such as Fraserburgh, which are affected by the run-down of the industry, as Fraserburgh is, but which now lie outside assisted areas. I would like to invite the Commissioner to consider giving this House an assurance that if the Regional Committee's amendments are passed deleting these criteria, he will, as my colleague Mrs Faith moved earlier, look again at areas such as Fraserburgh and Fleetwood, which now lie outside assisted areas, as it would give this policy a truly Community rather than a national look.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, I would like to thank the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and particularly Mr Hutton for his favourable report on our proposals, a report which received unanimous approval. Thus, once again Parliament is lending its political support to the non-quota measures. These measures are based on Community priorities and thus give a pronounced Community cast to regional policy. As Mr De Pasquale said as well this will certainly be the last time that the non-quota measures are implemented. However, I can assure all the honourable members who raised the issue that the Community dimension will be underpinned by the Community programmes foreseen in the new regulation, and which as of now are taking up where the non-quota programmes leave off.

These latest Commission proposals are connected with the second series of non-quota measures and, consequently, it was logical to implement them on the basis of the 1979 Regulation. In this regard I would like to remind you that the Commission, in proposing the extension of the second series of non-quota measures, is honouring the engagements it entered into with the Council. Beside, it was on the basis of these engagements that it was possible to approve the second series in January 1984. It is true that, once the new Regulation entered into effect on 1 January 1985, a legal problem was created as regards adoption of the measures by the Council. For this reason, as Mr Hutton also pointed out, the Commission submitted the fifth proposal for a Regulation amending Article 45 of the new Regulation, so that by extending the proposed time limit it could ensure approval and funding of the proposed measures on the basis of the system applying under the old Regional Fund Regulation.

Varfis

Thus, as I am sure that I have your general support, allow me to make certain comments on the amendments tabled by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning.

Firstly, I accept the amendment concerning the wider publicity which should be given to Community aid. Besides, this amendment is fully justified, as the rapporteur said, in view of the success of the non-quota measures. The Commission would merely like to reserve the right to reword the amendment, without in any way changing its essence.

I also accept the idea of some extension of the geographical scope as far as the measure on frontier zones is concerned. However, I do not think it is necessary to amend the criteria for selecting these areas, for reasons which I will explain immediately. The three amendments to the criteria for selecting the zones which are contained in point 2 of the regulations, and which refer to shipbuilding, the textiles and clothing industry and fisheries, are aimed more at changing the wording than at fundamentally altering the base indices. The wording chosen by the Commission does not merely mention the particular index but also refers to the elements of which it is composed, such as the minimum number of jobs in the sector, the high level of sectoral dependence, major job cutbacks, etc. In this respect I would like to say that a wise discussion already took place in Parliament on the occasion of the Pöttering report which concerned the second series of non-quota measures. I would like to remind you that the Commission at that time endorsed the principle of incorporating the criteria for selecting the zones into the regulations, reserving the right, however, to improve their wording.

Moreover, two amendments are aimed at introducing new zones into the regulation on frontier zones. These zones are in Northern Ireland — the District Council areas of Armagh and Down. Here it should be stressed that the Commission took care to substantially broaden the geographical scope of the programme for frontier zones, adding to the initial zones the frontier zones which are being hit by unemployment. Thus we accept the extensions to these two zones because these are the zones which are closest to the border. For Ireland it was also proposed that County Donegal be included in the case of the measures on gas. The selection of zones in Ireland was conducted by the Commission in conjunction with the responsible Irish authorities, bearing in mind the genuine possibilities for extending the gas distribution network and particularly the returns from the infrastructural works, which mainly depend on population density and economic activity.

On the basis of these criteria the Donegal region could not under the present circumstances be included in the Regulation on frontier zones — and I am sorry to have to say this to Mr MacSharry. However, I would like to point out that the Donegal area is included in

the Regional Fund programmes and has received considerable funding through the Fund's operations.

More generally, I would like to say that we believe — and this was very rightly demanded by the speakers — that the criterias applied are in fact objective. I would also like to add that, as regards the proposal for a Regulation on fisheries, if there are areas which today satisfy the established criteria, the Commission *will favourably consider* including them in the Regulation.

Finally, as regards the wording of Article 4 of the Regulation for the new fisheries sector, it is proposed that the phrase 'the Fund may participate' be replaced by the phrase 'the Fund shall participate'. I understand the desire to make participation of the Fund compulsory *vis-à-vis* the Member State, but the existing wording will have to be retained for various reasons — not only for budgetary ones, but basically for legal reasons and to ensure the overall consistency of the entire Regulation.

President — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

8. Regional development programmes

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-63/85) by Mr Poetschki, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on second-generation regional development programmes (1981-85).

Mr Poetschki (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a far back as 1975 the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning adopted a code of rules for regional development programmes. These rules require economic and social analyses to be carried out, the objectives of development to be clearly formulated and the necessary measures to be precisely described. Details of both Community funding and additional financing by the Member State concerned are also to be provided, and proof of the implementation of the measures is required.

My study of regional development programmes was based on these binding rules and of course the new Fund Regulation of 1 January 1985 in as far as it concerns the necessary improvements which it is hoped will be the feature of the third-generation regional development programmes.

At this point I would like to mention, on a positive note, that thanks to the past work of the Regional Committee and the endeavours of the Commission the quality of the second-generation programmes was considerably better than that of the first generation.

Poetschki

We are all expecting the third-generation programmes to show an even greater improvement in quality.

Allow me to go into a number of points in detail.

Some development programmes are very weak when it comes to the analytical part, with too little comparability of data. The Commission is working on a standard model for use in all Member States and this 'synthetic index' should be developed further, with the necessary consultation between the Member States.

As regards geographical concentration, some Member States, such as the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, have drastically reduced their development areas. But it cannot be in the interest of effective regional development for 54% of the surface area of the Community to be designated by the Member States as development areas within the meaning of the ERDF. Some 95 million people, around a third of the Community population, live in these regions. If unlimited financial resources were available, it would perhaps be acceptable. But in our present circumstances we must use available resources more specifically, in order to achieve the maximum effect in the regions concerned. Job market statistics vary from country to country. In order to be able to formulate development objectives precisely, separate unemployment figures for young people, women and men are needed. Sometimes it seems that certain regional statistics are either lacking completely or are the result of superficial guesswork. The emphasis of regional aid and incentives should be on measures to encourage investment in industry, services and medium-sized firms. This is the only way to create long-term jobs and improve regional economic structure.

So that more account can be taken of regional interests when regional development programmes are being drawn up, we must continue to insist that regional and local authorities and parliamentary bodies be involved in the procedure.

A regional development programme must not be prescribed for a region from above, but must grow up from the roots, feeding on the ideas of all concerned in the region. This is an old demand of the Committee, and we expect the proposal for third-generation development programmes to clearly state that the regions should be actively involved in the preparation of programmes, not just consulted in passing.

There are often no major differences in the economic structure and, for example, unemployment statistics of neighbouring regions on either side of a border or within a country. Nevertheless we must insist on the identification of priority development areas. On the other hand, this must not lead to a distortion of competition.

Good development programmes are essential for an effective regional policy. This is particularly true in

times of slow economic growth. During the boom of the 1960s, the problem of unemployment in peripheral regions was usually solved by migration. Today this is no longer possible, as unemployment is high even in the large industrial centres. No one wants a further rural exodus. People must be able to maintain a satisfactory standard of living and working conditions even in the less-developed rural regions. Regional policy represents the means of achieving this goal, and that is why we expect good development programmes.

The regional development programmes of the ten Member States are the legal basis for aid from the ERDF.

In the past the European Parliament has unanimously and repeatedly called for regional aid, i.e. the Regional Fund, to be increased and will continue to do so in future.

The struggle for an effective increase in Regional Fund resources will not become easier unless the third-generation regional development programmes bring with them a durable improvement in quality.

(Applause)

Mr Sakellariou (S). — *(DE, GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this report is an appraisal of the second-generation regional development programmes in the individual Member States. Following the first programme for the 1976-80 period, the Commission presented a schedule laying down the form and content of these programmes with a view to ensuring their comparability, coordination and concreteness.

The second-generation programmes cover the period from 1981 to 1985. I would like to make the following points on the content of the programmes and their assessment by the Commission and the rapporteur. Firstly, there is a slight improvement as regards the content and nature of the programmes by comparison with the programmes of the first generation. On the whole, however, they are far from being a useful instrument for concrete and concentrated EROP operations in structurally weak regions. Obviously the Commission has become modest in its ambitions, because despite the identification of shortcomings in these programmes it has not submitted any proposals for improvement. Secondly, a study of the regional development programmes lends substance to the suspicion that — at least as far as the great majority of national authorities and governments are concerned — they are still considered as irksome homework which unfortunately has to be done in order to get the goodies.

Thirdly, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and, I hope, this Parliament as well, will never acquiesce in this alibi role of the regional development programmes. We will insist on

Sakellariou

our demands that the very meagre and limited resources of the ERDP be spent — and spent sensibly — only when the programmes in question constitute an objective basis for meaningful regional development.

Please allow me to switch to Greek for my final comment.

Bearing these points in mind we finally call on the Commission to lay down binding frameworks spelling out in detail the structure and content of the regional development programmes, which will also be a *sine qua non* for each application made to the European Regional Development Fund.

Commissioner, past experience has shown that the indicative character of the existing scheme for the regional programmes is not enough to improve these programmes. I believe that in future both the structure and the content of the regional programmes should be compulsory and that, in so far as the Regional Fund appropriations are very concrete, the requirements of the Commission and the Community in general regarding the regional programmes should be binding.

Mr O'Donnell (PPE). — Mr President, at the outset I would like to congratulate sincerely my colleague, Mr Poetschki, on his excellent report on second-generation regional development programmes.

Mr Poetschki has pinpointed with a remarkable degree of accuracy the main problems, difficulties and weaknesses in Community regional policy, as revealed in the Commission document, which contains details of the regional development programmes of the 10 Member States for the period 1981 to 1985. When analysing those programmes for the different member countries, the first thing one can say is that the ERDF is totally inadequate to meet the needs of a realistic and effective Community regional policy.

Secondly, as Mr Poetschki has pointed out in his report, the Fund has been disbursed over too wide an area of the Community and has had therefore a mere watering-can effect. As Mr Poetschki pointed out, 54% of the geographic area of the Community, which contains 30% of the population, is designated as eligible for aid from the ERDF.

Thirdly, as this report points out, there is very little evidence of any real attempt to involve local and regional authorities in the formulation and implementation of regional development programmes. This is a very serious weakness in Community regional policy, and the motion for a resolution contained in this report lays especial emphasis on the need for a greater involvement of regional and local authorities in regional development.

The joint declaration of 19 June 1984 by the Council, the European Parliament and the Commission called

for effective relations between the Community and the regional and local authorities. This would enable regional interests to be better taken into account when regional development programmes are drawn up.

It has been my considered opinion for a long time past that the effectiveness, and indeed the success, of regional development programmes demands the closest cooperation between local, national and Community authorities. We therefore in this report call again on national governments to allow their local authorities to play a much greater and more active role in the formulation and implementation of regional development programmes in the future.

Another fact emerging from an analysis of the programmes of the ten Member States in the period in question, 1981-85, is that most of them continue to find it extremely difficult not only to describe their regional development objectives but also to quantify them. It is clear that most, if not all, member governments regard the ERDF merely as a source of additional revenue to their national exchequers, rather than what it should be — a major instrument of regional policy.

Indeed, the situation is somewhat the same in my country. Reference has been made in Mr Poetschki's report to the fact that Ireland is designated as a single development region, and he poses questions about the validity of this designation. Ireland has a very special status, which is recorded in the protocol to our treaty of accession. There are very valid reasons why Ireland should be given this special designation. It is an island country on the periphery of Europe and has major economic and social problems, as well as high unemployment.

Given Ireland's severe social and economic problems — that is, very high unemployment and intense demographic pressure, combined with fundamental structural change in agriculture and industry and the fact that these problems are being experienced in every part of Ireland — the withholding of ERDF eligibility from any Irish sub-region would have immediate negative effects, not only on that sub-region but also on Ireland's overall regional development.

My final point is that within Ireland there are very serious regional disparities. We have the growth of Dublin on the east coast and the depopulation of the western regions of Ireland. In a previous debate in Parliament, I drew the Commission's attention to the urgent need for the formulation of integrated regional development programmes for the western seaboard regions of Ireland, particularly for the Gaeltacht region, of the offshore islands and the north-western region.

I think that there is an opportunity now. What I am saying is this, that while I defend the designation of Ireland as a single development region, I believe there

O'Donnell

is a need for the Irish Government to earmark a certain part of the annual allocation of the ERDF to formulate and implement integrated regional development programmes for the western seaboard regions.

(Applause)

Mr Hutton (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of the European Democratic Group I would like to congratulate Mr Poetschki on a fine and a thoughtful report. It seeks out the weaknesses in the present system and highlights them, with suggestions for how they might be strengthened.

The regional problems which Member States seek to resolve through their regional policies vary very considerably from one Community country to another and even from one region to another within the same country. The backwardness of predominantly agricultural regions, the decline of old-established industrialized regions, the depopulation of rural areas and the decline of urban areas are all very varied and very difficult problems, but they illustrate the serious regional imbalances within the Community. They are reflected in most cases in a shortage of jobs which, with the economic crisis, has grown worse in recent years in all parts of the Community. Consequently, the creation and in some cases simply the maintenance of jobs is now the major regional policy objective in all Member States. This objective is made all the more pressing by the fact that one million young people are entering the labour market each year while at the same time a growing number of industries are facing urgently needed structural changes.

Regional development programmes are, from a Community point of view, the reference tool for assessing projects submitted for ERDF assistance and designed to tackle these problems and are, at the same time, the most appropriate framework for the coordination of national regional policies and Community regional policy.

In a market economy such programmes can only be of an indicative nature and must be updated regularly.

The more detailed and precise the content of the programmes, the easier it will be for the Fund to assess whether projects fall within the framework of the programmes. The effectiveness of ERDF assistance is closely linked to the quality of the regional development programmes.

As regards the ERDF-assisted regions, the regional development programmes are also the reference framework for using other Community financial instruments and allowing greater consistency to be achieved between the various forms of Community financial assistance in the regions concerned. The programmes must also allow the Community authorities to take account of the regional impact of other Com-

munity policies and the effect of the measures which are adopted. If the programmes contain sufficiently precise information in this field, they will make it possible to carry out this task more effectively. I appreciate the extra effort this will cause to national civil servants, but Community regional policy will be increasingly important and I think Mr Poetschki's recommendations are a good guide to how to use it better.

Mr De Pasquale (COM), *Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning.* — *(IT)* Mr President, the Committee on Regional Policy has drawn up its own work programme which will be presented in this House bit by bit in the form of a series of reports. Our aim is to bring the problems of regional policy up-to-date and to present Parliament and the other Community institutions with a picture of what we feel to be the problems which must be solved to lay the foundations for further progress in regional policy.

The Regional Fund has now been in existence for ten years and a great deal of water has passed under the bridge in this time. There have been successes and failures, the situation has changed, and I think that Mr Poetschki's praiseworthy report brings out all of these aspects. We regret one thing: the regional programmes are undoubtedly the basis for directing community action towards certain goals and priorities but if these regional development programmes do not do this, if they are superficial, all-embracing, then their scope becomes too diffuse and their effect correspondingly less concentrated. Without selectiveness, there is no precision, and I think that the Commission should take account of the recommendations made in Mr Poetschki's report. If we want to launch a method of action through programmes, then the regional development programmes need to be more specific and more precise; the scheme should be compulsory as far as possible and programmes which are not specific enough should be discussed and if necessary amended or rejected.

Mr President, the problems we are discussing today are of great importance. However, as you are well aware, we on the Committee on Regional Policy are nightbirds and are always obliged to hold our discussions at night. In Italy there is an excellent television programme called 'Quelli della notte' (nightbirds). We are like them, but our voices are not heard quite as clearly in Parliament or by public opinion.

Mr Barrett (RDE). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my group I would like to thank Mr Poetschki for the in-depth preparation and the excellent presentation of his report on the regional development programmes.

I welcome this opportunity to comment on the deficiencies and the problems of the existing regional

Barrett

development programmes, and I trust that the Member State governments will be impressed by the solidarity expressed here this evening when they are taking account of our complaints.

My group particularly welcomes paragraph 16 of Mr Poetschki's motion for a resolution in which he calls for the greater involvement of local and regional councils in the elaboration and implementation of regional programmes. We believe that, wherever possible, Community funding should be channelled directly to the local and regional authorities involved. We also believe that it is essential to ensure that there is greater coordination between national and Community regional policies and between regional policies and other policies, both national and Community.

In supporting the principle that ERDF resources should be concentrated in the least advantaged areas, my group feels that it cannot give unqualified support to paragraph 6 in Mr Poetschki's motion for a resolution, which calls for reductions in the geographical size of development areas. We certainly agree that the Fund should be concentrated on the least-advantaged regions and that it should be concentrated on the least-advantaged countries. But we are concerned that government planners might implement geographical cutbacks in a manner which would discriminate against the Community's sparsely populated areas.

For these reasons we have tabled an amendment, Amendment No 1, which points to the high incidence of regional problems in the least densely populated areas and calls for the continuation of ERDF support for disadvantaged areas of this kind.

I am pleased that Mr Poetschki has highlighted the need for a greater degree of transfrontier cooperation. I would like to register my disappointment at the fact that in the new proposals the cross-border programmes have lost their original sense of purpose. The United Kingdom authorities have decided not to participate in the gas pipeline project and are independently pursuing a new programme for the promotion of small and medium-sized businesses. I believe it is most unfortunate that the United Kingdom and the Irish authorities have abandoned the cross-border tourism programme, which not only operated successfully but was also seen to operate successfully. It is to be hoped that the recent gas finds off the coast of Ireland will persuade the United Kingdom Government to reconsider its position and that additional funds will be found to extend the cross-border tourism programme.

In his report Mr Poetschki also stresses the importance of transparency in the use of ERDF funds. I welcome the recommendation that the Commission make more intensive use of its powers to monitor and investigate the use of ERDF monies. We all have our suspicions that the additionality principle is not being respected.

(Applause)

Mr Dimitriadis (DR). — *(GR)* Mr President, on behalf of my Group I would like to warmly congratulate the rapporteur Mr Poetschki for his excellent work. The regional development programmes are an institution which can make a major contribution to equalizing conditions in the disadvantaged and privileged regions of the Community, thus accelerating the development of the countries in question, while at the same time solving specific problems which crop up in the implementation of the common policies. However, we believe that if the regional development programmes are to achieve their goals, their planning, approval and implementation must be realized both by the national governments and the Commission on the basis of concrete criteria with absolute coordination between the national agencies, both central and regional, and full documentation of the needs and the expected results. In particular, we think that the concrete measures which the national authorities will apply in implementing these programmes will have to be specified and evaluated.

Despite the fact that this need has been emphasised by the European Parliament in the past and was recently restated in the joint declaration of the Parliament and Commission of 10 June 1984, the second generation regional development programmes had but a few qualitative improvements to show.

Now we are facing the third generation of programmes which the Member States have submitted to the Commission and, with the experience gained in the past, it should be possible to ensure observance of the prerequisites laid down by the European Parliament. This is precisely what the report by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning is driving at. The report is a series of proposals, it lays down the general framework of conditions which must be satisfied in the selection, approval and implementation of the new regional development programmes.

I refer only to a general framework because we believe that on the basis of this framework the Commission will later wish to lay down detailed guidelines clearly establishing the procedures for selecting, evaluating and implementing the third generation programmes.

These guidelines must not leave room for uncertainty and controversy in the future. Within these frameworks we believe that the report by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning constitutes a major contribution to promoting Community objectives. We fully support it and once again we would like to congratulate the rapporteur.

Mrs Boot (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, today's debate on regional development in the Community has covered a range of subjects, which we have still not yet exhausted. Taken together, these subjects represent the span of the Community's regional policy, a policy that has been implemented step by step since 1975 and

Boot

which stands or falls on the basis of cooperation between the national and Community authorities. The aim is to create conditions in disadvantaged regions, or regions which have fallen behind for whatever reason, to allow them to develop on a more equal footing with the other regions. As for the report by Mr Poetschki on the regional development programmes I would like to say that it is a good report that deserves to be sent to all the Member States. A report which demonstrates that regional policy does indeed take shape step by step.

The third generation of regional development programmes are now due. On the basis of the Commission's summary, Mr Poetschki gives an assessment of the national regional development programmes submitted for 1981-1985. He draws particular attention to the quality of these development programmes, which could certainly be improved by adhering more closely to the 'common outline'. I think that the path to be followed has now been marked out for the Community's regional policy, in particular as far as direct aid to the regions is concerned. The Member States are in fact committed to carrying out a European policy, and also to utilizing the potential available in these regions for their development.

I would call for good strength/weakness analyses to be made and for the common outlines to be drafted to enable the Member States to prepare their own programme along the same lines — programmes that should form the policy framework for talks between the Commission, the Member States and the regions. Moreover, I believe that we as citizens of Europe have a strong need for a European government. A great economist once said that 'once we have achieved economic and monetary union, only regional policy will remain'.

(Applause)

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, I would like to thank the European Parliament for the motion for a resolution with which it aims at enhancing the role of the regional development programmes. I can state without reservations that I agree with the content of this proposal. I believe that the improvement *vis-à-vis* the first and second generation programmes is somewhat greater than the report claims, but I recognize that there is still a lot left to be done. I assure the honourable Members of the European Parliament that we are seriously endeavouring, both at government and regional level, to ameliorate the third generation programmes which will start rolling in during the coming months.

The proposal for a resolution and the report touch on a number of topics which are of particular interest to us and on which we are concentrating our efforts. Firstly, there is the question of comparability between the programmes, that is to say the attempt to gradually

work out a common model for regional development programmes which will make the Member States' regional policies more transparent and more effective.

A second point on which we are in full agreement is that the ERDF operations should be more concentrated. After the accession of Spain and Portugal the Fund's operations will cover approximately 50% of the total Community population and I think that this is indeed an excessively high percentage.

A third very important point is that the regional development programmes will have to be clearer and more specific as regards their geographical and sectoral priorities. This is something which we emphasize particularly in the Member States, just as we emphasize the need for a funding programme with a breakdown by region and by large categories of infrastructure works.

Amongst the priorities which we share with you, we attach particular significance to the future development of the labour market. We ask the Member States for precise data concerning the objectives of creating and preserving jobs and, where this is not possible in practice, we ask them to supply us at least with indicative data for each region, so that we can evaluate the situation in each region of the Community and channel funds accordingly.

Finally, another important issue concerns cooperation between the regions, the Member States and the Community in the preparation and application of the regional development programmes. The information obtained from the regions concerning their individual needs and priorities is certainly invaluable. Likewise, we believe that the programmes can be implemented more successfully if the regions participate more actively — and this is what we are striving at.

However, I would like to point out that the administrative and economic system of decentralization varies considerably from one country to another, making it is very difficult to adopt a uniform approach.

Finally, in your resolution you urge the Commission to suspend Regional Development Fund support in the Member States which have not submitted a satisfactory regional development programme. Here I have to make one point clear: any regional development programme which does not contain a schedule of expenditure by region cannot be accepted by our Fund, under the terms of the regulation. From this point on the question as to whether a programme is or is not satisfactory is one of pragmatic evaluation. Besides, an essential aspect of this evaluation is the follow-up to determine whether the monies from the Regional Development Fund were used correctly and effectively in developing the regions. I should mention that on occasions we have had to reject regional development programmes, whereas far more often weeks and sometimes months of discussions between the authorities of

Varfis

the Member States and the Commission elapse before a programme is officially submitted to our Fund, with a view to improving the programme's content, so as to ensure that it includes more concrete information.

All our endeavours are concentrated on moving as rapidly as possible from the stage of financing schemes which merely satisfy the formal criteria for selection to the stage in which there is a genuine selection of schemes and programmes taking as criteria the effectiveness of the programmes both at regional level within each Member State and the extent to which they serve Community priorities.

One decisive element in this endeavour is the improvement of the regional development programmes. However, I would like to point out that, given the criteria for priorities laid down in the new regulation, in conjunction with the Commission's greater leeway in the selection of schemes and programmes, this improvement is also in the interests of the Member States. For this reason we are sure that the third generation programmes will be substantially better than the previous ones.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

9. *Water resources*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-69/85) by Mr Vandemeulebroucke, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on the importance of water resources for the growth and development of certain regions of the Community.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this report on water resources was prompted by the three motions for a resolution tabled by Mrs Fuillet, Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz and Mr Chanterie, respectively. The fact that not all of them are present at today's debate does not mean that they do not consider their resolutions to be important. I think they have great confidence in their 18 colleagues who are still present.

The question of water resources cannot be seen apart from other aspects of economic development such as agricultural policy, the establishment of industries, energy policy and transport policy. In my view, a policy towards water resources should be developed in an integrated fashion and on a regional scale. The problem is extremely complex. There is not just the threat of a water shortage in various regions of the

European Community, human activity such as deforestation and increasing water pollution also plays a part.

The search for a European approach to water supply policy should start from a number of key points. The first is the establishment of a water databank at European Community level, which could be used to draw up a list of useful projects that should of course then be rationally implemented.

Secondly, such a policy should be aimed at development measures with an immediate job creation impact.

A third point is that new projects should also be examined for any detrimental side-effects. Hence I would argue very strongly for an environmental impact assessment relating to water policy. On the basis of these general starting points, we should develop a diversified policy approach. Water problems in the traditional industrialized regions are generally not at all comparable with the issues affecting the southern regions of Europe. For example, the industrialized regions are facing an increasingly rapid drop in groundwater levels. Certain industries such as the textiles sector urgently require easily accessible groundwater, since the need to drill ever deeper for water is placing these industries at an increasingly severe competitive disadvantage. This hence calls for a coordinated policy plan and a directive, addressed to the various Member States.

Of course, the Member States too need to work out and apply measures leading as quickly as possible to a substantial improvement in the quality of surface water and full protection of groundwater. Hence my reference to the directive of 15 July 1980 on the quality of water for human consumption, which has still not been implemented in all the Member States.

Consideration may also be given to a European financial contribution — at least that was the view of a number of Members on the Committee — for industrial regions with an extremely antiquated water distribution network. This is not my personal standpoint. I believe that Regional Fund resources can be used in much better ways.

The problems of water resources in the Southern regions are quite different. In the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes we now have in my view the most adequate and most suitable financial instrument for preparing a water resources policy. Water supply development measures can cover a wide range of activities. A river regulation policy can prevent flooding in seasons of high rainfall and droughts in summer. Measures can be taken to ensure an adequate water supply for tourist centres where the population increases tenfold in the holiday months. The supply of water can be improved by irrigation projects enabling obsolete forms of agricultural production to be replaced. Accompanying measures can be taken to

Vandemeulebroucke

regulate the water economy by means of reafforestation. The European Community has also launched interesting projects, for example the experimental Atra project in Greece in the field of aquaculture.

As far as energy production is concerned, I must point out that the distribution of hydro-electricity is truly uneconomic, and not always consistent with a policy of decentralized development and the need to create new jobs. It should therefore be approached in conjunction with the development of other energy sources, in particular the new energy sources. Here, I expressly wish to congratulate the Commission on their efforts to date, for they have indeed already launched a considerable number of projects. For example, the experimental project on the island of Pantelleria, where a great deal of work has been carried out into an integrated approach to the water shortage there based on the construction of a desalting plant operated on power supplied by biomass. The development of gas for domestic use from this biomass has also removed the island's dependence on imported fuels. The use of biomass, derived chiefly from waste agricultural or forestry products, as a source of energy can create employment in rural areas and also directly improve the water supply.

Consequently, I believe that water policy cannot be seen apart from integrated projects for the Southern regions, particularly when forming part of a Mediterranean programme. I have tabled three amendments to my report to emphasize precisely this integrated policy approach, because water resources must be considered in connection with agriculture, energy, transport, and other problem sectors.

(Applause)

Mr Lambrias (PPE). — *(GR)* Mr President, Mr Vandemeulebroucke indeed deserves to be congratulated for the report which he has presented to Parliament with the approval of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. In particular, the detailed explanatory statement supporting the motion for a resolution has many merits: the precise description and scientific foundation of the problem, the endeavour to adopt an integrated approach and, above all, the categorical statement of the political will to solve the problem in a methodical and coordinated manner, as part of an integrated whole, as befits the Community's development policy.

If only the approaches adopted by the individual governments to regional problems had these properties! Accordingly it would be desirable if the governments apart from falling in with the resolution also applied themselves to the study of Mr Vandemeulebroucke's explanatory statement and realized the need for multi-lateral and coordinated action.

I will not repeat the point so clearly stressed in the report concerning the vital indeed existential, signific-

ance of water and the dependence not only of the economy but also of civilization and the quality of life on this good which, alas, has ceased to be free. I would simply like to add certain comments, not in order to belittle the report but to enrich it in a practical direction.

1. A short-term emphasis on the recycling sector would be doubly beneficial because it would not only save water but also correspondingly reduce the steadily growing pollution of the environment. Consequently, immediate priority should be given to the intensive application of biological purification, particularly in tourist areas. Similarly, reafforestation is doubly beneficial — economically and environmentally — and the relevant programmes should likewise be given priority.
2. The report fails to mention the surprising success which Israel has had, particularly in the field of desalination. In certain areas desalination would be a magic solution, although from the micro-economic viewpoint it would appear today to be prohibitively expensive.
3. The inclusion of certain water economy problems in the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes would be a practically useful step because the necessary studies can be initiated at short notice. However, this solution would not blunt our awareness of the common danger which the Community is facing and the responsibility of all its members for conserving their water resources. Time does not allow me to refute certain inaccuracies and oversights in the report, particularly as regards hydroelectric and irrigation projects in Greece. Neither is this necessary since, as I stressed at the beginning, the rapporteur has given us a vade-mecum for integrated endeavours which both the Commission and the Council should endorse without prevarication.

(Applause)

Mr De Pasquale (COM), chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. — *(IT)* Mr President, I would like to express my approval and thanks to Mr Vandemeulebroucke for his report which — as I said before — is just part of a whole corpus of problems which we intend to raise. We are all aware that we cannot exist without water for our towns and water for our industry; and this means that the Community cannot afford to ignore Mr Vandemeulebroucke's report, which is concerned with the proper management of our water resources. We must find the ways and means to implement a comprehensive policy of water management, to protect our waters from pollution, to make better use of them, to conserve them, and to achieve their rational distribution.

De Pasquale

It is no secret to any one that there are areas in the south of the Community with vast resource of water which we are not making full use of and which could be a crucial factor in the improvement of living conditions and of economic and industrial development. However, this is a question which requires further examination and which the Committee will probably discuss at a later date. The Vandemeulebroucke report, for all its goods points does not perhaps offer solutions which have been proved viable in a more general context. However, its intentions are good in that it draws the attention of the Commission to what is a fundamental problem for the Community.

Mr Chanteric (PPE). — (NL) I too would like to endorse the appreciation expressed for Mr Vandemeulebroucke's report. It rightly devotes a great deal of attention to the problems of the Mediterranean regions, which Mr Lambrias also rightly emphasized on behalf of our Group. Nevertheless, I believe the problems and opportunities connected with the Southern regions and their water resources should not be allowed to deflect attention from the specific problems also faced by the Northern industrial regions. I should like to discuss two points in detail.

In recent years, the groundwater levels in some regions of Northern Europe and hence Belgium as well have dropped so drastically that it is not inconceivable that groundwater supplies will be exhausted within the next ten years. Now, certain industrial sectors, in particular housing construction and the carpet and textiles sectors, are heavily dependent on groundwater and internal water resources.

The exhaustion of groundwater supplies could mean a catastrophe for the textile industry in my region: West and East Flanders. Clearly, the negative consequences would also extend to employment — 11 000 jobs in the carpet and finishing sector together with numerous jobs in the industries supplying this sector. All these jobs would be jeopardized. In order to handle such a situation and to take preventive action, a coherent water plan should be drawn up to include the following elements amongst others: a study of regional water resources, an assessment of investment programmes, stabilization and then reduction of water consumption, and a plan to protect threatened groundwater supplies. The zone in the Community where groundwater levels are falling increasingly rapidly should in my view be eligible for ERDF aid to enable industry in that region to develop other, less water-intensive production processes.

There is also a second issue, Mr President. I have tabled two amendments calling for Parliament to oppose taxes or levies on the use of water resources on consumers in other regions of the Community. For example, in our country faced with a proposal by the Conseil Régional Wallon to levy a tax on all drinking water sent from Wallonia to Flanders. I should like to

put a highly specific question: can the Commission confirm that such a tax is in breach of the Provisions of the Treaty of Rome concerning the open market and the rules of competition?

If Parliament accepts Amendments Nos 1 and 2 to this report, the Commission will be asked to keep a close watch to ensure that no such taxes are levied. With a view to tomorrow's vote, I should however like to point out, Mr President, that several amendments have been tabled in my name, even though I myself have only tabled amendments Nos 1, 2 and 3. The rest were tabled under my name by mistake because I initially proposed them in committee.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, I consider very important the initiative contained in Mr Vandemeulebroucke's extremely valuable report and motion for a resolution on better management of the Community's water resources, which is in fact a vast issue. The Commission shares both the general views of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and the opinions expressed in the resolution concerning the usefulness of certain measures, such as the creation of a data bank on water resources, the adoption of measures to develop water resources, the protection of groundwater and the prevention of waste.

You know that these measures are included in the objectives of the Commission's environmental action programme and I would like to remind you that particular emphasis has been placed on these measures in the context of the programme for the protection of the Mediterranean which was recently approved by your Parliament. However, implementation of these measures is hampered by the shortage of funds. This is the reason why the Commission, unfortunately, is not in a position to take on all the commitments it would like to. Naturally, the Commission will not promise more than the resources and manpower available allow. As regards the problem of managing water resources, the Commission's main role is to give the authorities at national, regional and local level all the available basic technical data and assessments which will help them to forge a European policy in this field. The Commission has already attempted to do this in the field of groundwater resources. In future it will be in a position to perfect this system and to bridge the existing gaps by providing regular data as they become available.

Consequently, the Commission does not believe that a directive is the appropriate legal instrument, under the present circumstances for defining a coordinated policy on water management.

Finally we should remember that there exist Community directives which cover most aspects of water pollution. The Commission will have to implement them with all the means at its disposal, to ensure that the Member States comply with these rules.

Varfis

As regards regional policy the Community finances projects for the exploitation and management of water resources to the extent that these works contribute to the development of various regions in the Community. Indeed, I should mention that the water resources sector may well have received more support from the Regional Fund than any other sector. Thus, in the 1975-1983 period the European Fund provided a total of 2 350 000 000 ECU to fund 3 600 projects relating to the storage and distribution of water, irrigation, and the recycling of waste water. This is a major contribution in that it corresponds to 16% of the total of funded projects and 25% of the total contributions from the quota section of the Fund. The European Fund also provides support from the non-quota sector to measures in favour of the peripheral areas of the Mezzogiorno and the Greek islands, in the field of water exploitation and management and, mainly, in the development of hydroelectric power and in ensuring a plentiful supply of drinking water, for example by desalinating seawater. We hope that these measures will soon receive a major boost in the context of the Community programme and the implementation of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes.

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, a moment ago I put a specific question to the Commissioner. If he had said 'I cannot answer that directly at the moment', that would have been acceptable, but he did not say even that much. I should therefore like to ask what the Commissioner intends to do about my question?

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) I cannot give you an answer now, Mr Chanterie, but I promise to do so soon.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

10. *Appointing members of the Board of the European Foundation*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-47/85) by Mr Fajardie, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 116 final — Doc. C 2-12/85) for a decision laying down the procedure for appointing those members of the Board of the European Foundation to be chosen by the Community.

Mr Fajardie (S), rapporteur. — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the matter of the European Foundation is not exactly new to the European Parlia-

ment. May I remind you that the idea was launched by Mr Tindemans almost exactly ten years ago, when he proposed in this report on European Union that the European Council should create a European Foundation to be financed partly by grants from the Community or Member States. It will, however, finance a large part of its activities by private funds. Its objective will be to promote, either directly or by supporting existing bodies, all activities which might contribute towards better understanding between our peoples, by putting the emphasis on contacts in the form of youth activities, university exchange, scientific debates and symposia, meetings between people of similar interests or professions, cultural activities and information meetings.

After being taken up by the Council in 1977, the idea was relaunched in 1981 by Mr Chandernagor, at that time the French Minister for European Affairs, resulting in the agreement of 29 March 1982 between the representatives of the ten Member States of the Community.

So far seven Member States have ratified this treaty, and the three who have not yet done so — not four — as stated erroneously in the report — seem certain to complete the ratification procedure by the end of 1985.

Since 1982 a preparatory committee has been at work, although its relations with the European Parliament have not always been ideal.

In October 1983 our Parliament adopted a resolution highlighting the shortcomings of the project and asking to be represented on the Board of the Foundation. In March 1984 Mr Beumer repeated his reservations on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport. The European Parliament's warnings seem to have worked, and the Commission's proposal for a Council Decision on the procedure for appointing the members of the Board of the European Foundation opens the door to effective participation by the European Parliament in the activities of the Foundation.

The report I am presenting to you today, which was adopted unanimously — except for one vote — by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, generally approved the spirit and terms of the Commission's proposal to the Council, whilst also asking for the role of the European Parliament to be clearly defined.

For this reason we are proposing to you that at least three members of the European Parliament be included on the list of members of the Board of the Foundation appointed by the Community. Apart from the interest of our Parliament in the preservation and development of European culture, it seems quite natural — given that the Foundation is financed to a large extent by funds from the Community budget,

Fajardie

over which Parliament has a say — for the European Parliament to be suitably represented on the Board.

Finally, I must emphasize that an undertaking of this sort which may develop considerable influence, is an object of great interest to the European Parliament. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there is such a thing as a European culture, and it is the mixture of different ingredients which makes it so rich. We have to look after the whole, considering it as an enormous work of art created over the last 2 000 years, a many-sided yet unique culture which constitutes the most beautiful part of our common heritage.

This is where the European Parliament is at home; where the preservation of our culture is assured, knowledge about it is fostered and spread — to young people in particular — and efforts are made to make it eternal. For this reason the report invites you to vote for the broadest possible association between Parliament and the European Foundation, both for the purpose of determining objectives and in administrative matters.

Mr Hahn (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party will vote on the Commission's proposal on the appointment of Members of the European Parliament to the Board of the European Foundation, assuming that the motion tabled by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport will also be accepted. We would like to congratulate Mr Fajardie on his report and hope that after ten years the European Foundation will at last be able to start work and fulfil the important purpose for which it is intended.

For this to be possible the agreement must finally be ratified. In seven Member States this has already been done, and of the remaining three one or two are making ratification dependent on clarification of the Foundation's relationship with the European Parliament and on our approval of the same. We did in fact for a long time have major reservations, as the European Foundation was born, so to speak, with a handicap, having been founded not as an institution of the European Communities but as an inter-governmental body. This is by its very nature a complicated affair, as we have already seen, since all the national parliaments must ratify the agreement.

In addition, relations with the European Community were not made easier by the fact that on the one hand the European Foundation was to be financed out of the Community budget, whilst on the other hand we were to have no control and from the outset no say in the programme, policy or appointment of the members of the Board of the Foundation.

As Mr Fajardie has already pointed out, Parliament has complained about this time and time again; we

have also held discussions on the subject and now have to vote on the result of those discussions. The most important thing now is that the Foundation starts to function, as various extremely important tasks await it in the cultural field, tasks which are unsuitable for the Commission and of course even more so for the Parliament, but which are tailor-made for the Foundation.

We want cooperation to be really close, and this is why we have tabled a motion that three of the ten members to be appointed by the Commission should be from the European Parliament. Three is very few, when we consider that the Board is to consist of forty members: two from each Member State — making twenty — and another ten to be appointed by the Commission — including three from Parliament. These thirty members will then co-opt a further ten.

To the Members of the House, I would also like to say that the three of us appointed should undertake to play a full part on the Board of the Foundation and to become actively involved in policy-making and organization by constantly helping to shape and monitor the programme). There must be no duplication of the work of Parliament on the one hand and the Foundation on the other. We must not work against or regardless of each other, but in tandem.

Mr Fajardie has already mentioned the most important tasks, and I need not repeat them. But I would just like to say once more that we want to work with the Foundation and expect the Foundation to echo this sentiment and allow us to participate in its work — a principle which should in fact be recorded in some sort of institutional form or by an exchange of letters.

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, first of all I would like to affirm that the European Democratic Group welcomes this report and congratulates Mr Fajardie on his work. We also very much welcome the amendment stipulating that three Members of this Parliament should be included on the Board of the European Foundation. This is something which is obviously extremely important.

Mr Hahn has referred to the urgency of the conclusion of this work. The Tindemans report and the meeting which followed Mr Tindemans' initiative actually took place very nearly 10 years ago, I, as a former school teacher, am aware that lip service is very frequently paid by politicians to youth and European youth. We as politicians forget that time passes extremely quickly. Some of my former pupils used to come up to me three years after I had finished teaching them and say 'Good morning, Sir!'

They were 6'3" tall, they were of voting age and no longer the pupils I was aware of. The youth who would have benefited from the European Foundation when this initiative was put forward are now of voting age and young adults.

C. Beazley

I think that it is a shame that this particular committee, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, is not given greater weight in this House. I believe it is one of the most important committees and I believe that the European Foundation was one of the most important initiatives. Yet we consistently waste time. We say that we must convince the youth of Europe of the importance of education, of the importance of culture, of the importance of common shared values. Yet while we speak and do nothing, the youth of Europe grows up and becomes middle aged, and the danger is that they become disenchanting.

I very much welcome the fact that a decision will be made, as I understand it, by the end of this year, that all the Member States will get their acts together and that the European Foundation will no longer be a piece of rhetoric. It will actually be achieved. I think of the words which we find on the bridge here in Luxembourg on the memorial to Robert Schumann. He said *L'Europe ne se fera pas d'un seul coup*. He wrote those words in 1950, two years before I was born.

I believe that those of us who believe profoundly in the European Community must match our words to our actions. Certainly the European Democratic Group will vote in favour of this report and the amendments, but more than that we must ensure that Members of the European Parliament sit on the Board of the European Foundation. We must remember that it was Geoffrey Rippon, Lord Asa Briggs, Frau Focke and other distinguished people who nearly a decade ago called for action.

I will draw to a conclusion because I understand that time is limited at this hour, but I do seriously think that it is too easy to say we must convince the youth of Europe of the necessity of understanding our common shared values. I subscribe to those views, but we must also do something about it. I hope this report will not only be supported and voted upon but that action will be taken within this calendar year.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I must congratulate Mr Fajardie on behalf of the Commission for this excellent report, for the moderation and yet determination of the proposals it contains, for the simplicity and clarity with which it presents a wealth of objectives. Before I turn to some of the points raised in the debate, may I say how pleased I am that Parliament is in a large measure in agreement with our proposal on the appointment of members of the Board of the European Foundation.

We are all aware that this only added a further complication to the already tortuous process of ratifying the Foundation.

The proposal which I presented to the Council on behalf of the Commission on 31 March was favourably received and I can tell you that the three representatives of the European Parliament will be able to sit on the Board and act with full-powers and with authority — because of that same moderation and competence I mentioned before — in the administration of the Foundation.

The members appointed by the Community to the Board will have the very delicate task of ensuring the necessary coordination between the work of the foundation and the Community, to avoid the overlapping of jurisdiction and initiative which for a long time was the cause of disagreement and misunderstanding between the proponents of the Foundation and the European Parliament. I do not need to remind you of the opinion of Mr Schwencke, who gave what I felt to be a very sound summing up of the concerns of the first European Parliament elected by direct suffrage. I am sure that with this obstacle out of the way work can now begin in a climate of cooperation and mutual trust, with the proviso that the Foundation must in no way try to encroach on the work being done by the European Parliament and Commission but should concentrate on the sectors specified. I will mention just a few — because Mr Beazley has already given us a full account of them — namely the problems of youth employment, exchanges and other issues in which Parliament has for a long time been interested and which are discussed in the Fajardie report.

The Commission, therefore, supports your request to include — and I repeat — three members of Parliament in the list of ten members to be appointed by the Council.

May I, at this point, remind you of the idea put forward by Mr Hahn at the end of his speech, which was to formalize the Commission's intention by an exchange of letters which would do more than a speech made in this House by a Member of the Commission to give Parliament the guarantees if quite rightly requires.

Therefore, the Commission intends to comply with your request when it proposes the list of nominees to the Council. The Commission feels, however, while understanding and agreeing in principle — differing only on the form in which it is presented — that the proposal made in the report to amend the procedure initiated by us is liable to engender discussion in the Council on the number of parliamentarians to be included on the list even as the agreement is being drawn up. As we see it, this would have the twofold effect of delaying the final go-ahead for this procedure and laying it open to about — turns by the Council and second thoughts about the number — which could only mean a reduction.

This is the only point on which we do not absolutely agree, although — as I have said before — we are in

Ripa di Meana

complete agreement with the principle of your proposal and with what you are trying to do. In due course, therefore, after the exchange of letters which has been suggested and which I will certainly be drawing up in the next few days, we will contact your Committee and the official parliamentary bodies before drawing up the list of nominees, on which Parliament will again be consulted, and we will submit this list at the Council meeting. You will therefore be given the opportunity to consider the entire list of nominees — not just those put forward by the European Parliament.

Im am convinced that the procedure we have envisaged will enable us to achieve the result Parliament wants before the end of the year, that is the joint ratification by the Parliaments of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium, which would give us the final go-ahead.

The Foundation could then come into full operation by spring 1986.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

11. *Beef sector*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-48/85) by Mrs S. Martin, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on the beef and veal sector.

Mrs S. Martin (L), rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, this report takes up a whole series of resolutions tabled by our colleagues as a result of the considerable slump in the market for beef and veal... After increasing from 69 to 79 million head between 1965 and 1983, the Community cattle population remained steady for almost ten years. However, per capita consumption, which had increased steadily until 1979, then began to fall and has continued to do so. The Community's degree of self-sufficiency is now slightly more than 100%.

It was against this background that milk quotas were introduced, accompanied in many Member States by measures aimed at restricting milk production by reducing the dairy cow population. This unexpected slaughtering led to a flood of beef and veal just when production, which follows a cycle, was on the increase. In 1984 slaughtering figures went up by 16%. As a result, despite massive buying-in at intervention prices, the market price, for the first time in years, dropped to less than 80% of the guide price, which of course led to a considerable fall in producers'

income in a sector where average income has always been lower than in other production sectors.

Let me add that the Community, in accordance with GATT, the Lomé Convention and other trade agreements, has continued to import some 400 000 tonnes of beef and veal representing 6% of Community consumption, at a preferential rate of duty. Under present circumstances such imports have a negative effect on prices and generate storage costs and of course refunds which weigh heavily on the Community budget.

But in spite of everything, we have been fortunate. A shortage on the world market enabled us to export almost 800 000 tonnes of meat last year. Nevertheless, current stocks, which also increased from 300 000 to 600 000 tonnes at the end of 1984, are still a considerable burden on the market. In order to restore balance, to the market, a major effort must be made to dispose of stocks rapidly without upsetting the domestic market, i.e. by giving priority in particular to industrial processing.

We are all aware that trade agreements with third countries must be kept. However, given that this disturbing situation will certainly continue this year — and probably next year at least — we must ask the Commission to look into the possibility of a review of these agreements, which were concluded at a time when there was a shortage in the Community. But the main necessity is to promote exports effectively by introducing an intervention system which is more flexible and more suited to the needs of the market. To give just one example, intervention management as practised by the Commission for a number of years now causes producers or dealers who are sufficiently flexible to concentrate the marketing of their animals on the autumn, when the Commission intervenes on whole carcasses, although this is also the time of maximum supply due to the seasonal slaughtering of animals at the end of the grazing season. This means that in a way they are giving priority to market intervention.

Intervention should be the safety net only, in other words it should only take place when necessary. Similarly, priority should be given to private storage, which is more flexible and less costly, and a programme of incentives should be introduced at producer level in order to facilitate production planning and above all to improve coordination of supply with demand. The possibilities of adapting the storage system to the needs of the market should also be examined. In the present situation, exporters often complain about difficulties in meeting the demands of purchasers in non-member countries for specific parts of carcasses. Furthermore, whilst the suckler cow premium, the only true Community premium, has been retained, I think that an increase should be considered, as it is an incentive to the production of quality meat.

S. Martin

Finally, although this year, certainly next year, and perhaps even the year after there will be a considerable production surplus, the large number of dairy cows being slaughtered may well lead to a production shortage in the years to come. It is up to the Commission to keep a close watch on the development of the live-stock population so that we can forecast any such setbacks.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have summarized the situation and described the main proposals which I wanted to put to you this evening on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food to solve the considerable problems afflicting the beef and veal sector.

(Applause)

Mr Eyraud (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as in other animal production sectors, biological progress has had an effect on the supply of beef and veal. When the Treaty of Rome was signed and when the common market in beef and veal was organized in 1968, there was a deficit. Now we have achieved not only self-sufficiency but in recent years a surplus — 102% in 1982, as I recall. However, the cattle population of the Community has remained steady for more than ten years at around 80 million head. Increased productivity due to the improvement of breeding stock is not the only factor. Non-observance of the principle of Community preference means that 450 000 tonnes of meat per year is able to enter the EEC at a reduced or even zero rate of duty, this helping to flood the internal market.

The slaughtering of cows as a result of the introduction of milk quotas has also increased stocks. And managing these stocks involves a further superfluous strain on the Community budget.

At the May part-session I said that the cost of storing a tonne of meat stands at 1 470 ECU per year. The average price of a tonne of live weight in the Community is around 1 500 ECU. Therefore, since the governments of certain non-Community countries, India for example, are interested in live cattle with a view to replenishing their livestock population, I would like to reiterate my request to the Commission for such outlets to be explored.

Of course, such a measure seems very insignificant, but it illustrates the need to promote the export of live animals with a view to improving the breeding stock of the cattle populations of developing countries.

A more dynamic export policy must also be pursued; it was forecast that 900 000 tonnes of meat would be exported in 1984, but the final figure was in fact only 790 000 tonnes of carcase equivalent.

At the same time it is necessary to help the Community's agri-foodstuffs industries, which are cur-

rently unable to meet the demand of the internal market.

Further measures are recommended in Mrs Martin's report, which I fully endorse.

Addressing the Commission, I would like to add that intervention management as practised for several years now, i.e. according to the theoretical system of five month's hindquarters in winter, five month's forequarters in summer and two month's whole carcasses in autumn, does not strike me as being ideal.

In fact, as Mrs Martin has pointed out, during the periods when intervention buying is limited to quarters, the market support system is less efficient, resulting in a lack of stability on the markets and losses for the producers.

In 1984 intervention on whole carcasses did in fact continue for three months instead of two. Given the present prices, I think that this will have to be repeated in 1985.

As I have said before, the intervention and storage system is not the cure to all evils. Stocks must be disposed of under the best possible terms. Above all they must be exported.

This is the philosophy behind the proposals put forward by the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, and we hope that the Commission will accept them all.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — Mr President, Mrs Martin's report arises, as we have been reminded from a number of resolutions expressing concern about the beef and veal sector. This concern stems in the first instance from the fact that incomes in this sector have always tended to be lower than the average income for all farmers. However, these difficulties have been accentuated in recent times by the large number of cows being slaughtered as a result of measures taken to substantially reduce milk production. We have now reached a point where the Community is more than self-sufficient in beef and veal, and many farmers are now seriously concerned about the volume of imports of cattle and beef into the Community on preferential terms.

The milk quota system has very much reduced the land area being used for milk production, and in these circumstances farmers have to look for alternatives. Cattle and beef represent a normal and natural choice. There is also pressure to reduce production in the cereals sector and this creates further land use problems. Beef and veal need the sort of assistance and support required to provide farmers engaged in this line of production with a reasonable income.

It is my view that not enough encouragement is being given to those who are making an effort to find outlets

Clinton

in third country markets. A certain amount of aid is being given for promotion in the home market, which in some Member States at least is already saturated. However, there is nothing other than refunds for people trying to develop trade with third countries. Export aid by way of refunds has always been the cheapest and most effective way of disposing of surpluses, and it will have to remain as the main support. However, export credits will have to be used as well.

In view of the exceptionally large stocks of beef now in stores and the cost of this storage, a start should be made straight away with an offer of at least one year's credit on sales to third countries. Many of these third countries have not got the money at present to buy, and I believe that this would start off a worthwhile business. If this is not done and if the private storage scheme is not introduced during the months of July to November inclusive, there will simply be chaos in the beef and cattle trade before the end of 1985.

There will also have to be buying in of carcasses for at least two of the last three months of the year and aids to private storage will have to be maintained at 1984 levels. Unless we are to destroy the agricultural industry, policy cannot be framed on budgetary considerations alone. Marketing should always, of course, be a main aim, but because of the seasonal nature of production there must be intervention in order to keep a floor under prices, and there is absolutely no justification, in my view, for delaying payments for 120 days for intervention beef. This should be reduced immediately to one month.

Attention must also be given to the fact that winter beef production is a costly business. If serious losses are to be avoided, it is imperative that private storage and appropriate export refunds be available during the months of January, February and March. Many farmers suffered heavy losses during these months in 1985. It should be remembered too, that winter feeding of cattle might help to provide an outlet for surplus grain in the Community as well.

I regret to have to say that, as yet, no serious effort has been made to induce animal-feed producers to incorporate more Community grain in their products.

We must never forget that cattle and meat production provides an immense amount of employment outside the farm gate. This Community, above all areas in the world, cannot afford to ignore the employment content that is there.

When I am talking about employment, of course, outside the farm gate, I am talking about processing and distribution of the product. As we know, processing is all the time on the increase, and that is what we should be aiming for. More and more people are looking for convenience foods, and this is something that we should be encouraging.

I am, as you know, Mr President, particularly interested in this report and what it contains, because I happen to represent a small country that is very dependent on cattle and beef production. As you know, more than 70% of our total agricultural output is accounted for by cattle and beef and by milk and milk products. We have a very small home market. I think we are making a very creditable effort to find markets in third countries. Now a substantial proportion of our production goes to third countries. This is something that we must find — new markets. We are at least trying to find new markets.

This is a report, Mr President, that is factual and informative. It deserves not only the support of this Parliament but also the very serious consideration of the Commission. I am glad to see Commissioner Andriessen here tonight.

(Applause)

Mr Barrett (RDE). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the beef market in Ireland is of major national importance. This can be clearly demonstrated by the fact that the total value of exports of livestock, meat and meat products in 1984 was estimated at £ 890 million. This includes intervention and private storage beef stocks. This total accounted for about 10% of the value of total national exports. In 1984 only 15.8% of Irish cattle output went for domestic consumption. A further 21.7% was exported as live cattle while the remaining 62.8% was exported as beef carcasses or beef products. The trend in live cattle exports has been downwards, while beef exports have been on the increase.

The difficulties in the beef and veal sector are essentially the result of a considerable influx of beef meat onto the market, especially following the introduction of dairy quotas and the entry into force of a number of national measures aimed at reducing dairy herds which have brought about a marked increase in the number of animals slaughtered. The present situation of more than 100% self-sufficiency, is having an adverse effect on prices to the producer. In addition, a heavy burden is being placed on the budget because of storage costs and refunds.

One of the points raised in the report relates to preferential imports of beef and veal, which account for as much as 6% of total consumption in the Community. The Commission must look into the possibility of reviewing the arrangements relating to preferential importation agreements. Up to 1983 imports from third countries amounted to about 400 000 tonnes, most of which entered the Community on special terms. In addition, these preferential import agreements were made at a time when the Community could not supply its own needs in beef and veal. This situation has been completely reversed. As the common agricultural policy is the cornerstone of the Com-

Barrett

munity, so too is Community preference at the heart of the common agricultural policy.

In the introduction to its Green Paper on Perspectives for the Common Agricultural Policy the Commission states that the European Community is already confronted with the question of whether it wishes to maintain a substantial number of workers in agriculture or not. To that question the Commission says that there can be only a positive reply. It also argues the need to maintain the social fabric in the rural areas. If this is truly its intention, then for my country with its dependence on farming, especially the beef sector, every effort must be made to put the beef market in order.

In view of the present situation of self-sufficiency to which I have already referred, the Commission must strive to dispose of stocks rapidly and thereby help to stabilize the beef and veal market. Part of the problem we are dealing with arises from the quota arrangements in the dairy sector, together with a whole range of national measures designed to cut back the dairy herds. As a result, slaughterings have increased and the market has been flooded with beef and veal.

It is difficult to foresee a situation where a shortage of beef and veal could arise in the medium-term. This situation must be closely monitored.

I should also like to suggest that part of these stocks could be disposed of in the form of tinned meats as food aid for developing countries. Moreover, support for the agri-foodstuffs beef and veal industry, which cannot meet current consumer demand in Europe, would enable a substantial part of production to be disposed of on the internal market. The Commission should also encourage consumption by sales to the most disadvantaged social groups, a development which the Commission is pursuing at the moment. Sales of intervention beef to Community processors are available at present at a discount of roughly 10%. Any suspension would conflict with the aim of ensuring sufficient supplies at reasonable prices to the processing trade. Such a move would affect supplies to Irish processors and thereby employment in this important sector of the beef industry.

If we do not put some order into the beef and veal market, farmers' incomes in this sector, which have always been lower than the average income for all farmers, will never be secure. I urge the Commission to pursue the necessary reforms as a matter of extreme urgency.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to begin by expressing my appreciation for the report submitted by Mrs Martin and for the comments made this evening on this report by Mr Eyraud, Mr Clinton and Mr Barrett.

It is clear that the factual assessment in the present report is based on the situation obtaining on the beef market in 1984, and as we all know that year saw the most serious disruption to the balance between supply and demand since the introduction of a market organization. As nearly all speakers have stated, this was of course due to the extremely large numbers that were slaughtered as a result of the introduction of the milk quota system. I do not think we should say that the cause of the problems we are discussing this evening is structural in nature. At the moment, we have somewhat more favourable expectations for developments, because it now appears that the surplus production in 1985 will be about half that for 1984. There has been some recovery in market prices, which are currently 5 to 6% higher than in the same period of last year. A contributory factor has undoubtedly been the vigorous export policy pursued. In consequence, the Community is currently the largest beef exporter in the world. This is due to the fact that a number of the world's major suppliers are currently in deficit.

However, I must draw attention to a second point, and that is the size of stocks, which various speakers have already pointed to, namely a figure of over 700 000 tonnes. This prompts me to say that in the period to come we will need to be extremely careful in using the facilities for intervention, namely only then when it is necessary to support the market. Furthermore, we shall have to do everything we can to prevent an ill-considered stockpiling that would increase the amounts in storage and place a relatively large burden on the Community's financial resources. In this connection, a temporary private storage scheme — referred to by a number of Members — such as the one applied late last year and early this year is in the Commission's view — and here I agree with the Honourable Member — a particularly useful management instrument, because it allows advance financing of export refunds and permits the product to be treated, butchered or boned before storage, thus giving it a better change of being sold when released.

The Commission considers that everything possible needs to be done to sell stockpiled products. However, I must point out that converting the stocks into tinned meats or food aid does not so far appear to be a realistic alternative and simply amounts to, at least to a significant extent, a postponement of the problem, since the marketing opportunities are limited and the costs extremely high. Incidentally, I agree with the rapporteur that all measures need to be encouraged which will restore the balance between supply and demand by stimulating consumption and a dynamic commercial policy. The last speaker rightly pointed out that the problem of commercial policy is an important subject for the discussions on the future of the Common Agricultural Policy — which I hope will be prompted by the Green Paper published recently.

As regards trade, I should like to say the following. I can understand the call by the rapporteur and also

Andriessen

some speakers in this debate for a limit on preferential imports under arrangements concluded in the past. I can also understand recommendations being made for a more differentiated set of instruments to encourage exports, as suggested by Mr Clinton. He cites the system of exports credits in this connection. I agree on this point. However, as far as imports are concerned, I should point out that it is extraordinarily difficult, now that the Community has become the largest beef exporter in the world, to go back on trade agreements concluded earlier under different circumstances. Furthermore, if we were to do that extremely poor countries would be the victims in a number of cases. I thus have to express definite reservations on this point on behalf of the Commission. I therefore also do not agree with statements such as the one I believe I heard in Mr Eyraud's speech to the effect that Community preference is not being complied with sufficiently or at all. Although we import considerable quantities of beef, we export much larger quantities and I think that one should look at the problem of Community preference in this light.

Mr President, as regards premiums, I agree with the rapporteur that everything that can cause distortions between producers in the Community must be eliminated. The Commission hence takes the view that the suckling cow premium should be retained as the only genuine Community premium, and that we should continue to make serious efforts to put an end to the other premiums still in force in the Community.

To conclude, Mr President, I should like to say that I believe the crisis which the beef sector has suffered and is still suffering to a certain extent will perhaps have beneficial results. There will have been a restructuring of cattle stocks as a result of the large numbers slaughtered due to the milk quota. Supply will have been brought into line with demand as a result of falling meat production due to smaller numbers of calves and a switch to alternatives in certain sectors. Finally, management will be more efficient, as regards both intervening on the market and selling the products.

Finally, and here I endorse the last remarks made by Mr Barrett, this crisis has revealed the limitations of the current system. It is for this reason, Mr President, that the Commission has undertaken later this year to submit proposals, for changing existing practices, in order to modify the way in which the beef sector has been managed in recent years so as to bring the budgetary costs and the marketing opportunities for producers more into line with one another. The call in this debate for a re-evaluation and fresh approaches I thus wholeheartedly endorse on behalf of the Commission.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

12. Animal welfare policy

President. — The next item is the interim report (Doc. A 2-62/85) by Mr Simmonds, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on animal welfare policy.

Mr Simmonds, (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, at this late hour I would like to start my remarks by expressing my gratitude first and foremost to the secretariat of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, who have done a lot of research for me in the preparation of my report and particularly of my explanatory statement. Secondly, I would like to express my appreciation to the secretariat of the Euro-group on animal welfare whom I am pleased to see in the gallery of Parliament this evening. Thirdly, I would like to express my appreciation of the way that Commissioner Andriessen and his staff have been very receptive and cooperative in the preparation of a fairly detailed explanatory statement.

I do want to stress right from the outset that this is an interim report and that it was actually passed without opposition in the Committee on Agriculture. As an interim report it emphasizes one main message. That main message is that there is no sense at all in seeking further legislation, whether it be directives, regulations or whatever, while existing regulations are being ignored. That is the case at least as far as the transport of some animals is concerned. In this year's budget in June, Parliament voted funds to enable the Commission to begin to police existing legislation. Alas, in its wisdom Parliament included this money as a token entry. I do hope that later on this year steps will be taken to find funds so that at least we can make sense of existing regulations.

But likewise the message of this report is that there is no sense whatsoever in making proposals which are not going to be implemented by the Member States because they are either unrealistic or unresearched. This report paves the way for the work which we must now do to gather expert evidence and research and to prepare realistic proposals with a sensible timetable which will be accepted and observed by the Member States. Let me give you an example of precisely what we should not do. A few years ago a committee of one of the Member States' parliaments proposed that battery cages for laying hens should be banned within 10 years. They then passed an amendment to reduce the period to five years. Because no alternative system had been properly researched no action was taken and the report was ignored. I hope that this Parliament, spurred on by the emotion which often accompanies this subject, will not make the same sort of mistake.

In the autumn, in preparation for the second part of the report, we will be holding hearings on farm animal welfare and I do hope that it will be possible for Mem-

Simmonds

bers of Parliament to visit farms to compare existing intensive and alternative systems of keeping animals. That is the proper way to prepare ourselves to take proper informed, balanced decisions when we prepare the report on the four specific subjects. Firstly, the keeping of chickens in battery cages; secondly, the transport of livestock, particularly calves; thirdly, the crating of veal calves; and fourthly, the practice of tethering sows.

To save time in the morning, may I very briefly refer to the amendments. With one exception I propose to advise the House to reject those amendments, either because they were rejected in committee or because they do not, in my view, improve the text but dilute it, or because they raise issues which will be dealt with in the second part of the report. I am sorry to note that the author of some of the amendments is not present here this evening for the debate.

The amendment that I will accept with great pleasure is that in the name of Mrs Castle and also, I think, Mrs Crawley, whom I am pleased to see here this evening — Amendment No 3, which refers to paragraph 15 and not to paragraph 17, as some copies of the English text indicate.

Finally, may I say to the House that I am most anxious to proceed as quickly as possible with the second part of my report and also with the hearings. Those hearings have been held up twice — once by the election last year and more recently because we have lacked a budget. The second part of the report is a bigger and more difficult task, but that part of the report is a real challenge to Parliament to make its mark in the welfare field.

(Applause)

Mrs Crawley (S). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is becoming increasingly obvious from the growing volume of correspondence from our constituents on the subject of animal welfare that the people we represent are justly concerned that in our treatment and trading of animals within Community policy we stamp out all forms of hardship and suffering, and therefore our policy should be directed to that end. Animals have a right to dignity and humane treatment, both in life and in slaughter, and that right should, in our opinion, override narrow, purely commercial considerations.

Mr Simmonds would be highly surprised and embarrassed if I were to overwhelm him with euphemistic praise for his report, so I shall fight any temptation to do so, although others may be carried away by the excitement that is reverberating through the Chamber at this late hour.

Suffice it to say that the Socialist Group will be supporting the Simmonds interim report. Our support is

not surprising, as it was a resolution tabled on the initiative of Socialist Members in the Committees on Agriculture and the Environment which formed the basis for Mr Simmonds' report in the first place. However, reservations arise from the fact that the report in several respects does not seem to grasp some of the reality behind the sometimes pious-sounding phrases. For example, the hope is expressed in the report, quite rightly, that the Council of Europe's Convention 87, on animal welfare, and 65, on animal welfare during transportation, will be ratified by the European Community. Yet, and I draw Parliament's attention to the fact, Convention 65 has already been ratified by the following countries; Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the UK — all 10 in the EEC. Other Council of Europe countries where Convention 65 has been ratified include Austria, Cyprus, Iceland, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey. Convention 87 on rearing farm animals has also been ratified by eight EEC countries. Ireland and Italy have not ratified, nor have five Council of Europe countries. It is the opinion, therefore, of many organizations, including the RSPCA, that whether the EEC ratifies these conventions or not could simply be a red herring, since all these previously mentioned countries have ratified the conventions and nothing whatsoever is being done in real practical terms to implement them. It is, for instance, highly significant that veal-calf units are flourishing in the south of France, a country which has ratified the convention, and that 200 000 calves a year are exported from the UK to cater for this market, which would not be allowed to happen if the convention were being implemented. It would appear to some of us that an adequate standard of checking, monitoring and enforcing of the convention is almost impossible and that the only real way ahead would be the ultimate banning of live-animal transportation — transport on the hook and not on the hoof, a recommendation called for in the original Castle resolution. However, we do welcome the concrete proposal in the report for a special policy unit in the Commission to deal with farm welfare, and we see such a move as leading to a focusing and a strengthening of animal welfare policy in the Community.

(Applause)

Mr Mertens (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as the rapporteur has rightly pointed out, the report in question is only an interim one. But I would not like anyone to think that this interim report is not important, and wish to stress the public appeal values of its content. Widespread discussion of the subject has been going on for years and in my opinion it is time to take things seriously and draw the consequences.

This interim report did not materialize out of thin air. In her speech Mrs Crawley commendably referred to the Council of Europe's Convention 87, and I might

Mertens

add that this House has also contributed in various ways. For example, in the previous legislation period we discussed the very controversial Tolman Report on battery hens. And towards the end of the same period Mrs Schleicher presented an opinion on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on the subject of animal welfare on farms. I would also like to mention Mrs Herklotz's report on animal transportation. Finally, the report which we are discussing today is based on Mr Woltjer's resolution. Perhaps I might also add, in all modesty, that I also tabled a motion for a resolution on the conditions under which calves and pigs are kept, particularly on agricultural holdings.

I am not going to emulate Mrs Crawley's reticence in refraining from praising the rapporteur. On the contrary, I think he deserves it, as he has tried to describe the current situation as soberly and clearly as possible. I recommend everyone to read his explanatory statement carefully. Drawing on various expert sources, he has laid a foundation upon which we can build. As I already implied, there is an increasing fondness for animals in the Community, and this is leaving its mark on our discussions.

I do not intend to go into the various aspects or even the extremes of opinion on this problem, but in the short time available I would like to confine my attention to a few principles and proposals formulated by the European People's Party. First of all, we attach the utmost importance to the harmonization and approximation of legislation in the European Community at the earliest possible date. We must realize that this is a European problem. If we do not remember this, competition will continue to be distorted and developments to go in different directions. Perhaps some countries will also introduce bans or other measures of which we do not approve. The Community must therefore agree on a common stance.

Secondly, we attach considerable importance to animal welfare. Here I have consciously used the appropriate expression from the Council of Europe's Convention. This is an essential task for us. We do of course appreciate that it is not so easy to properly understand the psyche of animals and to contribute to their welfare. We also appreciate that exaggeration is often the order of the day and that over-enthusiastic animal lovers tend to think that they can understand animals on the basis of human feelings. Despite these reservations, animal welfare must be our goal. I would again like to confirm and take up two points which the rapporteur considers very important. First, we must endeavour to inform those concerned, i.e. producers and consumers, and to convince them that it is necessary to take action in the right direction. Secondly, the rapporteur stresses the importance of research and asks the Commission for continued and direct assistance. Thirdly, he mentions the hearing which the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food has

decided to hold in order to obtain the views of experts on the present situation.

Allow me to close with just one comment: over and over again we hear people expressing the view that it is time to ban technology from agriculture. This is totally unrealistic. If I might draw a comparison with the human world, it would be tantamount to abolishing production line work or electronics. Modern agriculture cannot go back to the Middle Ages. We must solve present-day problems in a present-day manner. Finally, I would like to say that we support this interim report and are in favour of its being adopted as a final report as soon as possible. On the other hand, we do not consider the amendments to be particularly useful and are not in favour of them.

Mr Schinzel (S) — (DE) I would just like to ask Mr Mertens whether it would not have been more useful at this late hour, instead of philosophising at length about the psyche of animals, to approve the Tolman Report. When the Tolman Report was under discussion, you were against it.

Mr Mertens (PPE) — (DE) I would like to ask Mr Schinzel to read again what I said about the Tolman Report's findings on this subject at the time. And secondly, he should himself think about the problem. This, in my opinion, is essential for a clear understanding of the situation.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, although we have before us just an interim report, I should nevertheless like to congratulate the rapporteur on a report that in the Commission's view expresses very clearly what very many are increasingly thinking today in both the Community and outside as regards the protection and welfare of animals. I also find it extremely positive that Parliament has regularly shown interest in this subject, as in demonstrated by the series of reports mentioned by Mr Mertens.

I am somewhat hesitant about entering this debate. Naturally, I am grateful for the rapporteur's appreciation for the work of the Commission and its services but I do realise that in the past we have not been able with the resources at our disposal to obtain sufficient staff to do what was asked of us and perhaps what we had committed ourselves to doing. The tasks arising from the Treaties or Community legislation are constantly growing, and unfortunately I have to admit that we have not succeeded in increasing staff levels sufficiently to perform these tasks. We have taken a number of internal administrative measures and are trying in this way to utilize the resources available as efficiently as possible, but I have to concede that we are not sufficiently capable at the moment of carrying out properly that which needs to be done for the Community.

Andriessen

This leads me to say that at the moment I am unfortunately not in a position to respond positively to an important recommendation in the rapporteur's resolution, namely the creation of a special policy section at the Commission for the welfare of farm animals. I believe it is better to say bluntly that I cannot make such a commitment than to create the impression that this would be feasible in the near future. I think this would be over-presumptuous and dangerous into the bargain. The effect would be to give rise to expectations that cannot be fulfilled, and I feel that a public authority should not do such a thing.

What I can promise, however, is to continue the efforts of my predecessors to do everything in our capacity to draw attention to the important area of animal welfare, which public opinion demands of us because animals are entitled to such attention.

I can also promise that we shall continue our research activities in this sector as before — naturally within the budgetary framework for agricultural research. I also promise you that I shall submit a report to Parliament and Council at the end of the year on the studies we have carried out and the progress we have achieved. I also think that would then be a suitable moment to examine how we can make resources available under the agriculture research budget for research on this subject.

Finally, I should like to finish with a comment on supervision. I promise you that we shall continue to monitor strictly as far as possible what is being done in the Member States to meet the obligations arising from Community legislation. We shall attempt as far as possible to arrange more in-site Community supervision. We shall make use of existing facilities, for example when our veterinary inspectors visit slaughter houses to ascertain whether the Community rules for the stunning of animals are correctly observed. I have also suggested Community supervision in our proposals for protecting laying hens in batteries, but I would point out that the subject of supervision by the Community still remains an area for which it is not too easy to find an acceptable solution. We shall do what we can to live up to the undertakings we have made with regard to animal experiments, transport of animals, intensive livestock farming and the slaughter of animals.

Mr President, I have tried to give you an honest account of the possibilities open to us. I hope I have also made it clear to you that the Commission agrees with the objectives that are set out in the interim report and which have been expressed in many other contributions during this debate. The Commission looks forward with great interest to the rapporteur's final report.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

13. Dried grapes and dried figs

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. A 2-66/85) by Mr Stavrou on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 146 final — Doc. C 2-21/85) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1603/83 laying down special measures for the disposal of dried grapes and dried figs held by storage agencies.

Mr Stavrou (PPE), rapporteur. — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my report which we are discussing this evening is the third one dealing with the disposal of old stocks of dried figs and grapes, and I hope that it will also be the last — not of this evening's sitting but the last of its kind — since, as you will already have noted, these quantities are being used up by being disposed of for a use which is, of course, not what they are really intended for but which is considered essential if we are to avoid an unfair loss to small farmers struggling to make a living.

Consequently I shall not bore you by going into arguments for adopting the report. This has been done successfully by the colleagues who drew up the reports on the same subject in the past two years, and I should like to take this opportunity of thanking them not only for thus making my own task this evening easier but mainly because, with the measures which they have proposed for restoring an important sector of Greek agricultural production and which the Commission has implemented so industriously, they have managed to create a shining example which may turn out to be an effective cure for many ailments, in which, as you know, the Common Agricultural Policy is anything but lacking.

Indeed, Mr President, it has been and still is incomprehensible that we should end up with solutions involving the destruction or waste of agricultural products, and particularly of agricultural products which are in deficit in the Community. Perhaps it would be worth saying a few words about the reasons for such a strange state of affairs.

Ignorance, ill-conceived economy measures, and the lack of even basic planning in agricultural production are unfortunately the permanent causes of such predicaments, and yet these could be easily avoided by simple planning based on two fundamental, I would even say classic, economic concepts, those of productivity and competitiveness. Instead of these we generally prefer the facility of mass production, irrespective of the quality of the product or of what ultimately happens to it. We must recognize, Mr President, that this is the Achilles's heel of the Common Agricultural Policy. Guaranteed prices are without doubt the cornerstone of this policy. However, it is equally certain — and there are countless examples of it — that with-

Stavrou

out accompanying measures able to make these products competitive, the national, European and even world markets, guaranteed prices will totally distort the Common Agricultural Policy.

For these reasons, Mr President, we must sound the alarm now, and as responsible politicians we must call on the Council and the Commission to make the essential and far-reaching cuts which will cure the now ailing system and will give proper structure to the only sector which yet entitles us to speak about a European Economic Community, since, as we know, it is only in agriculture that the Community's joint financial responsibility is at present applied.

When announcing the publication of the Green Paper yesterday, the Member of the Commission responsible for Agriculture, whom we are very pleased to see here today at this late hour, rejected the accusation that the Commission is being technocratic. I have no difficulty whatsoever in believing him. But if he wishes to prove it, all he has to do, on the occasion of the new budget, is to change the present relationship between appropriations spent on supporting prices and those made available for guidance, crop restructuring and, more generally, the improvement of agriculture. So if the Commissioner is moved by the small and insignificant example which is the subject of my report, then he should make, a bold proposal capable of solving a broad range of problems which today constitute enormous obstacles on the path to European Union. That means, Mr President, that instead of totally gearing its agricultural policy to bagging the lion's share in the form of parasitic subsidies or repayments, each Member State should pay more attention to improving the agricultural infrastructures which will make its products competitive and viable on the European and world markets.

Mr Battersby (ED). — Mr President, I am speaking this evening on behalf of Mr Provan, who has been called away on constituency business.

When Greece joined the Community, we were faced with the problem of accommodating a surplus of 60 000 tonnes of dried grapes and figs. In order to facilitate accession Parliament agreed to take on this surplus as a concession, and we accepted a charge of some 60 million ECU. However, this was on the understanding that this should be a one-off operation. Nevertheless, in 1983 a further 30 million ECU were charged to the budget for the same reason. In 1984 one million ECU were charged, and now we are being asked to accept 300 000 ECU for each of the next two years. In other words, we appear to be being asked to establish an annual programme.

We feel that this sector must not be allowed to become an annual regime with all the dangers of fund manipulation. The sector is a large market with a significant level of imports. It is now under control, the phase-down has been achieved — perhaps slowly but never-

theless efficiently — and enough compensation, we think, has been paid out.

My group regrets therefore that, as a matter of principle, it is compelled to vote against the Commission's proposals. This means unfortunately that, despite the professionalism and excellence of Mr Stavrou's report, we have to vote against it.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Mr Andriessen, I have a question to ask you, since you were also a member of the last Commission: I would like to know how the Commission defines the term 'the last time'. Three years ago you — or the Commission — said that this was a one-off operation. One year later, the Commission said this really was the last time we would take such action, and now this year we are faced with yet another proposal on these lines. Could you perhaps explain the Commission's use of language and what is meant by 'the last time'?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, there is an English saying stating that once elected Members of Parliament regret the speeches they made before entering Parliament, and this also applies to some extent to this Commissioner, who is now being reminded of undertakings his predecessor evidently made on this matter.

The sentence I originally wanted to start with this evening I decided to drop. I wanted to say that this was the last time I would come before Parliament on this matter; however, I thought I could not really say that because it sounded so rude, as if I was not prepared to discuss such matters with Parliament. I now understand why my officials included this sentence, and I now repeat it with pleasure: this is the last time that I shall come before Parliament with this matter: In line with the decisions that have been taken, and on which our proposal is based, we shall try to bring this matter to a close in the near future, although I should say that the size of the amounts involved at any rate are quite clearly in line with the spirit of the undertakings made by my predecessor. Having said that, Mr President, you will understand that I am extremely grateful for the support I have received from the rapporteur, whom I congratulate on his report on the Commission's proposal. If Parliament endorses our proposal, we shall try to proceed in this spirit, and at the risk of my successor having to repeat the same saying that I started with a moment ago, I solemnly promise you that this is the last time I shall consult parliament on this matter.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

(The sitting was closed at 12.05 a.m.)¹

¹ Agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX

I. *Questions to the Council**Question No 73, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (H-23/85)*

Subject: Enlargement

When they became members of the Community twelve years ago, Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom undertook to become part of the European judicial area by acceding to the Convention of 27 September 1967 on jurisdiction and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters as between Member States of the EEC. It would appear that this obligation has not been fulfilled, as Belgium and the 'Three' have failed to ratify the protocol to the Convention of 9 October 1978. On the eve of a third enlargement, is it right that the Community authorities should still be patient with the four Member States in question? Is it acceptable that the 'Three' should persist in their refusal to accept Community acts? Surely, European citizens and those facing legal proceedings will grow weary of this situation? What will the Council do to put an end to this anomalous state of affairs, which is becoming increasingly worrying as time passes?

Answer

The extension of the Convention on Jurisdiction and the Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters on 27 September 1968 to the four Member States that were not originally members of the European Communities is taking place for Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom by means of the Accession Convention of 9 October 1978 and for Greece by means of the Accession Convention of 25 October 1982.

With regard to the 1978 Accession Convention to which the Honourable Member refers, five Member States have deposited their instruments of ratification (Netherlands, Italy, Luxembourg, France and the Federal Republic of Germany).

As soon as Belgium has also ratified the Accession Convention it will be possible for the latter to enter into force between the original Member States and the three countries of the first enlargement, provided they have also deposited their instruments of ratification. The United Kingdom has already completed its internal ratification procedures and is able to deposit its instrument of ratification. The internal ratification procedures are under way in Denmark and Ireland.

As it stated in its reply to Written Question No 896/84 put by Mr Carignon, the Council, while hoping that the 1978 Accession Convention may soon enter into force, nevertheless considers that it should not take steps with a view to influencing the internal ratification procedures that the Parliament of the Member States must follow pursuant to their constitutional law.

*
* *

Question No 75, by Mr Hutton (H-115/85)

Subject: Participation by Parliament in legislative power

In view of the proposal made by the Dooge Committee that Parliament should participate effectively in legislative power (Report, Section III, C, (a)), will the Presidency propose to the European Council that such participation should include the presence of a delegation from Parliament at meetings of the Council when Commission proposals are discussed to which Parliament has proposed substantial amendments?

Answer

At its meeting in Milan, the European Council noted that the President of the Council will be submitting proposals for improving the Council decision-making procedure, the exercise of the Commission's management responsibilities and the European Parliament's powers so that they may be adopted at the earliest opportunity.

I believe, moreover, that this question ties in with the debate which we conducted yesterday concerning the results of the European Council meeting in Milan.

*
* *

Question No 80, by Mr Pearce (H-197/85)

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 Council's new approach to technical harmonization and standardization is not intended to streamline paperwork formalities at frontier crossing-points but to speed up harmonization Community-wide of the plethora of technical rules and standards in the various Member States which are designed to ensure that the industrial products to which they relate do not endanger the safety of persons, domestic animals or goods.

The new approach adopted by the Council is part of the process of completion of the internal market and, as you know, the European Council in Milan welcomed the Commission initiative on this point.

The priority areas include the elimination of both technical and physical barriers to the free movement of goods within the Community and, as regards method, the application, wherever possible, of the principle of overall equivalence of the legislative objectives of the Member States, with the corollaries of the fixing of minimum standards, mutual recognition, monitoring by the country of origin.

Although the benefits of such harmonization are to be seen first and foremost in terms of the placing on the market and sale of products, the creation of a genuine internal common market is bound to have a positive effect on controls at intra-Community frontiers.

*
* *

Question No 85, by Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (H-247/85)

Subject: Adoption of Commission proposals

A number of Commission proposals on which Parliament has already delivered its opinion have been before the Council for several years. These are:

- a proposal for a Council Decision concluding a European Convention on the protection of international waters against pollution (COM/74/2029 final), submitted to the Council on 11 December 1974
- a proposal for a Council Directive on the reduction of water pollution by cellulose plants in the Community (COM/74/2256 final) submitted to the Council on 20 January 1975

- a proposal for a Council Directive on the dumping of waste at sea (COM/75/688 final)
- a proposal for a directive concerning the assessment of the environmental effects of certain public and private projects (COM/80/313 final) submitted to the Council on 16 June 1980.

Does the Council still intend to adopt these proposals and, if so, when?

Answer

The situation regarding each of the 4 proposals referred to by the honourable Member is as follows:

- Regarding the *proposal for a Directive concerning the assessment of the environmental effects of certain public and private projects*, better known as the 'impact studies' Directive, I am pleased to be able to say that this important Directive was adopted on 27 June 1985 by the Council, which thus confirmed the agreement in principle reached in March.
- Regarding the *proposal concerning the conclusion of the European Convention on the protection of international waters against pollution*, the Council Decision depends on completion of the preparation of this Convention within the Council of Europe. The procedures for finalization of the Convention have not yet led to acceptance of a final text by the bodies of the Council of Europe.
- Regarding the *proposal for a Directive on the dumping of waste at sea*, the Council has examined this proposal in the context of the Community's participation in several international Conventions on marine pollution, without reaching any decision, however. In this context, the Council has been informed of the Commission's intention to submit a new proposal for a Directive in this field in the next few weeks.
- Regarding the *proposal for a Directive on the reduction of water pollution by cellulose plants in the Member States*, discussions within the Council have revealed major differences of opinion between delegations, regarding both environmental protection and distortions of competition. These differences of opinion have so far prevented adoption of the Directive.

*
* *

Question No 87, by Mr Flanagan (H-274/85)

Subject: EEC forestry policy

A joint committee of the Irish Parliament and Senate has called for an EEC action programme with the ultimate aim of establishing a common forestry policy and, in the meantime, the inclusion of timber as a product under the common agricultural policy. In view of the fact that the EEC is still only 50% self-sufficient in timber products, will the Council make a statement on this important issue?

Answer

The common agricultural policy is governed by the provisions of Article 38 et seq. of the Treaty and a forestry policy cannot be envisaged as part of it since neither the standing trees which constitute the forest nor the timber produced from it are included in Annex II which gives the list of agricultural products referred to in the said Article 38.

The Council is nevertheless aware of the problem raised by the Honourable Member; it will examine with particular attention any communication on this important matter which the Commission may wish to make.

*
* *

Question No 88, by Mr Selva (H-276/85)

Subject: Relations with Albania

Would the Council state whether and in what guise it would be possible, in the wake of the Albanian Government's overtures towards the West, to initiate closer links between the EEC and Albania with a view to furthering the interests of peace and encouraging beneficial cultural, economic and commercial exchanges while respecting each others' independence and sovereignty?

Answer

The Community has on numerous occasions shown its willingness to normalize relations with the State-trading countries of Eastern Europe. This also applies to Albania. I would remind you, moreover, that Albania was one of the addressees of the outline agreement of 1974 in which the Community stated its readiness to enter into negotiations for a trade agreement.

The Albanian government has not so far reacted to that offer, however. I would emphasize that the offer is still open and that the Community remains willing to examine ways and means of improving relations with Tirana.

*
* *

Question No 89, by Mr Pasty (H-284/85)

Subject: Order of precedence of Members of the European Parliament

Can the Council state what precedence is given to Members of the European Parliament at official ceremonies in the Member States?

Answer

The precedence given to Members of the European Parliament in the Member States depends on decisions taken by the authorities in each Member State and the Council does not have the information which would enable it to answer the honourable Member's question.

*
* *

Question No 92, by Mrs Caroline Jackson (H-293/85)

Subject: Cereal quotas

Can the President-in-Office state whether the Council or any of its working parties has yet made any examination of the feasibility of cereal quotas as a means of controlling overproduction in the cereals sector, and, if not, would the President-in-Office not agree that such an examination is now urgently needed?

Answer

The considerable problems entailed in the present situation on the cereal market call for a detailed consideration of all aspects of the operation of the common organization of markets. With this in mind the Council has noted with satisfaction the Commission's studies on the prospects for the common agricultural policy, on the basis of which the matter will

be intensively discussed in the coming weeks and months in the various bodies concerned, particularly the European Parliament.

The Council has not so far received any proposal on the specific issue of recourse to a system of quotas for cereals. I can tell you as the President of the Council, Mr Pandolfi, told your Committee on Agriculture last June — that it was very clearly stressed during the Council's negotiations on farm prices for 1985/1986 that a system of production quotas would give rise to enormous management and control problems and that it was not therefore planned to resort to such a system.

*
* *

Question No 93, by Mr Costanzo (H-295/85)

Subject: Post-mortem examinations on the victims of the tragedy at the Heysel Stadium, Brussels, on 29 May 1985

Is the Council aware that the medical examinations on the bodies of victims of the Heysel Stadium disaster were not all carried out in accordance with professional and medical standards and does the Council know whether the Belgian legal authorities have investigated or taken action on the conduct of the postmortem examinations by the doctors responsible?

Answer

The matter to which the honourable Member refers is not within the Council's purview.

*
* *

Question No 99, by Mrs Boserup (H-310/85)

Subject: Aid in the olive oil sector

What progress has the Council made in its deliberations on aid in the olive oil sector in connection with Spanish and Portuguese accession, and what are the chances for the early adoption of the proposal the Commission submitted to the Council on 15 October 1981,¹ on which the European Parliament delivered its opinion on 12 January 1983?² The Court of Auditors' special report³ on the common organization of the market in olive oil states that these proposals are still before the Council.

Answer

1. The Community, Spain and Portugal adopted a joint statement in the context of Spanish and Portuguese accession to the effect that after accession the 'acquis communautaire' would have to be adjusted in the vegetable oils and fats sector, especially with regard to olive oil, on a proposal from the Commission.
2. When that time comes the Commission may, if appropriate, reconsider the proposal to which the honourable Member refers, which is indeed still before the Council.
3. It has to be emphasized that although the Council has not yet acted on the said proposal, it nevertheless adopted overall guidelines for the olive oil sector on 17 and 18 October 1983 in the context of the enlargement of the Community.

¹ COM(81), 610 final.

² OJ C 42, 14. 2. 1983.

³ OJ C 134, 3. 6. 1985, para. 7.15.

The Council will also use those overall guidelines as a basis for its discussions on the adjustment of the arrangements for vegetable oils and fats.

*
* *

Question No 100, by Mr Cornelissen (H-314/85)

Subject: Security checks at airports

According to press reports, representatives of some 40 airlines flying into Athens wrote to the Greek Prime Minister on 29 April 1985 concerning the lack of adequate security checks at Athens airport. The answer they received from the Greek Minister for Transport stated that the Greek Government regarded the security arrangements as satisfactory.

Can the President of the Council comment on these press reports and, assuming that he shares the view that security checks at some airports need to be improved, will he say what measures have since been introduced, particularly at the Transport Council of 24 June 1985?

Answer

The Council does not consider that it is for it to comment on press reports, but I can inform the honourable Member that the Transport Ministers who came together in Luxembourg for the Council meeting on 24 June were unanimous in their resolve that the wave of terrorist attacks on aircraft and civil airports must be countered by action by the Member States within the relevant bodies and that the Community Governments must act with fresh determination to implement the measures necessary to ensure maximum security in civil aviation.

*
* *

Question No 101, by Mr Eyraud (H-316/85)

Subject: Farm prices

The German veto in the vote on farm prices has been a grave setback in the building of Europe. If the Commission had proposed maintaining the cereal price for the first 1000 metric quintals produced by each farm, and reducing it by 5% beyond that quantity, the deadlock would probably have been broken.

What are the Commission's views, and does it intend to consider this suggestion at last?

Answer

During the negotiations on farm prices for the 1985/1986 marketing year, the Council did not receive any proposal or suggestion, whether from the Commission or from delegations, along the lines indicated by the honourable Member.

However, as the European Parliament is aware, serious consideration is now being given by the Commission to adjustments to and the prospects for the common agricultural policy. The Commission has just issued a Green Paper which will be submitted for lengthy discussion in the various bodies concerned, including the European Parliament.

*
* *

Question No 102, by Mr Iversen (H-321/85)

Subject: Exceeding the 1.4% VAT ceiling

According to The Guardian of 18 June 1985 a Conservative Minister, Mr Ian Stewart, has stated that the British Government would not permit a further increase in the Community's own resources to 1.6% of VAT. If it continues its present policies with the related rise in expenditure the Community will soon reach the present VAT ceiling of 1.4%, any increase in which is opposed by Britain.

Will the Council therefore indicate the areas in which it thinks there should be cuts, and in particular the cuts which will be necessary in agriculture, and estimate the size of the cuts in the budget it considers realistic if a Community of Twelve is to finance its own spending within the 1.4% VAT limit?

Answer

The Council Decision on the Communities' own resources was adopted on 7 May 1985 further to the conclusions of the Fontainebleau European Council on the same subject. In the recitals of this Decision the Honourable Member will find a statement to the effect that 'the maximum rate may be increased to 1.6% on 1 January 1988 by unanimous decision of the Council and after agreement has been given in accordance with national procedures.'

*
* *

Question No 103, by Mrs Dury (H-327/85)

Subject: Purchase and possession of firearms by private individuals

In many Member States there are a large number of crimes involving firearms, and in particular .22 long rifles. This is the result of the ease with which such weapons can be acquired and the disparities between legislation in the various Member States. The Council of Europe Convention of 28 June 1978, which basically provides for mutual assistance between the States that are parties to the convention in combating illicit arms traffic, has not yet been ratified by all the Member States.

Can the Council explain what measures are envisaged with regard to this lack of harmonization and when the European convention will finally be signed by all the Member States?

Answer

The Commission has hitherto not used its right of initiative to submit formal proposals to the Council to harmonize Member States' legislation on the purchase and possession of firearms by private individuals.

However, it is the Commission's intention — as expressed in the Commission's white paper on completion of the internal market — to make proposals in this field in the near future. The Council proposes to examine those proposals in due course.

Moreover, the Community as such is not a party to the European Convention of the Council of Europe of June 1978 referred to by the honourable Member. It is for the signatory Member States to ratify it in accordance with their respective constitutional rules.

*
* *

II. *Questions to the Foreign Ministers**Question No 113, by Mr De Vries (H-206/85)*

Subject: Abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union

On 12 October 1984 the European Parliament adopted a resolution tabled by Mr De Vries, Mrs Veil, Mr Habsburg, Mr Dankert and Sir Henry Plumb on the abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union and the persecution of anyone daring to denounce this situation. In this resolution Parliament calls on the Soviet Government to allow Mrs Irina Grivnina, a member of the Moscow Working Commission to Investigate the Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, and her family to take up residence in the Netherlands.

On 13 February 1985 the Commission stated in its answer to me during Question Time that it was fully aware of the importance of this appeal and wholeheartedly supported the initiatives by the European Parliament to expose every violation of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

On 18 March 1985 the President of the European Parliament called on the President of the Council of Ministers meeting in political cooperation to urge the Soviet authorities to issue Irina Grivnina and her family with an exit visa.

What action have the Ten taken in response to that request and to the resolution of 12 October 1984, and are they prepared to press for the Grivnina family to be permitted to emigrate, at the CSCE follow-up conference on human rights which is currently being held in Ottawa?

Answer

At the experts' meeting on human rights and fundamental freedoms held recently in Ottawa as part of the CSCE, the problem of the abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union was raised during the debate on questions concerning the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The protection of the dignity of the individual in psychiatric practices was also the subject of a motion which was tabled when the conclusions and recommendations of the meeting were being drawn up and which was supported by the Ten. In the statement by the Foreign Ministers issued in Luxembourg on 19 June last, the Ten expressed their regret that the Ottawa meeting had not led to any progress towards strengthening the provisions accepted by the 35 signatory states of the Helsinki Final Act with regard to human rights and fundamental freedoms. These provisions are a joint commitment by East and West. They hope that the merits of the recommendations they put forward or supported at that meeting will gradually come to be recognized, in particular at the other CSCE meetings dealing with these questions.

Furthermore, the Member States will continue to make individual efforts to influence favourably the decisions by the Soviet authorities in cases such as that of Mrs Grivnina and her family.

*
* *

Question No 114, by Mr Balfé (H-237/85)

Subject: Meeting on human rights to be held in Canada

In answer to my Question No 91 (H-701/84)¹ at the April part-session, the President-in-Office looked forward to an *ad hoc* meeting on human rights to be held in Canada as part of the Helsinki review meeting.

In view of the concern of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation for human rights outside the Community, will the Community be making a joint representa-

¹ Verbatim report of proceedings of 17. 4. 1985, provisional edition.

tion to the Canadian meeting and will it discuss its position at either Council or Foreign Minister level?

Answer

As you will know, at their meeting of 29 April 1985 the Foreign Ministers of the Ten issued a statement prior to the Ottawa meeting on human rights and fundamental freedoms and on 19 June 1985 they issued a further statement on the outcome of the meeting.

Although the Member States of the Community were represented at the meeting their individual national capacity, as is the case with all meetings within the CSCE framework, thorough discussions took place between the Ten both before and during the meeting, with the result that they were able to pursue a united approach and adopt common positions in Ottawa.

*
* *

Question No 115, by Mr Taylor (H-152/85)

Subject: Capital punishment

In which of the ten Member States of the Community is capital punishment still retained for certain criminal offences?

Answer

The question raised by the honourable Member does not come within the terms of reference of European political cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 116, by Mr Ephremidis (H-164/85/rev.)

Subject: Reagan's visit to German military cemetery

What approaches have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation made to the American Government on the subject of Reagan's visit to a German military cemetery at Bitburg, a move which has aroused the emotions of the whole of anti-fascist public opinion in Europe at a time when it honours the tens of millions of martyrs made 40 years ago by the fascist armies?

Answer

The question raised by the honourable Member has not been discussed as part of European political cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 118, by Mr Iversen (H-231/85)

Subject: Refunds on air tickets to South Africa

Are the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation aware that several airlines in Community countries secretly give their passengers refunds on arrival in South Africa?

Which airlines are involved, and how large are the refunds? Do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation plan to call for a Community boycott of civil flights to South Africa?

Answer

The situation in South Africa and the policy to be adopted towards that country are, as you know, regularly discussed in European political cooperation. The firm position of the Ten on this matter was stated in the statements by the Foreign Ministers on 25 March and 29 April 1985. In my statement to this House this morning I reiterated this firm approach.

As for the measures to be adopted with regard to South Africa, the Ten are rigorously implementing the mandatory measures adopted by the United Nations. The possibility of boycotting civil air traffic to South Africa has not been discussed in European political cooperation.

*
* *

Question No 119, by Mr Deprez (H-250/85)

Subject: Repressive legislation in Poland

On 10 May 1985, the Polish authorities imposed the adoption of a series of draft laws boosting still further the machinery of repression, especially as regards 'political' criminals. This new amendment to the Code of Criminal Law is the latest episode in a sequence which began with the exceptional measures adopted when martial law was declared in December 1981, and then, after martial law was lifted, continued with the special laws 'for the emergence from the crisis', which will in principle remain in force until the end of this year. The aim — once again — is to enable the police and the courts to crack down harder, more swiftly and more insidiously against political criminals, while restricting their rights of defence.

This new repressive legislation has caused an outcry, amongst both Polish legal experts and the bishops. Despite this, the authorities have overridden all protest and Parliament adopted the draft laws without debate.

The new laws make any form of opposition particularly dangerous. Hitherto, the only punishable offences in connection with unofficial demonstrations were their organization and where crowds demonstrating refused to break up. From now on, mere participation in an unofficial demonstration carries a penalty of two years' imprisonment, under a procedure for persons apprehended in flagrante delicto.

As a further instrument of repression, the various fines payable have been substantially increased, and it will from now on be an offence for third parties to pay them. The aim is to prevent clandestine support groups or even charitable organizations such as the 'Primate's committees' from helping convicted persons. According to the religious authorities, the new laws will increase the prison population by one-third, at a time when prisons are already overcrowded.

How do the Ministers view this policy of 'bringing Poland to heel' by creeping repression, and do they plan to take retaliatory measures?

Answer

The Ten are closely following developments in Poland, particularly in the light of events since the 1984 amnesty.

In this regard they reaffirm the validity of their statement issued at the end of the 57th Political Cooperation meeting in Luxembourg on 29 April 1985 to the effect that the Hel-

sinki Final Act explicitly reaffirms that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is an essential factor in the peace, justice and well-being required for the development of friendly relations and cooperation between all states.

*
* *

Question No 121, by Mr Fellermaier (H-300/85/rev.)

Subject: Changing the names of Turkish citizens in Bulgaria

What was the outcome of the inquiry (1) into the situation of the Islamic minority in Bulgaria, which was intended to increase the information available to the Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States of the Community and what political consequences have they derived from it?

Answer

As already stated in the reply to Oral Question H-150/85, the Ten continue to follow closely the situation of the Turkish Muslim minority in Bulgaria.

This question was also raised at the experts' meeting in Ottawa on human rights and fundamental freedoms.

At that meeting the question of respect for the rights of people belonging to a national minority was raised several times. The Italian Presidency, in its opening address on behalf of the Ten, and several delegations of Community countries expressed the concern of our governments at the failure to respect the rights of people belonging to national minorities.

*
* *

Question No 125, by Mrs Dury (H-323/85)

Subject: The future of Hong Kong

In December 1984 the United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China signed an agreement on the status of Hong Kong from 1997 to 2047. This document states that the British Crown Colony will return to Chinese sovereignty on 1 July 1997. For fifty years Hong Kong will have the status of a Special Administrative Region, i.e. China undertakes to maintain the economic and social system of Hong Kong unchanged until 2047. In their reply to my Oral Question H-473/82¹ the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation stated that they did not discuss relations between Member States and their dependencies, and therefore had not discussed the future of Hong Kong. Since then, the European Parliament's Committee on External Economic Relations has drawn up a report on the future development of economic and trade relations between the European Community and Hong Kong (Seeler Report, Doc. A 2-54/85 of 3. 6.1985), which stresses the importance of that agreement for future economic relations between the European Community, the People's Republic of China and the Western Pacific area as a whole, and emphasizes the importance of the European Community's working to encourage support for this agreement and its implementation in practice.

Having regard to the signature of this British agreement and the findings of the European Parliament's Committee on External Economic Relations, will the Foreign Ministers of the European Community meeting in political cooperation review their attitude to relations between the Member States and their dependencies and will they, in future, support this agreement and its implementation in practice?

¹ Debates, No 291, 18. 11. 1982.

Answer

The Ten do not propose to review their position which consists in not discussing relations between Member States and their possessions.

However, as regards Hong Kong in particular, when the agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China on the future of Hong Kong was initialled on 26 September 1984, they issued the following joint statement:

The European Community welcomes the initialling of the agreement about the future of Hong Kong between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China. This is an impressive achievement which augurs well for the future of Hong Kong as a prosperous and stable community. As a result of this agreement, the Community looks forward to maintaining a close and fruitful relationship both with the People's Republic of China and with the future Hong Kong Special Administrative Regions on the basis of its continuing participation in international economic arrangements.

*
* *

III. *Questions to the Commission*

Question No 3, by Mr Guermeur (H-713/84)

Subject: Cancellation of EIB loans of 200 million ECU to the ACP countries under Lomé II

The European Investment Bank has just announced the cancellation of approximately 200 million ECU intended for the ACP countries under Lomé II.

Does not the Commission consider that cancelling these loans, rather than carrying them over to Lomé III, is likely to damage the Community's reputation with the ACP countries?

Answer

There would seem to be a misapprehension concerning the intentions of the EIB with regard to a non-allocated balance of 200 million ECU. The bank has simply drawn the necessary conclusions from a fact which cannot escape its attention by stating that circumstances — in particular that there are not enough projects which satisfy the necessary criteria — will probably prevent it from committing the entire amount which had been set aside as the upper limit of possible contributions *from its own resources* under Lomé II. The Bank will, however, continue to provide loans, within the limit of the non-committed amounts, during the transitional period pending the entry into force of the Lomé III Convention at the beginning of 1986. It should also be noted that the ceilings for such loans has been set at 1 100 million ECU under Lomé III as against 685 million under Lomé II. This means that there should be no difficulty in meeting loan applications from the ACP countries.

*
* *

Question No 4, by Mr Andrews (H-714/84)

Subject: Possibilities of fish agreement

The Commission is negotiating a fish agreement with Gambia. What is the state of the negotiations, and did the Commission explore other possibilities of fish agreements with other ACP countries?

Answer

As far as Gambia is concerned, in March 1985 the Commission received directives from the Council to open negotiations on a fishing agreement. Following exploratory talks with the relevant authorities in Gambia on technical aspects, the Commission is now ready to consider an initial round of real negotiations, which might take place during the last two weeks of September 1985.

It should be noted that following the signature of the acts of accession with Spain and Portugal, administration of the agreements concluded between those countries and third countries will, from the date of accession onwards, be undertaken by the Community. Responsibility for these agreements will be assumed by the Community without delay in order to ensure that they are integrated into the common policy. However, any agreements in force on the date of accession will continue to remain in force until they are taken over by the Community. This transfer of responsibility may be implemented by incorporating the relevant agreements into existing agreements between the present Community and third countries concerned or, if necessary, by their renegotiation in a Community context on the basis of the acquired rights. The Council will take any decisions necessary to safeguard fishing rights for as long as required, on a case by case basis.

In the case of other ACP States, the Commission would point out that it is currently negotiating fishing agreements with Mauritania and Dominica. As regards agreements with other coastal ACP States, the Commission is already exploring the possibility of fishing agreements on the basis of the current mandate; as and when a clear need for any such agreements emerges, the Commission will take the necessary steps to open the negotiations process.

It should be noted that after enlargement, the Community will continue to apply the principles now governing its relations with third countries with regard to fishing, namely the safeguarding, restoration and expansion of fishing opportunities for the Community fleet through the conclusion of new agreements, for example in the Indian Ocean area.

*
* *

Question No 6, by Mr Fitzsimons (H-766/84)

Subject: Community research and development programmes and demonstration programmes in Ireland

Will the Commission agree to take urgent steps to redress the situation whereby the technology gap between Ireland and other Member States seems to be increasing rather than decreasing, more specifically to be of greater relevance to Irish needs and ensure that Community research and development programmes and demonstration programmes increase programmes relevant to agriculture and natural resource-based industries, application and demonstration programmes relevant to SMEs and advanced training, exchange and mobility programmes?

Answer

In preparation for the revision of the 1984-1987 framework research programme, planned for the second half of 1985, an analysis and comparison of national research policies (COPOL II) is to be made before the summer recess. This comparison will also include an analysis of the differences between or growing convergence of individual national research policies and research and technology infrastructures. Only then will it be possible to ascertain whether the technological gap between Ireland and the other EEC Member States has increased since 1983 when the last survey was made. It is however true that Ireland's primary research objectives, unlike those of other Community countries, are chiefly concerned with agricultural productivity and technology.

Should the comparison of national research policies reveal considerable differences demanding a Community response, the revision of the framework research programme will attempt to take this fact into account.

In its present form the framework research programme does however already aim to extend Community research and development projects with a view to greater competitiveness of agriculture and industry. The Council decisions of 12 March 1985 for new Community research programmes in the fields of biotechnology and basic technological research are a practical implementation of the guidelines for joint research policy laid down in the framework programme.

*
* *

Question No 7, by Mr Papoutsis (H-20/85)

Subject: Convergence of the Greek economy

A basic aim of the Community is to promote convergence of the economies of the Member States and to reduce structural inequalities. Four years after Greece's accession to the Community, can the Commission assess the results of Community measures and activities taken with the above aim in view?

Answer

1. The most important macro-economic indicators show that since Greece's accession to the Community its economy has not been brought into line with those of the other Member States. Between 1981 and 1984 growth was below that of the rest of the Community (on average 0.6% as against 0.9%), and there is unlikely to be any change in 1985. This means, that there is a continuing trend towards the widening of the gap between the per capita GDP in Greece and that of the Community as a whole.

From 1980 to 1984 the current account deficit fluctuated around an average of about 6% of GDP without any noticeable improvement, unlike the situation in the other countries of the Community, where there was an improvement in the current account balance. Furthermore, there was a distinct downward trend in production and industrial investment, while without expansion in these areas it is impossible to establish a sound balance of payments.

2. This state of affairs has arisen despite the Community's persistent attempts to support the Greek economy. Immediately following its accession Greece had the benefit of certain transitional measures. For example, the Act of Accession provides for Greece to receive from the Community a monthly reimbursement of a proportion of its VAT payments (or financial contributions on the basis of GNP) as follows: 70% in 1981, 50% in 1982, 30% in 1983, 20% in 1984 and 10% on 1985.

Furthermore, the financial provisions of the Act of Accession laid down that there was to be a transitional period up to 21 December 1985, during which the customs duties charged by Greece are to be paid within the limits of those duties which will remain after the transitional period when the Common Customs Tariff is being fully applied.

3. After the devaluation of the drachma in 1983 the Community also approved transitional protection measures under Article 130 of the Act of Accession in order to relieve the burden on certain sensitive sectors. In capital transactions Greece was allowed exemptions from the provisions of the Directive on the implementation of Article 67 of the EEC Treaty. Between 1981 and 1984 loan agreements were concluded with the European Investment Bank and under the New Community Instrument totalling on average approximately 400 million ECU per year. Under the Community policies the Greek economy also receives funds which at present amount to over 2% of GDP.

4. At the meeting of the European Council in Brussels on 29 and 30 March 1985 it was decided to launch integrated Mediterranean programmes to assist the southern regions of the present Community. These programmes will last seven years, and their aim will be to improve the economic structures of those regions to enable them to adjust under the best conditions possible to the new situation created by enlargement.

As regards financing arrangements and methods, the European Council agreed to the following:

- (i) participation by the structural funds up to 2 500 million ECU; the increase in real terms which will apply to the Regional and Social Funds and the EAGGFs Guidance Section over the next 7 years will help to finance the IMPs;
- (ii) an additional budget contribution amounting to 1 600 million ECU which will permit the Commission to supply the additional funds for the implementation of the programmes approved by it;
- (iii) loans of 2 500 million ECU contracted by the regions concerned with the EIB and under the New Community Instrument.

Greece is to receive 2 000 million ECU from the first two categories of resources above. The European Council drew attention to the special case of Greece, whose entire territory comes within the sphere of the IMPs.

5. However, the subsidies and aids from the Community can do no more than back up the efforts of the Greek economy itself to adapt. As stressed in the 1984-1985 Annual Economic Report, what is needed most of all to enable Greece to adapt its economy is a policy geared first and foremost to the expansion of production structures, particularly industry. This policy calls for rigorous measures which the Greek economy cannot escape.

*
* *

Question No 11, by Mrs Oppenheim (H-176/85)

Subject: Loans advanced by the Greek agricultural bank

What information can the Commission give about loans advanced by the Greek agricultural bank in connection with, among other things, the purchase of equipment, and what does it intend to do to ensure that the Community provisions about free competition are respected so that there is no discrimination between equipment produced in Greece and equipment imported from other Member States?

Answer

The Commission has commenced proceedings against Greece in this matter on the ground that the practice in question contravenes Article 30 of the Treaty.

*
* *

Question No 12, by Mr Ducarme (H-224/85)

Subject: Rationalization of slaughterhouses — decision of the Agricultural Council — 1002nd meeting

At its 1002nd meeting, the Council took a decision on the rationalization of slaughterhouses as follows: whereas the situation in this sector was particularly serious, especially in Belgium, the Council decided to introduce Community measures to rationalize slaugh-

terhouses and invited the Commission to submit the necessary proposals to it before 1 October 1985 so that a decision could be taken by the end of 1985.

Will the Commission state what documents were available on the subject and what its analysis of the Belgian situation was, and forward to Parliament the study document that enabled it to make that analysis as well as an outline of the Community action it is to propose to the Council by 1 October 1985?

Answer

As regards the first part of the question, I would point out that, as the Commission has already stated in its reply to Written Question No 119/85 by Mr Chanterie, the reports drawn up after Community inspections and the conclusions drawn from them are confidential and have been transmitted only to the responsible departments; the question therefore falls within the field of competence of the responsible national authorities.

As regards the approach which the Community should adopt, I must state that the matter is currently being studied by the responsible departments and that a proposal will be drawn up by the Commission during next September. This proposal will, of course, be referred to Parliament.

*
* *

Question No 13, by Mr Juppé (H-230/85)

Subject: Enlargement and the GATT

Can the Commission state how and on what bases it proposes to conduct negotiations within the GATT, under Article XXIV, sixth paragraph, and in particular with the United States, on the compensation arrangements that will have to be made following the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal?

Answer

One of the consequences of enlargement is that the Community will be obliged to enter into negotiations with its commercial partners under the terms of Article XXIV (6) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In entering these negotiations the principal aim of the Community will be to ensure that the commercial interests of the enlarged Community as represented by its Common Customs Tariff (CCT) are safeguarded consistent with the provisions of Article XXIV.

In view of past experience in Article XXIV negotiations, particularly following Greek accession, the approach of the Community on this occasion will be to construct a new CCT for the enlarged Community. The tariff will as a general rule be based on a trade-weighted average of the present tariff levels of the Community of 10 and of Spain and Portugal.

The objective of submitting to the GATT a new tariff based on a trade-weighted average of the external tariffs of the Community and the adherents is to give the enlarged Community a solid negotiating position in the context of the Article XXIV examination and in conformity with the terms of Article XXIV: 5(a). However, as the necessary preparatory data is not yet available, it is not possible at present to estimate realistically what the position will be, with regard to credits, debits or compensation, at that stage of the negotiations.

*
* *

Question No 16, by Mr Marshall (H-577/84)

Subject: Accession of Spain and the EEC's sugar-using industries

The sugar-using industries within the European Community have a successful record of exporting to other countries. Has the Commission made any study of the impact on them of the proposal that the Spanish Government should be allowed to impose a penal border tax upon sugar-based products once Spain has joined the European Community? Would the Commission accept that such a proposal would effectively stop the possibility of exports of sugar-based products into Spain once she had joined the Community and is this really what is intended by Spanish accession to the Community?

Answer

The Commission has no knowledge of the proposal to which the Honourable Member is referring.

Be that as it may, the accession Treaty stipulates firstly that, in the case of trade between the Community as presently constituted and Spain, all charges having an effect equivalent to customs duties on imports are to be abolished with effect from 1 March 1986, and secondly that no customs duty of a fiscal nature may be levied after that date.

However, to guarantee the proper conduct of trade both between the Community as presently constituted and Spain and between Spain and third countries, the accession Treaty has made provision, for a transitional period, for a compensatory price system, to be applied to both sugar itself and sugar-based products, since the price of Spanish sugar is higher than that of the sugar produced in the Community as presently constituted. Under this system, Spain will accordingly be subject to an 'accession' compensatory amount, collected on imports and payable on exports.

*
* *

Question No 18, by Mr Van Miert (H-677/84)

Subject: Relations with the European Trade Union Confederation

What contact has the Commission that has just taken office already had with the leadership of the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC)? What was the outcome of such contact and how (e.g. by re-starting 'trilateral meetings') does the Commission intend to expand its relations with the European trade union movement?

Answer

On 31 January 1985 the President and the Members of the Commission responsible for economic and social questions met the leaders of the national organizations affiliated to the European Trade Union Confederation and those of the Union of Industries of the European Communities (UNICE) and the European Centre of Public Enterprises (CEEP).

This meeting, which had been painstakingly prepared with the President and Secretaries-General of the above organizations, had the following points on its agenda:

- the creation of a large, obstacle-free market and industrial development;
- growth and employment: economic and social aspects.

The detailed debates which took place on this occasion revealed considerable similarity between the views expressed by the representatives of employers and workers and the Commission's general approach. For its part, the Commission stressed the need for the

two sides of industry to engage in direct dialogue with each other with a view to expanding joint relations at Community level, on both a trade and a sectoral basis.

In response to this appeal by the Commission, the UNICE and the CES organized direct top-level contacts which, according to the Commission's information, mainly concern the following:

- growth, employment and investment;
- the creation of a large market and, at the same time, the expansion of the European social areas;
- the introduction of new technologies and its social implications.

For its part, the Commission assisted this dialogue by forwarding to the representatives of employers and workers numerous informal papers and a wide range of basic documentation.

The chairman's summing up at the recent meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment on 30 May reflects the climate of mutual understanding in the contacts between the UNICE and the CES.

*
* *

Question No 19, by Mr Vandemeulebroucke (H-697/84)

Subject: Situation and problems of the aged in the Community

1982 was the year of the senior citizen. To mark the occasion, the European Parliament adopted the Squarcialupi report¹ on the situation and problems of the aged in the Community. Parliament asked the Commission and Council to formulate specific initiatives in a number of policy areas. Can the Commission state what measures have already been taken by way of follow-up to this report and what its policy is on the subject?

Answer

Since your assembly adopted on the 18th of February 1982, the Resolution on the situation and problems of the aged in the European Community, a number of activities have taken place in this field, the most important of which has been the Council Recommendation on Retirement age. Has to be mentioned also for 1982 our active participation to the World Assembly on aging. On a more day to day work level, a number of multidisciplinary meetings have been initiated at European level mainly with NGOs assistance on subjects like preparation to retirement, housing, family placement schemes etc. . . In the field of research, a well received study has been completed on innovatory measures to promote the self-reliance of the elderly. As you already know we have a study in progress on the fringe benefits available in the Member States for the elderly as well as on the feasibility of a European card for the elderly, subjects which receive a good deal of attention from a number of Members of your assembly. At your last January meeting, I had the opportunity to inform you that the elderly was one of the target-groups of the 1985-88 Dublin European Foundation programme. So they are in the new Community poverty programme and in the 1984-87 FAST Programme.

This does not add up to a programme or a horizontal strategy for social policy — I am the first to admit this. I recognize too the increasing urgency for the Community to develop a philosophy of action — social, economic and cultural — towards elderly people, who represent an ever increasing proportion of the Community's total population. Demographic trends will ultimately oblige Member States to review their own policies, not merely in terms of the public expenditure implications, but also from the point of view of

¹ Doc. 1-848/81.

employment policy, education, transport, housing, leisure facilities, consumer policy. It is exceptionally difficult for the Commission to begin the elaborate policy positions on issues which are so vast and still not perceived by Member States as having anything to do with the Community.¹

Moreover, it must be borne in mind that we have still an obligation to justify new developments in social policy as being in some way related to the labour market and economic life. These two last considerations are equally valid where action in favour of families is concerned and will therefore guide us in preparing the Communication on living conditions which the Commission intends to present to the Council. As regards the elderly we perceive two key issues at this stage: self-reliance and integration, and three fields: employment and working conditions of the older workers; activities of retired people; housing and social services. These objectives may appear to be relatively modest in relation to the Squarzialupi report. I regard them as fairly ambitious however, considering the novelty of this field of activities for the Community and the means at our disposal. To achieve them we will need the full support of this House.

*
* *

Question No 25, by Mr Moorhouse (H-81/85)

Subject: Air transport and the ECU

Will the Commission make proposals for legislation and take all necessary action in order to allow the ECU to become the basis for all air transport charges and all air transport fares within the European Communities?

Answer

The Commission is in favour of wider use of the European Currency Unit (ECU) in all economic sectors in the Community. In the particular field of air fares a Commission proposal for improving the present fare-setting system, including the mechanism whereby fares are established in national currencies, is already under consideration by the Council. As for other air transport sectors, the Commission will bring to the competent authorities' attention that it would welcome their examination of the potential benefits that could be derived from using the ECU.

*
* *

Question No 27, by Mr Van der Waal (H-156/85)

Subject: Situation of Baptists in the Soviet Union

Is the Commission aware that, with increasing frequency, Baptists imprisoned for their beliefs by the Soviet authorities are being re-sentenced before the official date for their release, as now threatens to happen in the case of Alexei Kozorezov, for example?

What steps does the Commission envisage taking to counter this violation of religious freedom?

Answer

The Commission has already stated on numerous occasions and in various forums that it attaches great importance to the respect for all individual freedoms and in particular freedom of conscience.

¹ This passage is an extract from the speech by Mr Richard before the Social Affairs Committee on 16. 10. 1984.

Action to assist the 'baptists in the Soviet Union' initiative is a matter for political cooperation between the Member States, should they consider it appropriate.

*
* *

Question No 29, by Mr Wolff (H-194/85)

Subject: Intra-Community tax-free sales

In February 1984, the Court of Justice of the European Communities delivered a judgment in case 278/82 concerning imports of goods purchased tax-free on ferry boats.¹ In substance, the Court considered that such imports were legal but should be limited to the allowance granted to travellers from third countries (currently 45 ECU). Since this judgment was delivered, Member States giving 'the higher allowance' (currently 280 ECU) have received injunctions from Directorate-General XV of the Commission asking them to implement the judgment without distinguishing between ferry-boats and airports, contrary to the terms of the judgment. The Commission has also made two proposals for directives,² one legalizing tax-free sales at the level of the allowance for third countries, the other raising this allowance: the most recent proposals show a figure of 100 ECU.³

Does the Commission not think it would be preferable to suspend any moves which might lead to a dispute while the proposals for directives are currently being discussed by the Member States, in order to avoid going from 280 ECU to 45 ECU, then from 45 ECU to 100 ECU, with all the administrative difficulties that such to-ing and fro-ing would involve?

Answer

The Commission has not in fact issued any injunctions against any Member State in this matter. It has, however, written to all Member States asking for information about the allowances granted for goods bought in tax free shops. There are, therefore, no proceedings to suspend.

*
* *

Question No 30, by Mr Romeos (H-204/85)

Subject: Dealing with infringements of European law in the context of the economic crisis

To impose the same conditions of competition on a peripheral country as those applied to the industrially developed countries is to widen the gap between the two and impede the development of the former. In its reports on competition policy, the Commission notes, on the one hand, that the Community is going through a structural crisis and, on the other, that there is a need to break down competition structures within the Common Market. At the same time, the Ninth report on competition policy states the Commission's determination to adhere, in this period of crisis to a policy of leniency. Despite the Commission's statements of policy, however, it has charged Greece with a number of infringements of European law, citing the Greek oil monopoly, AGREX (agricultural exports), the national pharmaceuticals organization, the trade intervention organization, etc.

In the light of the various statements by the Commission, do these measures constitute infringements of European law when they were implemented under particular economic

¹ OJ C 80, 21. 3. 1984.

² OJ C 114, 28. 4. 1984,
OJ C 102, 14. 4. 1984.

³ OJ C 78, 26. 3. 1985.

conditions and for particular reasons which are perhaps to be found in the Greek Memorandum?

Answer

The Commission would draw the honourable Member's attention to its communication to the Council of 17 June 1982 concerning the Greek memorandum, in which it stated that, while the Community can contribute to the economic development of the Hellenic Republic, it cannot do so by means of derogations from the provisions of the Treaty.

That is why the Commission, faced with certain violations of European law by the Hellenic Republic, has been obliged to initiate various infringement procedures.

The Commission has thus found that the Greek Government has not undertaken the progressive adjustment of the oil monopoly, whereas, as from 1 January 1986, products imported from the other Member States must be able to be marketed freely.

Similarly, as regards the National Bureau of Medicinal Products, the Commission has established, by means of a reasoned opinion, that the Greek legislation on this question infringed Articles 30, 37 and 95.

On the other hand, as far as the Commercial Intervention Agency and Agrex are concerned, the Commission has not yet reached a decision on the compatibility of those bodies with the Treaty.

Generally speaking, one should not, as the honourable Member has done, establish a link between the Greek memorandum and the assessment made by the Commission of certain infringements resulting from Greek law.

*
* *

Question No 32, by Mrs Crawley (H-216/85)

Subject: British consumer protection on food packaged in the EEC

What action can a British consumer take against another Member State if a food product that he or she buys in the United Kingdom has been packed by another Member State in a faulty manner, and is, consequently, a danger to health, and what form of compensation is due to the consumer in such circumstances?

Answer

The responsibility for assuring the safety of food supplied to consumers in the United Kingdom is first and foremost that of the United Kingdom authorities in accordance with their relevant national legislation. It is also their responsibility to enforce this legislation.

Such national legislation includes rules laid down pursuant to a number of Community directives concerning the types of materials which may be used in packaging, as well as their labelling etc. In this context there are regular meetings of officials from Member States dealing with controls. Furthermore, the Commission will shortly be making proposals to accelerate work on the removal of barriers to trade in food. These will, *inter alia*, cover the question of equivalence of control between the enforcement authorities of Member States. The Commission's services are also operating a rapid alert system for foods which are found to be potentially dangerous to health, for example, because of faulty packing. This system links control authorities in Member States through a central reporting point in Brussels, and allows rapid action to be taken to limit the potential dangers perceived by one of the national authorities.

As the legal relationship between the consumer and supplier of goods within the United Kingdom is governed by British law the Honourable Member should consult the United Kingdom authorities regarding the question of compensation.

*
* *

Question No 33, by Mr Stavrou (H-217/85)

Subject: Exploitation of solar and wind energy in certain Mediterranean regions

Whereas solar and wind energy is an important factor in the development of peripheral regions, especially certain disadvantaged regions in the Community; whereas it enables energy supplies to be decentralized and therefore favours the regions with inadequate transport infrastructure; whereas it is particularly suitable for producing electrical energy and heat and for desalinating sea water, particularly in the case of the Greek islands, which enjoy protracted exposure to sunshine throughout the year and continuous winds both of which remain unexploited; whereas also these regions are practically impossible to link up to the national electricity grid — one kilowatt hour costs six times more than it does on the mainland owing to the various additional factors involved, such as transporting fuel, equipment, etc; what action has the Commission taken to exploit the special features of certain Mediterranean regions for the use of alternative forms of energy, and does not the Commission think that it would be expedient to develop a programme for the exploitation of solar and wind energy on the Greek islands and to finance investment in sectors concerned with the exploitation of the abovementioned forms of energy?

Answer

Under the 'non-quota' section of the former European Regional Development Fund, the Community adopted, with a view to assisting the mountainous areas of the Mezzogiorno and the Greek islands (except Salamina) a specific measure¹ contributing to improving security of energy supply by better use of new techniques for hydroelectrical power and alternative energy sources. The aim of the special programmes approved under this regulation is the co-financing of installations such as mini-turbines, wind-powered generators, equipment using solar energy or energy from biomass, as well as prospection and development of geothermal fields. These operations are supplemented by aid for the dissemination of information (including demonstrations) on the possibilities offered by these energy sources, and by aid for the organization of basic technical training. A sum of 20 million ECU is set aside for the Greek islands under this scheme.

Furthermore, the Community grants financial support for demonstration projects² on the exploitation of alternative energy sources and on energy saving and the substitution of hydrocarbons. Under this demonstration programme the Commission has so far selected 14 solar projects and 7 wind-energy projects to be carried out in Greece. Financial support limited to 40% of the investment cost is granted to these projects, which are selected mainly for their innovative character.

Lastly, as regards research and development, since Greece's accession to the Commission a number of projects concerning solar and wind energy have been co-financed by the Commission in Greece. Particular reference should be made to the two photovoltaic power stations built on Greek islands as part of a series of 15 pilot projects. These power stations are situated in Aghia Roumeli (Crete) and on the island of Kythnos; their capacity is 50 and 100 kW respectively.

The Commission actively supported the initiative by the Hellenic Republic in setting up a national research centre for renewable energies by participating in laying down the tasks

¹ Regulation (EEC) No. 261/80 amended by Regulation (EEC) No 218/84) OJ L 27 of 31. 1. 1984.

² Regulation (EEC) No 1972/83 amended by Regulation (EEC) No 2126/84, OJ L 196 of 26. 7. 1984.

to be entrusted to this centre, by having a feasibility study carried out, by currently financing a feasibility study and by currently financing a study on the most appropriate preparatory work to be carried out with a view to setting up this centre.

*
* *

Question No 34, by Mr Debatisse (H-221/85)

Subject: Repercussions of the prolongation of the milk year until 26 May 1985

As the milk year has been extended to 26 May and this has entailed losses for stock farmers, might the Commission consider letting the period for the further reduction of 1% in milk production begin likewise on 26 May 1985?

Answer

The extension of the milk year until 26 May does not affect the provisions of Article 5 of Regulation (EEC) No 804/85¹ laying down the guaranteed total quantities for the first 12-month period and for subsequent periods.

The Council, bearing this situation in mind, has reduced the new rate of the co-responsibility levy (2% as against 3% in 1984/85), back-dated to 1 April 1985.

*
* *

Question No 35, by Mr Gerontopoulos (H-238/85)

Subject: Research into, and application of, new technologies in the countries of the European Community

The rate of development in some EEC countries is not the same as in others where research into, and the application of, new technologies are concerned. Is the Commission aware of the very adverse consequences of this lack of uniformity, which may condemn certain regions to decline in the future, and, if so, what is the Commission doing to analyse the problem and what steps does it propose to take to solve it?

Answer

1. The Commission is aware that the Member States do not yet all have the necessary scientific and technical potential to pursue research and the application of new technologies at the same rate. In particular as regards information technologies, a very recent study did in fact come to the conclusion that information technologies are concentrated in the best developed regions, unless deliberate measures are taken to correct the situation.

2. In order to promote the balanced development of research and technology in the Community, the Commission put forward in 1982 an outline programme for the promotion of science and technology in the Community for the period 1984-1987. This programme was adopted by the Council of Ministers on 24 July 1983. With the help of this new approach, which also provides for regular comparison between the various national policies in the field of research and technology in order to establish possible differences in the Member States, individual projects in research, development and demonstration are laid down on the basis of the scientific/technological objectives of the Community and the Member States. Irrespective of the state of research and development in each case, the

¹ Regulation (EEC) No 856/85, OJ L 90 of 1. 4. 1984, p. 10.

Member States have, via their direct or indirect participation in the Community programmes, access to the results obtained.

In addition, the RACE programme will provide throughout the Community a compatible telecommunications infrastructure incorporating the latest technology, thereby offsetting very many regional disadvantages.

3. Furthermore, financial aid from the European Regional Fund has to a considerable extent already led to the application of new technologies and promoted the introduction of new technological products and processes, particularly in small and medium sized businesses.

4. The Commission is currently looking into ways of meeting the needs of the Member States and the less-favoured regions, by interlinking the individual Community policies more closely.

5. Lastly, it must be stated that the Community's efforts can never do anything but compliment national initiatives.

*
* *

Question No 37, by Mr Hughes (H-242/85)

Subject: Visits by young people to Member States other than their own

The European Community has long recognized the usefulness of encouraging young people to visit Member States other than their own to broaden opportunities and stimulate new interest, discussion, learning and study. In the case of young unemployed people on supplementary benefit in the UK, however, such visits are made impossible by the fact that payment of benefit ceases for the period whilst overseas.

Does this rule comply with the Treaties in the view of the Commission or does it constitute a barrier to the free movement of young people?

Answer

The Commission is fully aware that some unemployed young people may be discouraged from participating in exchanges if, by doing so, they lose their entitlement to income support whether during their stay abroad or on their return to their own country.

Obstacles to youth exchanges, such as these, do not constitute infringements of Treaty provisions on the freedom of movement of workers, since these relate specifically to employment. The Commission considers nevertheless that action should be taken to facilitate the participation of young people, particularly the unemployed, in exchanges, whether they be young worker exchanges, sponsored by the Commission on the basis of the third Community programme adopted by the Council on 13. 12. 1984, or any other form of exchanges or voluntary work in the Community. The Commission has launched a study to identify the various administrative and legal barriers to exchanges which exist in the different Member States with a view to assessing the scope for joint action at Community level in this field.

*
* *

Question No 38, by Mr Collins (H-246/85)

Subject: VAT on air fares

VAT is currently not applied on air transport passenger fares in the European Community. Would the Commission confirm whether or not it is currently considering the ending of this exemption under the Sixth VAT Directive?

Answer

A number of Member States already tax domestic flights: but all Member States at present zero rate intra-Community flights. They do so by virtue of the derogation contained in the 6th VAT Directive, which provided for the continuation of exemptions existing before the directive coming into force. That derogation for intra-Community flights is transitional. The 6th Directive provides that, at the end of the transitional period, passenger transport should be taxed in the country of departure for that part of the journey taking place within the Community. This question will fall to be considered, along with all remaining VAT derogations, under the programme for the completion of the internal market set out in the Commission's recent White Paper.

*
* *

Question No 39, by Mr Christensen (H-249/85)

Subject: Community pigmeat exports to the USA

What does the Commission propose to do in order to avoid quota restrictions or counter-vailing duties being imposed on Community exports of pigmeat to the USA?

Answer

The United States authorities through their International Trade Commission are currently conducting an investigation into imports of pigmeat from the EEC, and exports from the Community to third countries.

The results of this investigation are due to be transmitted to the relevant United States Senate Committee not later than the end of this year. What the findings of the International Trade Commission will be and more importantly, what conclusions the United States authorities will finally draw, are obviously currently unknown.

The Commission is none the less in contact with the International Trade Commission. It is providing the latter with factual information pertinent to its enquiry which it feels will help to ensure that the analysis is made on the basis of adequate data.

A threat to EEC exports of pigmeat made by the US in connection with the GATT panel findings concerning citrus fruit has been removed.

*
* *

Question No 40, by Mr Clinton (H-252/85)

Subject: Court of Justice Case 23/84: Milk Marketing Board for England and Wales

There are repeated rumours that the Commission might now be prepared to withdraw its action against the UK Government under Article 169 (Case 23/84) in respect of certain pricing policies of the Milk Marketing Board for England and Wales.

Will the Commission deny these rumours and indicate when this case is likely to be determined by the Court of Justice and if not, would the Commission then agree that by not pursuing this case it would be abdicating its responsibilities as Guardian of the Treaty, particularly as it is aware of a private action in respect of the same infringement, which must await the Court of Justice decision in this case?

Answer

The Commission denies the rumours and expects that the Court of Justice will be able to give judgment early in 1986.

*
* *

Question No 41, by Mr McCartin (H-253/85)

Subject: Aids to businesses and cooperatives in the dairy sector

Will the Commission reconsider its decision not to grant, in any case, aids to businesses and cooperatives in the dairy sector, when many such enterprises are, as a result of their processing and research activities, discovering ways of creating energy from waste products, lessening pollution and finding more efficient ways of disposing of waste?

Answer

The selection criteria applied by the Commission is indeed to exclude the dairy sector from aids granted under the Guidance Section of the EAGGF pursuant to Regulation (EEC) No 355/77, except in the case of certain Mediterranean regions.

However, the regulation does permit the Commission to derogate from the general criteria in decisions approving specific programmes submitted by the Member States, provided that the programmes in question provide evidence of particular structural problems that would justify such a derogation.

The Commission will consider any programme of this type submitted by a Member State, in order to establish whether or not a derogation is justified.

*
* *

Question No 42, by Mr Pearce (H-254/85)

Subject: Documentary formalities at intra-Community frontiers

Arising from the Commission's welcome reaffirmation, in its answer to my Question No 734/84¹ that its policy is to abolish frontiers altogether rather than merely improve frontier procedures, does it agree that as soon as the administration of VAT is moved away from frontiers (to points of despatch and receipt of goods in the interior) it will be possible to abolish ALL documentary formalities at intra-Community frontiers, since remaining frontier controls (drugs, fire-arms etc.) do not require documentation? When will this happen?

Answer

Regrettably, for all documentary formalities to be abolished at internal frontiers it would require more than the shift of VAT accounting procedures from frontiers to inland tax offices. Unless VAT rates throughout the Community were sufficiently approximated there would continue to be circumstances in which Member States would continue to require documentation at frontiers. There are also other fiscal and administrative purposes at present served by frontier documentation which would also need to be dealt with. The

¹ Annex to Verbatim report of proceedings of 17. 4. 1985, p. 8.

arguments and a programme for achieving all this are set out in detail in the Commission's recent White Paper on the completion of the internal market.

*
* *

Question No 43, by Mr Hindley (H-255/85)

Subject: Code of Practice for EEC companies concerning the transfer of hazardous industries and products

The resolution on the poison gas catastrophe in India (Doc. 2-1193/84)¹ called upon the Commission to ensure that European firms apply the same safety measures abroad as within the Community.

Could the Commissioner report what action has been taken, and would he consider the drawing up of a Code of Practice for EEC companies concerning the transfer of hazardous industries and products?

Answer

The Commission is conscious of the importance of the problems posed by the export of dangerous products as well as by the transfer of technology to developing countries. It is therefore aware of the need to promote appropriate measures in this field.

As regards the export of dangerous chemical substances the Commission is finalizing a draft regulation which sets up a notification procedure for substances to be exported from the Community if these substances are regulated within it.

This draft regulation will meet European Parliament resolution requirements and implement at Community level international agreements on this matter (OECD, UNEP).

As far as the transfer of technology is concerned, the problem is very complex and the Commission is currently studying the different possibilities to tackle it (e.g. code of conduct) also taking into account developments in progress at international level (e.g. OECD).

*
* *

Question No 44, by Mrs Jepsen (H-257/85)

Subject: Incidence of and measures to combat swine fever in Spain and Portugal

What information can the Commission give on the incidence of swine fever in Spain and Portugal and what steps does it intend to take in relation to these two countries' entry into the EC to ensure the eradication of the disease and the prevention of its spread to the other Member States?

Answer

There are two types of swine fever — African and classical —, the two diseases are totally different and are caused by different organisms. Both diseases are endemic in Spain and Portugal.

In the case of the African swine fever the Community has been providing financial aid for the eradication of this disease in Spain since 1 July 1980 and in Portugal since 1 July 1981.

¹ OJ C 12 of 14. 1. 1985.

The programme involves a total expenditure by the Community of 10 million ECU for Spain and 5 million ECU for Portugal. The measures that are being applied include compulsory slaughter and compensation of pigs on all infected holdings, movement control and tracing, disinfections and disinfestation of infected holdings, use of sentinel pigs in repopulated holdings, the obligation to slaughter pigs in establishments under permanent veterinary control and the creation and protection of disease-free zones by the development of integrated pig-farming enterprises etc. It is a very difficult disease to control, however, a certain amount of progress is being made.

In the case of classical swine fever a Community financially aided eradication programme is currently in progress within the Member States. Spain and Portugal upon accession would not be excluded from joining this programme, however, this matter would need further study between the Commission and the parties concerned.

Current Community veterinary legislation in relation to trade in pigs and their products will be fully applicable upon accession of Spain and Portugal, thus reducing the risk of spread of these two diseases.

*
* *

Question No 45, by Mr Sherlock (H-265/85)

Subject: 'Seveso' Directive

Directive 82/501/EEC¹ on major accident hazards (the Seveso Directive) is currently under review by a working party. Is it correct that substances such as nickel and cobalt and wood preservatives containing copper, chrome and arsenic, even in fairly small quantities are now likely to be brought within the scope of the Directive? If so, what is the justification for including them in a measure designed to control major hazards?

Answer

The directive on major-accidents hazard of certain industrial activities (82/501/EEC, OJ L 230 of August 5, 1982), which came into force on January 8 1984, provides for a series of stringent measures to be taken for the production, processing and storage of dangerous chemicals. In particular for the most dangerous chemicals listed in Annex III in the laid down quantities, a detailed notification concerning all information concerning safety, assessment of hazards and emergency situation of the installation, must be submitted by the manufacturer to the national competent Authorities.

It has to be underlined that Nickel and Cobalt (metal powders and compounds) as well as Arsenic pentoxide are included in the Annex III of the directive with the threshold quantity of 100 kg and 500 kg respectively. Therefore the substances mentioned by the Honorable Member of the Parliament fall already within the scope of the directive since it came into force on 8 January 1984.

On the other hand, as requested by Article 19 of the directive, the Commission is proceeding with the revision of the Annexes I, II and III of the directive, together with the national authorities responsible for its implementation, and will put forward a proposal to the Council in Autumn 1985. It has to be stressed that the Commission, in preparing its proposal, is taking into account the great concern for the hazard posed by the storage and processing of dangerous chemicals and considering attentively the real needs for prevention and safety measures in the field of industrial activities involving dangerous substances.

However, as with all proposals for Council Directives the Parliament will be consulted and invited to give its opinion on the proposed amendments of the directive.

*
* *

¹ OJ L 230 of 5. 8. 1982, p. 1.

Question No 46, by Mr Lomas (H-267/85)

Subject: Legality of the FIFA ban on free movement of English soccer teams

Can the Commission tell me whether the decision by FIFA to ban all English League Football Clubs from playing anywhere in the world, including other parts of the United Kingdom — Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland — and thus preventing players from practising their profession, is allowable under the EEC Treaties provisions on the free movement of goods, capital, services and labour?

If this ban is in breach of the Treaties what action is the Commission prepared to take against FIFA?

Answer

The ban imposed by FIFA on English soccer teams playing abroad is not a legal measure; it is a disciplinary measure, imposed following the specific and tragic events at the Heysel Stadium, and accepted voluntarily by the football authorities of other countries. The Commission has noted that it was preceded by a decision of the English Football Association to withdraw all English football clubs from European competitions: and that the legality of this decision was upheld by the English courts.

The FIFA disciplinary ban undoubtedly affects the possibilities of English soccer teams (though not of individual players) to undertake activities in other Member States, and if it remains in force for an excessive period, it may become appropriate for the Commission to consider its compatibility with Community law. At present, however, the Commission does not think it appropriate to do so.

*
* *

Question No 47, by Mr Di Bartolomei (H-272/85)

Subject: The American Biceps programme and the GATT talks

In view of the fact that the Biceps programme in support of exports of agricultural produce may considerably harm Community interests in this sector, has the Commission made any progress in efforts to persuade the United States to abandon the measures in the Biceps programme which are unfair in regard to the Community and, if so, what progress? Similarly, has the Commission pointed out to the American Administration that the Community alone is not responsible for the drop in American agricultural exports (as the American Secretary for Agriculture has claimed) and can the Commission assure the American Government forthwith that all Member States are willing to agree to multilateral trade talks within the framework of GATT in accordance with the declaration issued by the Council of Foreign Ministers on 19 March 1985?

Answer

The United States so-called Export Enhancement Program could involve the consequences indicated in the question. It is however too early to judge given that the program has been presented by the United States authorities in outline. Only one specific action under this program has been announced in any detail. This concerns a sale of up to 1 million tonnes of wheat to Algeria. The terms of this action provide for the potential exporter to make an offer for an amount of wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation stock to make US wheat competitive with that being offered for sale from other exporting countries.

GATT allows subsidies on the export of primary products provided sales do not take place at prices materially below those of others on the same market and provided that it does not lead to the subsidizing country obtaining more than an equitable market share. The

Commission intends to check the conformity of the US action with these GATT provisions. If it is convinced that there is incompatibility with GATT obligation the Commission will of course act to safeguard the Community interest.

As regards the Community exports the Commission is confident that even if the US program led to an increase in American exports the Community would be able to export the quantities it deems necessary.

The Commission none the less deplores the adoption and presentation of this program which could destabilize world agricultural markets and make the forthcoming New Round of trade negotiations more difficult. The Commission has made this view clear to the United States authorities.

The Commission has for some considerable time also pointed out to the United States authorities that the problems of their agricultural exports are to a large extent the result of the strong dollar and generally sluggish development of world agricultural markets. The United States authorities now recognize that the problems of their agricultural exports are the result of numerous causes, especially the strength of the dollar, many of which have no connection with the agricultural policies of any third country, including the Community.

The Commission has given a full account of the Community's position regarding a New GATT Round at various meetings at which the United States was represented in the GATT and at the meeting of Ministerial level in Stockholm on 8-10 June.

*
* *

Question No 49, by Mr Raftery (H-275/85)

Subject: The ECU

Will the Commission state what steps it intends to take to further promote the use of the ECU, and in particular whether it would support the introduction of currency notes denominated in ECU?

Answer

1. A study on the future role of the ECU in both the public and private sectors is being undertaken by the Monetary Committee and the Committee of Governors on the basis of the issues I raised in Parliament on 14 January 1985.

The study is still in progress; it should be noted, in particular, that following the European Council meeting in Milan, the Commission has been asked to continue its consideration of the future development of the EMS, including the role of the ECU, in close collaboration with the *Community bodies* concerned.

2. The issuing of bank notes denominated in ECU raises the same problems, but on a larger scale, as the minting of ECU coins.

This gives rise to political problems with considerable institutional and technical implications, as can be seen from the following two simple points:

- For bank notes denominated in ECU to be legal tender throughout the Community, they would have to be issued by a monetary authority with a status comparable to that of a central bank. However, the provisions of the existing Treaty principally recognize the competence of national governments in the monetary field and not that of the issuing institutes. In practice, this distinction is vital even if its significance varies from one Member State to another.
- Such a monetary authority could not assert its powers unless it were able to regulate the creation of liquidities in ECU in line with economic trends in the ten Member

States. This ability in fact presupposes a degree of harmonization of national macro-economic policies that is far advanced if not total, i.e. the subordination of such policies to common objectives on inflation and financial equilibrium.

The awareness of these problems does not mean that the objective of European monetary union is any less powerful in providing the momentum for efforts to achieve parallel convergence in the various economic and monetary sectors. Even if the Member States were to retain a fair degree of autonomy in their economic policies, monetary union would still open up opportunities for consolidating the European economy; such opportunities are far from being exhausted and are the continuation of the developments expected of the EMS at its inception.

3. Some of the objectives that the issuing of bank notes in ECU seeks to achieve, might be attained to a certain extent through the use of ECU travellers' cheques, which are already being issued by commercial banks in the Community.

*
* *

Question No 51, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-278/85)

Subject: Campaign launched by PAN (the Pesticide Action Network) against the twelve 'Dirty Dozen' pesticides

PAN, which is an international association drawn from non-governmental organizations from all over the world and is particularly concerned with exports to developing countries of pesticides that are banned or subject to very severe restrictions in the industrialized countries, has launched a campaign against the 'Dirty Dozen', a group of pesticides which are among the most toxic and dangerous on the world market.

Could the Commission — which must be aware of this initiative — state what contribution it intends to make to the campaign launched by PAN to end the production, export and use of these pesticides, which constitute a serious threat to human life and health?

Answer

The Commission is aware of this initiative only from press reports and does not know the basis on which these twelve particular products have been selected.

With regard to the Community internal market, the Commission and Member States review periodically the range of plant protection products authorized for use and may take restrictive measures against a product if, in the light of scientific and technical development, it is established that the product gives rise, or is likely to give rise, to dangers for human or animal health or to unreasonable, adverse effects on the environment.

Most of the twelve products, which I understand PAN to have cited, are either not manufactured or used in the Community or are subject to the provisions of Directive 79/117/EEC¹ prohibiting the placing on the market and use of plant protection products containing certain active substances. Three are authorized in Member States for specific uses. The Commission has no evidence that, when properly used for the purpose intended, they give rise to harmful effects but will continue to keep them under review.

With regard to the export to developing countries of pesticides which are banned or severely restricted in industrialized countries, the Commission has stated on numerous occasions that it believes these problems are best resolved by international agreement.² The Commission has consequently been participating actively in the work of several interna-

¹ OJ L 33, 8. 2. 1979, p. 36.

² OJ C 245, 20. 9. 1982, p. 10.
OJ C 339, 27. 12. 1982, p. 10.
OJ C 93, 15. 4. 1985, p. 21.

tional organizations concerning international trade in banned or severely restricted products, in particular chemicals and pesticides. These include the General Assembly of the United Nations, GATT, OECD, UNEP and FAO. Pursuant to these initiatives, Commission departments are presently working out a proposal for a Community notification system for exports from the Community of prohibited or severely restricted chemicals to provide developing countries with information to help them make informed regulatory judgments.

*
* *

Question No 52, by Mr De Pasquale (H-279/85)

Subject: Relations between the EEC and Libya

According to press reports, the Libyan Government is interested in embarking on negotiations on the conclusion of a cooperation agreement with the Community.

Could the Commission confirm these reports and state whether its contacts with Libya have included discussions of specific issues relating to future cooperation, and does the Commission agree that the conclusion of an agreement with Libya could encourage the development of even more positive friendship and cooperation between the European Community and the Mediterranean countries?

Answer

The Commission has not yet received an official request from Libya regarding the opening of negotiations on a cooperation agreement with the Community.

However, during talks between representatives of the Community and of Libya, the Libyans stated that they would like to establish closer relations with the Community, including by means of a cooperation agreement. On the practical level, mention was made on the possibilities of cooperation in combating desertification — with the requisite regional dimension — and the possibilities of co-financing in the developing countries.

When it laid down the principles of its overall Mediterranean approach in 1972, the Community provided in principle for the possibility of concluding cooperation agreements with all the countries bordering the Mediterranean. However, whether or not such agreements are actually concluded depends on the particular nature of relations between the Community and each of these countries. As regards Libya, if it wishes normally to start discussions with a view to concluding a cooperation agreement, there would have to be an examination of all the facts concerning the role which such an agreement might play in the Community's Mediterranean policy in the light of the Community's desire to help maintain the balance in the region.

*
* *

Question No 53, by Mr Schinzel (H-280/85)

Subject: Laws and interim legislation governing the media in Länder of the Federal Republic of Germany

In conducting its announced review of the laws and interim legislation on the media passed in various Länder of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1984 and 1985, has the Commission come across any rules governing broadcasting organizations or cable transmission which conflict with the EEC Treaty, and if so, what steps has it taken to remove the offending provisions?

Answer

1. In part five of the Commission's green paper on 'television without frontiers' published on 14 June this year, the Commission set out its interpretation of the provisions of the EEC Treaty which guarantee the freedom of provision of services within the Community in relation to radio and television broadcasts. The Commission proposes to act on the basis of this interpretation in discharging its responsibilities under Articles 155 and 169 of the EEC Treaty.

By giving this precise indication of its interpretation of Community law, the Commission wished to ensure that those responsible at national level would have no doubt as to the legal position and of the need to respect fully the principle of freedom of cross-frontier broadcasting within the Community.

2. The Commission is currently examining the laws and legislative proposals in the Member States concerning transborder distribution and redistribution of broadcasts. In two cases steps have already been taken to put an end to discrimination against cable distribution of programmes from other Member States.

When this review has been completed, the Commission will decide whether further action is necessary.

*
* *

Question No 56, by Mr Deprez (H-289/85)

Subject: Spain's purchase of large quantities of milk from the United States

Spain will become a member of the European Community on 1 January 1986 and will then have to comply with the fundamental European principle of Community preference.

It is therefore surprising to learn that Spain has just bought 25 000 tonnes of dried skimmed milk for animal feed from the United States, which will cover its feed milk requirements up to mid-1986, in other words for six months after its accession to the Community.

This is all the more surprising since the Community has been setting limits on the milk produced (milk quotas) by its own farmers for more than a year.

What does the Commission think of this, and how could Spain be made to reverse its decision?

Answer

According to the information available to the Commission, it is not the Spanish authorities but private Spanish businessmen (an association of manufacturers of artificial milk for animals) which have bought 25 000 tonnes of skimmed milk powder for animal feed from the United States authorities. These quantities are to be delivered over the period June 1985 to October/November 1985.

According to the same information, the same Spanish businessmen also have an option on 40 000 additional tonnes, and this option will cease by November 1985.

The Commission would like to draw the honourable Member's attention to the fact that private businessmen retain the right to decide on sources of supply. However, with effect from the date of accession, when the Community's agricultural trade arrangements become applicable to Spain, the various economic operators will have to comply with Community rules.

If the purchasing operations in question take place after this date, they will be fully subject to Community rules, which provide in particular for a levy to bring the price of the imported product into line with the price on the importing market.

It is true that the purchasing operations referred to by the honourable Member have economic implications with regard to the supply requirements of the Spanish market which may make themselves felt beyond the date of accession.

However, the Commission would like to stress that the Community authorities responsible for conducting negotiations were aware of these facts prior to the conclusion of the accession negotiations. The Act of Accession provides for the necessary measures to ensure the presence of Community products on the Spanish market.

*
* *

Question No 59, by Mrs Schleicher (H-296/85)

Subject: Directive on beaches

Recently the following report appeared in a German newspaper: 'only the day after a new law on the cleanness of bathing water came into force, the Italian Government has reduced the stricter limit values laid down in it. According to the Italian press, the levels have been lowered in order to avoid having to close long stretches of beach on the Northern Adriatic coast, which would have had a disastrous effect on the tourist trade in the area. If the original values had been adhered to, it would have been necessary to close miles of beaches which are polluted with seaweed, including the area around Rimini, which is especially popular with German holiday-makers'.

Is the Commission aware of this fact and, if so, what steps does it intend to take in order to safeguard the health of people going on holiday to such areas this year?

Answer

The Commission has no comment to make as to certain statements in the German and Italian press relating to the alleged motivation of the Italian government for reducing certain guideline-values for the quality of bathing waters.

On 3 May 1985 the Italian government adopted the Decreto Legge n. 164 modifying the Decreto del Presidente della Repubblica 1982, nr. 470. This modification allows the regional authorities who monitor algae, which may have a detrimental effect on health, to waive, for a maximum period of three years, the parameters for colour and dissolved oxygen. The Community parameters for dissolved oxygen are guideline values; whereas the colour may only vary in the case of exceptional meteorological conditions, provided that public health will not be endangered. Member States that waive these provisions shall notify the Commission immediately. So far the Commission has received no notification from the Italian authorities that the waiver in question is being applied. The Commission has asked the Italian government for information and will act according to Art. 169 of the Treaty should it find that Italy has failed to comply with its obligations. However, the Commission is not able to guarantee that the Member States will apply the Community legislation.

*
* *

Question No 62, by Mrs Van Hemeldonck (H-313/85)

Subject: The Latin-American debt to the enlarged Community

Does the Commission advocate, in the framework of the enlargement, a comprehensive renegotiation of the Latin-American debt to the EEC banks which — taking Spain and

Portugal into account — amounts to \$ 350 000 million dollars, and is the Commission in favour of a moratorium on the payment of interest on this debt?

Answer

The Commission considers that the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal will have little direct effect on the nature and size of the debt problem facing Latin American countries. The total external debt of Latin America to all creditors amounts to approximately \$ 350 000 million. The Commission has recently held discussions with a delegation from the Cartagena Group on debt problems and would like to see this type of contact develop in the future. Appropriate management will be required by all parties including banks, creditor and debtor countries for some years to come if the present debt problems are to be eased. The Commission would not favour measures which would penalise European banks in comparison with the position of other creditors.

*
* *

Question No 63, by Mr Eyraud (H-315/85)

Subject: Farm prices

The German veto in the vote on farm prices has been a grave setback in the building of Europe. If the Commission had proposed maintaining the cereal price for the first 1000 metric quintals produced by each farm, and reducing it by 5% beyond that quantity, the deadlock would probably have been broken.

What are the Commission's views, and does it intend to consider this suggestion at last?

Answer

When making proposals for fixing farm prices for 1985/86, the Commission announced its intention to organize, before the end of the first half of 1985, a debate within the Community institutions and with the trade organizations in order to establish which way European agriculture should go in the future. To this end, the Commission organized within its own departments working parties dealing with all the political, economic and social aspects involved in ensuring that the Common Agricultural Policy can in the medium and long-term meet the objectives set for it by the Treaty, and in particular Article 39 thereof. One of these working groups, Group No 6, deals with the cereals factor, its task being to analyse, among other things, the additional market instruments such as the co-responsibility levy and quotas.

The initial results obtained by these working groups will soon be published in a Green Paper, intended to launch the debate announced by the Commission when it put forward its 1985/86 price proposals.

At this stage the Commission feels it would be premature to put forward definitive proposals and solutions. Group No 6, which was given the task of analysing the possible solutions in the cereals sector, has also studied the measure proposed by the honourable Member, which was applied in France before the common organization of markets under the name of 'quantum'. It emerged from this study that such a measure requires an efficient organization of the national markets and that even in France, with a system whereby the levy had to be collected by authorized collectors, the quantum proved extremely difficult to check. Nevertheless, the Commission does not refuse *a priori* to put forward the quantum system for discussion as soon as it publishes its Green Paper.

*
* *

Question No 64, by Mr Turner (H-320/85)

Subject: Open Systems Interconnection

Will the Commission report progress in achieving Open Systems Interconnection throughout the European Community?

Answer

The Commission has repeatedly stated that it considers communication above the manufacturing level and the associated European and international standardization efforts to be of considerable importance. These efforts relate in particular to the application of international standards which encourage open communication in the framework of ISO-OSI, i.e. world-wide use of the most common data transmission procedures. Various notable successes have been achieved in this area in the recent past.

In May 1984, the Council of Industry Ministers adopted the guidelines¹ proposed by the Commission for a joint action programme and in December 1984 acknowledged specifically that standardization was the key factor in achieving a European telecommunications policy.² Following on from this the European standardization organizations CEN/Cenelex and CEPT have in the meantime undertaken to carry out the necessary technical work. The adjustment of their organizational structures needed to achieve this has now been set in motion. The first operational standards will probably be submitted at the end of 1985 or beginning of 1986.

The work is therefore making satisfactory progress.

Your question also gives me the opportunity to draw special attention to a recent Commission initiative — a proposal for a Council directive in the field of information technology and telecommunications and a proposal for a Council directive on the mutual recognition of type approval for telecommunications terminal equipment.³ Both proposals were forwarded to the Council for a decision in May this year and they have been submitted to the European Parliament for its opinion. In view of the particular significance of both proposals for European standardization policy I should be grateful if the European Parliament could deliver a favourable opinion as soon as possible in order to ensure a speedy passage through the Council.

*
* *

Question No 65, by Mrs Dury (H-326/85)

Subject: Frauds and irregularities in the fitting of pacemakers

The increasing use of pacemakers has attracted various manufacturers who are not averse to employing questionable sales techniques in their contacts with doctors. A number of scandals have been exposed in France and the Federal Republic of Germany. Such practices have led to pacemakers being fitted improperly, at high cost to the social security services and the community.

Does the Commission intend to put forward proposals on pacemakers, similar to those on the sale of pharmaceuticals?

Answer

Safety hazards and free circulation of electrical apparatus used in human and veterinary medicine as a whole are the subject of the Council directive of 17 September 1984. Its

¹ Doc. SEC(84) 796 of 15. 5. 1984. Commission working document.

² Results of the meeting of the Council of Industry Ministers of 17. 12. 1984.

³ Doc. COM(85) 230.

scope covers much of the sector but excludes some items of equipment and in particular pacemakers. Standardization in the area of electromedical equipment is incomplete and this sector will be given priority in the context of the new approach to harmonization and standards. It is envisaged that a mandate for drawing up of a European standard in this sector will be given to the standardization organizations, CEN and Cenelex, which are already engaged on work in this area.

*
* *

Question No 67, by Mr Iversen (H-335/85)

Subject: Commission pressure on Denmark

Is it true that the Commission is attempting to persuade Denmark to relinquish its chemicals legislation, which contains stricter rules on the notification of chemicals than is the case in the other Member States, thus forcing Denmark to accept the importation of many thousands of chemicals without investigation as to whether they are harmful to man or the environment, and on what considerations of public health does the Commission base its attitude?

Answer

The placing of chemical substances on the market is governed by the Council Directive 79/831/EEC of 18 September 1979 which instituted a Community system of prior notification. The control of the application of this directive has shown that the Danish legislation deviates from the Community dispositions which obliged the Commission to instigate infraction proceedings against Denmark.

The reason for the Commission's opposition to the Danish legislation is that Community legislation is not respected and constitutes therefore a technical barrier to trade.

*
* *

Question No 68, by Mr Battersby (H-336/85)

Subject: China

Can the Commission state what new developments have taken place or are contemplated in the fields of research and information technology subject to the recent visit to the Commission of the Vice-President of the State Commission on Science and Technology of the People's Republic of China?

Answer

The visit of the Vice-President of the State Commission on Science and Technology of the People's Republic of China was in the framework of the cooperation activities between the Community and China.

It allowed an assessment to be made of the projects in progress and the future prospects for such cooperation in the fields of science and technology, energy, telecommunications and data processing. As well as its meetings at the Commission, the Chinese delegation, which spent three weeks in Europe, also visited Germany, Belgium, France and the Netherlands.

The visit demonstrated that scientific and technical cooperation, in particular in the fields of data processing and telecommunications, seems very promising. During the second

high level consultations between the Community and China held in Brussels in May, the two sides also showed their special interest in developing cooperation in these new fields to their mutual advantage.

At the end of the Chinese delegation's visit agreement was therefore reached on a programme of work which provided, firstly for further cooperation in those fields where this had already been developed (i.e. energy, science and technology) and secondly for an initial series of data processing and telecommunications projects to commence in the Autumn.

*
* *

Question No 69, by Mr Prout (H-337/85)

Subject: Consumer credit

Is the Commission aware that France is in the process of preparing a law to give effect to the judgment of the Cour de Cassation in the case of *Visofi v Jakubowski* (1985), which will require grantors of credit to use the so-called proportional method in calculating the annual percentage rate of interest (APR)? In view of the advanced stage of the Commission's proposals on consumer credit and the recommendation made by the experts appointed by the Commission that there should be a uniform method of calculating the APR based on the exact or actuarial method, what is the Commission's reaction to the French proposals?

Answer

The Commission is reliably informed that France is considering the preparation of a décret which would give effect to the judgment of the Cour de Cassation in *Visofi v Jakubowski*, and that the result would be that when, in France, a monthly rate of charge for credit is to be expressed as an effective annual rate the calculation will be done by multiplying the monthly rate by the figure 12. So, for example, when the monthly rate is 2 per cent and this is to be expressed as an effective annual rate, the answer will be arrived at by multiplying 2 by 12, giving an effective annual rate of 24 per cent. This method has the attraction of simplicity. Unfortunately it is not correct mathematically where compound interest is charged, which is virtually always the case. The true answer, at compound interest, is 26.8 per cent. This represents a difference of nearly three percentage points.

The Commission is at present engaged in piloting through the Council of Ministers the amended proposal for a directive on consumer credit. This text reflects the European Parliament's insistence on the need for a uniform method of calculating the effective annual rate of charge for credit. The purpose of this is to ensure that the rates of charge for credit are calculated and expressed in the same way throughout the European Community. The Commission believes that this will benefit lenders and borrowers alike in so far as it will make for greater transparency, contribute to the creation of a common market in consumer credit, and enable the borrower/consumer to compare the rates offered by various lenders.

To this end the Commission requested Professor Kirschen, a noted expert in this field, to examine the problem and make recommendations. His Report has been circulated to all interested parties. He sees no reason why the actuarial method (sometimes called the exact or arithmetical method) should not be used in all the Member States.

The Commission considers that France:

- should note carefully what Professor Kirschen's Report says;
- should ask itself whether the man in the street, when told that the true cost of a credit he is contemplating (or for which he has actually contracted) is 24 per cent, whereas in reality it is 26.8 per cent, is well-informed or badly informed;

- should contribute positively in the discussions in the Council of Ministers' Working Party to the establishment of a uniform method of calculating the true cost of credit to the consumer, and that France should refrain from legislating on the subject until a Community method has been agreed.

*
* *

Question No 70, by Mr Ulburgs (H-339/85)

Subject: South African coal boycott

On 14 June 1985 Mr Beyersz Naudé, Secretary-General of the Council of South African Churches, paid a visit to Commissioner De Clercq. In interviews, Mr Beyersz Naudé left no room for doubt about the fact that he was in favour of a boycott of the South African economy as the ultimate means of bringing pressure to bear in order to resolve in a peaceful manner the threat of conflict in South Africa.

Is the Commission contemplating specific boycott measures, and more particularly, a boycott of South African coal, which moreover, competes unfairly with European coal?

Answer

Mr Beyersz Naudé, as Secretary-General of the South African Council of Churches, has expressed his view that the only remaining peaceful means of finding a solution to the growing conflict in South Africa is to establish trade sanctions against that country. The Community, and in particular the Commission, have frequently expressed the belief that the apartheid policy, as practised by the South African Government, should be condemned and abandoned forthwith. The Community should, furthermore, do all in its power to bring about its rapid end by peaceful means. The Commission does not itself exclude any measure which might bring the South African Government to reason.

It is the Commission's opinion that actions involving sanctions would not be effective without full coordination at international level.

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 12 JULY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Votes</i> <i>Mr Guerneur; Mrs Crawley; Mrs Daly; Mrs Veil; Miss Tongue; Mr Adamou; Mrs Ewing; Ms Quin; Mr Wurtz; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Bonde; Mr Wurtz; Mr Simmonds; Mr Balfe; Mr Seligman; Mr Verbeek; Mr Bombard; Mr Christensen; Mr Adamou; Mr Ford; Mr Romeo</i>	281	2. <i>Imports of motor vehicles into Portugal — Pre-accession protocol EEC-Portuguese Republic (Doc. C 2-56/85)</i>	287
		3. <i>South Africa (Commission statement) Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission); Mr Cassidy</i>	288
		4. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	288

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

*(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)*¹

1. *Votes*

Proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 290 final — Doc. C 2-57/85) on the production and marketing of hops (1984 harvest)

Explanation of vote

Mr Guerneur (RDE), in writing. — (FR) I shall certainly vote in favour of the Commission's proposal for increasing the amount of aid to hop-producers for the 1984 crop.

This decision, however, does nothing to alleviate the fundamental problem of hop-growing. In certain regions, such as Flanders, this sector is seriously

impeded by considerable variations in prices. Growers are completely unable to estimate revenues from their investments, which, as everyone knows, is an essential condition of any activity in a free economy.

Investments weigh especially heavily on this sector, since they have to cover the high cost of erecting networks of hop-poles and also the purchase of complicated machinery for tending and then harvesting the crop. The result is that many growers in my country are abandoning this crop and dismantling and destroy equipment which they have inherited from previous generations.

Needless to say, those growers who have been forced to switch to other crops are merely augmenting the output of products already in surplus, particularly milk.

The solution lies, not in a fixed amount of aid, but in a thoroughgoing Community-wide organization of the market such as already exists for the big products. This is what the specialists want, and we should follow their advice.

I urge that the Commission undertake to meet the specialist organizations in all the Member States concerned with a view to working out, before it is too

¹ *Approval of the Minutes — Petitions — Procedure without report (except Commission proposal (Doc. C 2-57/85) which is dealt with under Votes): see Minutes.*

Guermeur

late, a solution that makes economic sense to a problem which is not only economic but also social.

(Parliament approved the proposal)

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-76/85) by Mr Tolman, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on the proposals from the Commission for

- A. a Council regulation (EEC) amending Regulation (EEC) No 1943/81 on a common measure to improve the processing and marketing conditions in the cattlefeed sector in Northern Ireland (COM(85) 234 final — Doc. C 2/45/85);
- B. a Council regulation (EEC) amending Regulation (EEC) No 1938/81 on a common measure to improve public amenities in certain less-favoured agricultural areas of the Federal Republic of Germany (COM(85) 236 final — Doc. C 2-46/85);
- C. a Council regulation (EEC) amending Regulation (EEC) No 1054/81 establishing a common measure for the development of beef cattle production in Ireland and Northern Ireland (COM(85) 238 final — Doc. C 2-47/85): *adopted*

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-55/85) by Dame Shelagh Roberts, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights, on the memorandum presented by the Commission to the Council (COM(84) 695 final — Doc. 2-1759/84) on income taxation and equal treatment for men and women.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Crawley (S). — It is ironic that this report should have been written by a Tory, Dame Shelagh Roberts. She is a Tory crying in the wilderness of her own party's hardline opposition to equal treatment, particularly when it comes to taxation and workplace nurseries, as we heard this from the House of Commons.

The report is highly critical of the Commission's milk-and-water approach to the obvious need for a directive. The Commission has merely prepared a memorandum, and it is now obvious to the vast majority of women that a directive will be the only way to kickstart Member States into equal treatment in fiscal legislative reforms.

The separate taxation of men and women workers called for in the report will mean that married women

are not automatically relegated to the second division as they are now, when the fiscal disincentive to paid work is often overwhelming. The present system does emphasize the fact that women's economic independence and self-esteem must be fought for tooth and nail against real weapons of bigotry and injustice intent on pushing women to the side of mainstream economic life, especially during this time of mass unemployment. The lesson to be learned . . .

President. — Mrs Crawley, I have really got to stop you there. You have gone well beyond your time, I am afraid.

Mrs Daly (ED). — My group will support the report in spite of the fact that Amendment No 1 was not adopted. We are very concerned that the original objectives of Dame Shelagh's report may be diluted, but the fact that Amendment No 4 was adopted enables us to support it.

I support it personally because I believe that Dame Shelagh Roberts and her predecessors in this group have done a tremendous amount to pursue these objectives unequivocally. In this instance I cannot accept Mrs Crawley's views about the British Government. Because of the work of the European Democratic Group and Dame Shelagh and my predecessors, the British Government has taken a positive step by producing a Green Paper promising separate taxation in the future, which can only be to the benefit of women workers and will, in fact, achieve the objectives that Dame Shelagh and my colleagues have set themselves.

(Applause from the European Democratic benches)

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* My group will vote for this report and wishes to congratulate the Women's Committee and, in particular, the rapporteur on the quite remarkable work she has accomplished.

I should like to address a remark to the Commission. When we talk to women of the Community, we find that the impression that many of them have of Europe is the work that has been done on behalf of non-discrimination. But this work has not been completed, it has to be pursued further, and the proposals made by Parliament to this end are extremely important. I think we should be doing something really very useful for the reputation of Europe, of the Community, and for the equality of the sexes if action were rapidly taken on these excellent proposals made by Parliament. I also think they will be backed this morning by a very large majority of this House.

(Applause)

Miss Tongue (S). — Along with the rest of the Socialist Group I will support this report. However, I would

Tongue

like to emphasize that the adoption of a directive in this field of taxation will in no way prevent national governments from implementing really progressive tax systems. Equality of treatment between men and women in taxation goes hand in hand, I believe, with a tax system which strives to achieve a better distribution of wealth between rich and poor and between men and women.

Whilst I wholeheartedly applaud the work of the rapporteur. I do believe that the Finance Bill vote in the House of Commons two days ago, when the Conservatives voted to continue with the taxing of workplace nurseries, means that the rapporteur has some lobbying to do with her own women Prime Minister and her own male colleagues, as I am sure that she supports the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment which says there should be no tax on such nurseries.

The Council has done nothing since 1979. Not one directive to achieve equality between men and women has actually been enacted by the Council since that date. We trust this will not happen with the directive on this subject which I hope we will see coming before this House very soon.

(Applause from the Socialist benches)

Mr Adamou (COM). — *(GR), in writing* — Equal treatment for men and women with regard to income taxation represents just one aspect of the huge social problem of full equality between the sexes. Dame Roberts' report identifies the consequences of fiscal discrimination against women and proposes measures which would counter them. Therefore, we have no valid reason not to support and vote for these proposals. However, the discussion on this subject gives us the opportunity to emphasize the general nature of discrimination against women, and their inferior position in present-day capitalist society, an inferiority which extends to all areas of life.

Women were and still are the object of fierce exploitation, a source of removable profits for employers, as they demand the lowest pay-rates of the entire workforce. Women do not enjoy the same opportunities to further their careers, and neither can they gain the same access to all professions commensurate with their physical and intellectual capabilities. Neither does a corresponding protection or guarantee exist for mothers: within the family, too, they occupy a position inferior to that of the man, whether husband, father or brother.

It is clear that the origins of this problem lie in the very structure of society which has established and legally protected discrimination, and which fosters and preserves the traditional perception of women's 'natural disadvantages'. We believe that women will, by their efforts, win their family and social rights and will con-

tribute to the common struggle for the liberation of all workers from the chains of exploitation.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-72/85) by Mr Hutton, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

- I. a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2617/80 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to overcoming constraints on the development of new economic activities in certain zones adversely affected by restructuring of the shipbuilding industry
- II. a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 219/84 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to overcoming constraints on the development of new economic activities in certain zones adversely affected by restructuring of the textile and clothing industry
- III. a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2619/80 instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to the improvement of the economic and social situation of the border areas of Ireland and Northern Ireland
- IV. a Regulation instituting a specific Community regional development measure contributing to the development of new economic activities in certain zones affected by the implementation of the Community fisheries policy

(COM(84) 715 final — Doc. 2-1556/84) and for

- V. a Regulation relating to the establishment of specific Community regional development measures in 1985 and amending Regulation (EEC) No 1787/84

(COM(85) 243 final — Doc. C 2-52/85)

Explanations of vote

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — Mr President, I have it in writing and I was going to put it in writing, but I am so shocked at the rapporteur's not supporting the amendments in the name of Mr Barrett, Mrs Lemass and

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendment No 2;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 3 to 5, 7 to 11, 13, 18, 21 to 23, 26 to 30, 32.

Ewing

myself. I would point out to the House that I support all fishermen, everywhere in the Community, as evidenced by my votes, and not just if they come from my part of the world. But the Conservatives apparently only support the fishermen that come from their part. I really am rather shocked that the rapporteur should have been against the amendments and that the person for Fraserburgh was not even here to vote for them. These things quite shock me, because you know I speak for all the fishermen of the Community at all times. It is time we had a little reciprocity!

(Applause)

Miss Quin (S). — I shall vote in favour of this report as I believe it is important for the Regional Fund to do something to tackle the enormous economic problems which have been experienced, particularly in areas affected by the loss of jobs in the shipbuilding and textile industries. I do, however, feel strongly that the amount of money which has so far been made available has been ludicrously inadequate to even scratch the surface of the problems that have been created. My own amendments pointed this out.

Furthermore, I would like to make it quite clear that while the resources of the non-quota section are welcome in shipbuilding areas, I believe it would have been much more useful for the Community to develop shipbuilding policies which would have prevented the catastrophic decline of this industry. The shipbuilding industry has been run down, especially in my own region, to an unacceptably low level which will not allow us to take advantage of future world demand. This is a tragedy for which the amounts of money available in the non-quota section can never be adequate compensation.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Wurtz (COM), in writing. — (FR) Fourteen million ECU from the non-quota section of the ERDF are surely not an excessive appropriation for our French shipbuilding regions that have been hit by the policy of closing and restructuring shipyards. Nevertheless, I am disturbed to read in the Court of Auditors' report for 1983 that in some cases ERDF aid coincided with a reduction in the number of jobs. I therefore deplore the fact that the Commission should have said nothing about the creation of employment as an indispensable criterion for the allocation of funds.

In our shipbuilding regions it would certainly be preferable to modernize shipyards and make the most of the capacities at our disposal in order to achieve a breakthrough on the shipbuilding market. What we want is not the watering-can but the means of responding to the increased demand for new ships. Orders for new vessels placed with European shipyards during the first quarter of 1985 were double the value of those placed during the first quarter of 1984.

The ERDF should not be used to repair the damage done by austerity but rather to encourage development, employment and training for women and men.

I would add that Mr Hutton's proposals on flexibility of labour are unacceptable.

For these reasons, the French members of the Communist and Allies Group will abstain on this report.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-63/85) by Mr Poetschki, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on second-generation regional development programmes 1981-85: adopted²

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-69/85) by Mr Vandemeulebroucke, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on the importance of water resources for the growth and development of certain regions of the Community: adopted³

Mr Tomlinson (S). — On a point of order, Mr President, I was waiting for an appropriate break in the voting. In view of what appears to be the welcome move in the United States towards the application of sanctions against South Africa, have you received any request from the Commission to come to this House this morning to advise the House of what is happening, particularly in light of the resolution passed in this House in April? This is among the most important news that has happened on an issue which this House has expressed very serious opinions on over the years. It appears that there are moves in the United States for the application of sanctions against the South African Government and I think it would be a pity if we were not to have the opportunity of hearing a Commission view, if they have one, before we adjourn for the Summer recess.

(Applause from the left)

President. — Mr Tomlinson, I can inform you that I have received no such request at the moment, but as

¹ The rapporteur was
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1 to 10, 22;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 13 to 15, 18 to 20 and 23.

² The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 2, 7, 8;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 3 to 6, 9 and 11.

³ The rapporteur was:
— AGAINST Amendment No 7.

President

the Commission are here they might like to think about it and perhaps later on make a statement to the House once the voting has been completed.

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-47/85) by Mr Fajardie, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 116 final — Doc. C 2-12/85) for a decision laying down the procedure for appointing those members of the Board of the European Foundation to be chosen by the Community.

Explanation of vote

Mr Bonde (ARC), in writing. — (DA) The People's Movement is against the unlawful connections between the EEC institutions and the cultural structures set up by Member States and points out that any contribution from the EEC budget for cultural purposes or other sorts of connection will mean that Denmark cannot lawfully cooperate in the cultural foundation without a vote to this effect in the Folketing by a five-sixths majority or, failing that, a plebiscite.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PERY

Vice-President

Report by Mrs S. Martin, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on the beef and veal sector (Doc. A 2-48/85)

Explanation of vote

Mr Wurtz (COM), in writing. — (FR) By tabling a motion for a resolution on problems in the beef sector in October 1984, the French members of the Communist and Allies Group made their contribution towards the holding of this debate.

Later, the Pranchère report adopted by the European Parliament on 14 March 1985 took account of the difficult situation of stock-breeders and proposed solutions. Unfortunately, the Council rejected them with regard to both prices and the organization of the mar-

ket. The increase in prices for the 1985-86 marketing year was late in being adopted and amounted to no more than 1.9%, whereas the Pranchère report had proposed an increase of 7% for France to take account of the suppression of negative MCAs, including the neutral margin of 1.5%.

The effects of applying the milk quotas, including the increased numbers of animals slaughtered, have led to a deterioration in the market situation, which remains very depressed. Steps must be taken to restore price levels and improve stock-breeders' income. Of these, the most important are improving the system of intervention so that the prices adopted are passed on to the producer, the proportion lost at the moment being about 20%; limiting preferential imports by revising agreements concluded during a period of shortage; measures to encourage the disposal of goods whether by export or by domestic consumption (special sales at reduced prices to less-favoured social categories, preserves for food aid).

The Martin report, which we have helped to improve by the adoption of some of our amendments in committee, meets our essential requirements and so we shall vote for it, gratified that the specific problems of the store-cattle market, which is of interest to many stock-farming regions in France, have been taken into account.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Interim report (Doc. A 2-62/85) by Mr Simmonds, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on animal welfare policy

Explanations of vote

Mr Simmonds (ED), rapporteur. — Last night at ten minutes to midnight the Commissioner informed the House that he could not support paragraph 12 of my report which calls for the setting up of a specific unit within the Commission to deal with animal welfare matters. Earlier in his remarks he informed the House that he proposes to ensure that the Commission takes greater steps to ensure that existing legislation on animal welfare is observed to a greater extent than it has been in the past. I really find therefore his announcement that he does not propose to make staff specially available for this purpose rather surprising and I will be forwarding to him a question as to how he proposes

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 4 and 6;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 3 and 5.

Simmonds

to implement his intentions. Having said that, not surprisingly I propose to vote in favour of my report.

Mr Balfe (S). — I congratulate Mr Simmonds on his dogged determination and hope that the Commission will put something in the kitty.

Mr Seligman (ED). — I shall vote for this important resolution because I feel it centres on two important aspects — research and staff. I was particularly pleased to note the Commissioner's remarks last night regarding research — by the way, it was the early hours of the morning by the time he finished. But I was, of course, disappointed that he did not feel able to establish in the near future a specialist division to deal with matters of animal welfare within the Commission, especially as this is demanded by all sides of the House. I trust therefore that he will, as a matter of urgency, review the distribution of his staff at present available to him in this field, in order that the representations of Parliament and the anxieties of the millions of people we represent can be adequately dealt with at the Commission.

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — (*NL*) Economics deals with living but tricky means of production. What is lifeless is easier to handle. Plants, animals and, above all, human labour are more awkward than machines. Can you have any faith in a civilization that sees animals merely as a cost factor, as a means of profit, when it comes to dealing with individuals and peoples? This resolution is vague because with vagueness you can suit everyone. It contains nothing concrete for animals as regards proper security of living conditions. The interim report holds out scarcely anything for the final report. It is not a question of giving poultry, calves and pigs a few more millimetres of space, but of abolishing batteries, calf boxes, pig cages and chains, just as much as jails, concentration camps, labour camps, etc. We shall abstain in this resolution.

Mr Bombard (S). — (*FR*) I asked for the floor because you know how people in the Latin countries maltreat animals and treat them with contempt, whereas we, the European Parliament, have a chance of showing ourselves to be a multinational assembly and I think it extremely important that the laws in force should be applied and that a stop be put to these scandalous massacres, these scandalous concentrations of animals which, moreover, lose in quality, as do their subproducts. I am thinking, for example, of eggs. We must not only fight for the welfare of animals but, in this Parliament, introduce a budgetary line to ensure a livelihood for those who fight for this.

Mr Christensen (ARC), in writing. — (*DA*) The People's Movement against the EEC emphasizes that animal-protection legislation is a national concern and

therefore not something for the EEC to decide. Furthermore, economic special interests in the EEC often triumph over the general good as, for instance, in matters of environment, health and animal protection. Before Denmark joined the EEC battery-hen farming, for instance, was banned as animal mistreatment, which it is. Now Denmark sees itself obliged not only to allow battery-hen farming, but even to accept smaller batteries.

The People's Movement is of the opinion that Denmark itself should decide on its animal welfare. We will not have the EEC cutting back on animal welfare. On the other hand, we are more sympathetic to the idea of cooperation in, for instance, the Council of Europe in the sphere of conventions, that is to say obligations freely entered into in the interests of animal welfare.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. A 2-66/85) by Mr Stavrou, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1603/83 laying down special measures for the disposal of dried grapes and dried figs held by storage agencies (Doc. C 2-21/85 — COM(85) 146 final)

Explanations of vote

Mr Adamou (COM), in writing. — (*GR*) We are in agreement with the proposal for the disposal of stocks of dried grapes and dried figs in Greece. We wish, however, to use this opportunity to stress that the building up of these stocks is totally unjustifiable, since the Community requires 200 000 tonnes of dried grapes annually, while Greek production does not reach this figure. Consequently, the Community should encourage Greek dried grape producers to step up production — this is the most logical policy since Greece is the only Member State of the Community which produces dried grapes and dried figs. The Community, however, did exactly the opposite: it imposed a quota on Greek dried grapes (93 000 tonnes for sultanas and 65 000 tonnes for raisins). However, not even this figure was sufficient. Infringing the principle of Community preference, it imported 80 000 tonnes of dried grapes from Turkey (i.e. 75% of Turkish production) while only 40 000 tonnes were imported from Greece (representing 40% of Greek production). A similar story occurred with regard to figs:

¹ The rapporteur was:
— FOR Amendment 3/rev.;
— AGAINST all other amendments.

Adamou

20 000 tonnes — all, of course, completely free of duty — were imported from Turkey, while only 3 000 tonnes were imported from Greece.

The result of this policy is that Greek dried grapes and figs remain unused, and Greek producers' income has fallen.

This policy towards Greek products is a typical example of the negative effects that the country's entry into the EEC has had on Greek workers and, more generally, on the Greek national economy.

Mr Ford (S), in writing. — This report proposes that we spend £ 420 000 destroying currants and figs that have been held in store for a number of years. The Community is being asked again to spend large sums of money destroying food in a world where millions face starvation. In this case it is currants and figs, but so often before we have seen the same thing happening again and again to a whole shopping basket of food.

The Common Agricultural Policy in its grotesque absurdity means consumers pay three times — in over-priced food, in storing food for years and finally in destroying the same food. It is commonly believed that this bizarre policy helps to protect small farmers. This is not the case except by accident. Instead it gives massive subsidies to the multinational agricultural companies. Europe must have a food and agricultural policy that ensures good food for the people of Europe, but without the obscene culinary topography of cereal mountains, wine lakes and the rest.

We are being asked to pay to destroy food, while our aid to the starving is woefully inadequate. *Live Aid* will do more for food aid this week than the whole of the institutions of the European Community put together. It is beyond belief that we are doing so little when voluntary organizations and groups are doing so much.

For these two reasons I shall be voting against this report.

Mr Romeo (S), in writing. — (GR) I shall vote in favour of Mr Stavrou's report on the proposal from the Commission for special measures for the disposal of dried grapes and dried figs.

It would, however, be appropriate, in view of the debate on the review of the Common Agricultural Policy, to make some fundamental points relating not only to dried grapes and dried figs, but also to other agricultural products, particularly those from the Northern Member States of the Community.

The reaction of certain of our colleagues against the use of funds from the budget for the destruction of stockpiles of produce is fully understood, and we entirely agree that this practice should be stopped.

But who is to bear the responsibility for such a policy? Certainly not the producers, since their production falls within the limits that the Community itself has set.

When in actual fact the farmers' produce does not even satisfy 50% of Community demand — as is the case with dried grapes — the existence of stocks is the responsibility of the Commission, being linked to the organization of the market.

In fact, the setting of a guarantee threshold and a minimum price for imports from third countries has brought about a considerable revival of the dried grape market, and as a result, we have witnessed a continual reduction of stocks.

This means that a better management policy could, at least in the short term, have an important effect on the problem of stockpiles — also for other products, and particularly processed goods.

Along with better management policy, moves should be made within the framework of a revised CAP towards a 'gentlemen's agreement' on structural policy and Community preference: structural planning covering not only production but also disposal of produce (new markets, new applications for products).

Such a policy would certainly lead to a reduction in surpluses, an improvement in production and competitiveness, lower prices for consumers, more balanced regional development and a more equitable distribution of income.

I do not think that anyone can disagree with these aims.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

2. Import of motor vehicles into Portugal

President. — The next item is the Pre-accession Protocol to the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Portuguese Republic and the Protocol between the European Economic Community and the Portuguese Republic concerning the arrangements for the progressive liberalization of imports of motor vehicles into Portugal from the Community (Doc. C 2-56/85).

Since no one has asked to speak, we shall proceed immediately to the vote.

(By successive votes Parliament adopted the two Protocols)

3. *South Africa (Commission statement)*

President. — I am informed that Commissioner Ripa di Meana is ready to make the statement requested by Mr Tomlinson, though the relevant Commissioner is absent. However, there can be no debate since, I repeat, the relevant Commissioner is not here to answer more precise questions.

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — (IT) Madam President, the Commission is at one with this Parliament with regard to the policy of *apartheid*, the acts of aggression against the neighbouring states and the protracted occupation of Namibia by the South African Government.

The Commission has appealed on several occasions to the government of South Africa to end its policy of *apartheid*, to cease carrying out acts of aggression against neighbouring states and to respect the many UN resolutions on Namibia.

The Commission well understands the many voices raised in this Assembly, as elsewhere, in favour of economic sanctions against South Africa. Commissioner Willy De Clercq, addressing this Parliament on 18 April, did not rule out this possibility, and I repeat today that the Commission does not reject out of hand measures of this sort that could bring South Africa to see sense.

(Applause)

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Madam President, my point of order was to ask whether we are going to have the opportunity to question the Commissioner on his statement.

President. — Mr Cassidy, I agreed to have this statement added to the agenda whilst specifying there would be no debate. Your request cannot therefore be accepted.

4. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — Before closing the sitting I should now like, on your behalf, to thank the authorities of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for their efficiency and hospitality.

(Applause)

We are all, I think, particularly appreciative of their having kept on the receptions planned in our honour and for our pleasure in spite of the bereavement they have suffered.

(Applause)

I wish you all an excellent holiday.

I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.¹

(The sitting was closed at 10.20 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 01 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
Tel. 322 22 55
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 56 56

Sub-agent:

Alan Armstrong & Associates Ltd

72 Park Road
London NW1 4SH
Tel. 01-723 39 02
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
Ottawa
Ontario K1P 5R1
Tel. Toll Free 1 (800) 267 4164
Ottawa Region (613) 238 8985-6
Telex 053-4936

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shiniuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Journal Department

PO Box 55 Chitose
Tokyo 156
Tel. (03) 439 0124

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 63.30 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

